ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT AND JOB INVOLVEMENT IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN EDO STATE, NIGERIA

OZIEGBE UWUIGIAREN & *EVELYN UMEMEZIA
Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria
uwuigiarenoziegbe123@gmail.com
*Corresponding author's email: evelyn.umemezia@uniben.edu

Abstract

This study empirically investigated the influence of perceived Organisational support on job involvement in selected universities in Edo State. The specific objective was to ascertain if perceived employer support, perceived supervisor support and perceived fellow employees support have any influence on the level of job involvement in selected universities in Edo State. Three hundred and eighty-four (384) sampled employees from four selected universities in Edo State were involved in the study. Data collected from the sampled employees were analysed using multiple regressions. The findings of the study revealed that the dimensions of perceived Organisational support investigated, that is, perceived employer support, perceived supervisor support and perceived fellow employees support have significant influence on employees' job involvement in the selected universities. The study recommended that management of universities in Edo State sustain and possibly increase their level of support provided for employees in other to attain optimal employee performance.

Keywords: *Job Involvement, Organisational Support, Perceived Employer Support, Perceived Fellow Employees, Perceived Supervisor Support.*

1.1   Introduction
The intense competition occasioned by globalisation has necessitated the need for organisations to create a competitive advantage (Mudrack, 2014).   And one of the ways by which organisations achieve this competitive advantage is through employee job involvement; a concept that has been defined as the focus and enthusiasm to make one available for work activities (Bhatia, Deep, & Sachdeva, 2012). It is an emotional and psychological identification and attachment with immediate work activities rather than the organisation itself (Robbins & Judge, 2015).

Job involvement differs from employees commitment in the sense that, while the latter is concerned with emotional attachment with the organisation itself occasioned by the congruence in the values of the individual member and

organisation (Allen & Meyer,1997), the former is more closely associated with acceptance of, and active participation and emotional attachment to assigned job activities (Mudrack, 2014).

Employee job involvement can be triggered by assigning work with activities to employees that are meaningful, impactful and significant to their lives and the lives of others (Carmeli, 2015). Many studies have also shown that job involvement can be nurtured, enhanced, sustained and developed (Carmeli, 2015; Greenberg & Colquitt 2015). Individuals with high job involvement have lower intention to turnover and are less likely to engage in absenteeism (Geldenhuys, Laba & Venter, 2014). They are likely to perform work with optimal creativity (Berg & Feij, 2015). Job involvement will be at the highest when there is perceived justice in leadership support, fair treatment of subordinates and provision of fair rewards (Mudrack, 2014). Greenberg and Colquitt, (2015) concur that job involvement increases when employees perceive fairness in organisational support. They assert that organisational support is one of the core mechanisms for creating a positive state of mind, sense of the meaningfulness of work experience and psychological connectivity and identification with job and organisation.

Organisational support is the degree to which the organisation the employees are working for, value their contributions and care about their well-being. The sources of organisational support lie in the favourable treatment attributed to the organisation as a whole. Many studies advocate that when employees perceive organisation and its agents as great support they feel obligated to avail themselves in role performance (Eder & Eisenberger 2008, Simosi, 2012, Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015). Thus, job involvement has been found to be related to organizational support in organisations. It is against this backdrop that this study intends to assess the degree of influence the concept of organisational support exerts on job involvement in tertiary institutions in Edo state.

1.2   Statement of the Problem

Employees feel obligated to engage themselves in in-role and extra-role performance when they perceive support, caring and sincere concerns from employers, supervisors and fellow employees (Eder & Eisenberger, 2015). However, several organisations in Nigeria do not support employees even when they are the most critical resource in the organisation whose actions and inactions determine the success of the organisation (Oge, Ifeanyi & Charles-Gozie, 2015). According to Oge *et al.,* (2015), perceived low support from supervisors and employers in Nigeria workplace including tertiary institutions has been increasing at an alarming rate reflecting in reward distribution, interpersonal treatment and even the policies and procedures developed by some organisations, which are in most cases unclear, or largely immeasurable even to those who design them. These unfair and deplorable working conditions employees experience have generated a lot of controversy in

employer-employee relationship in tertiary institutions, featuring tardiness, strikes, workplace assault, extensive absenteeism, sabotage, which is commonly associated with the Nigerian workers (Efanga & Akpan, 2015). This has also negatively affected the psyche and morale of many workers in tertiary institutions in Nigeria making them unwilling to get highly involved in the delivery of their job description (Igbinomwanhia & Akinmayowa, 2013). This tends to suggest that employees in tertiary institutions in Nigeria may be far from psychological attachment to jobs, which is what job involvement is about.

Besides, studies conducted in developed countries focused on the implication of employer support and supervisor support on workers' job satisfaction, with employment dissatisfactions spilling over to low interest in job involvement, job engagement and performance of employees (Burns, 2017; Caesensa & Stinglhamberb, 2014, Chhetri, 2017).

It is on the strength of the identified issues and research gap created by the exclusion of the fellow employee support dimension of organizational support in previous studies, that this study is undertaken.

1.3   The Objectives of the Study
The study aimed at:
1. examining the relationship between perceived employer support and job involvement in selected universities in Edo State;
2. ascertaining the relationship between perceived supervisor support and job involvement in selected universities in Edo State and; and
3. determining the relationship between perceived fellow employee support, and job involvement in selected universities in Edo State.

1.4   Research Hypotheses
The following hypotheses will be tested at 0.05 level of significance.
1. There is no significant relationship between perceived employer support and job involvement in selected universities in Edo State;
2. There is no significant relationship between perceived supervisor support and job involvement in selected universities in Edo State; and
3. There is no significant relationship between perceived fellow employees support and job involvement selected universities in Edo State.

2.0   Conceptual Review
2.1   Job Involvement
Job involvement has been described as the extent to which employees psychologically identify with a job, actively participate in it, and how they consider the job activities they perform to be important to their life satisfaction (Carmeli, 2015). The concept connotes the degree to which workers psychologically identify with a job (Robbins and Judge, 2015), merge

ego identity with the job, (Elankumaran, 2014) internalise work values, (Lunenburg, 2010), believe work or job to be important in life (central life interest) and consider their self-image, self-worth or self-esteem or life satisfaction to strongly depend on work performance.

2.2   Perceived Organisation Support.

Perceived organisation support is concerned with meeting socio-emotional needs through reward of greater effort or sustained increase in performance-reward expectancies, and provision of assistance to employees when required (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart and Adis, 2015). Perceived organisational support arises from three dimensions or sources that include employee support, supervisor support and perceived fellow employee support (Eisenberger, Shoss, Karagonlar, Gonzalez-Morales, Wickham, and Buffardi, 2014). Each of these dimensions is discussed below.

2.3   Perceived Employer Support

Perceived employer support is the degree to which employees evaluate and judge employers to show concern about their well-being, regard their contributions and willingness to fulfill their socio-emotional needs through an offering of favourable organisational rewards and job conditions (Neves and Eisenberger, 2014). Many studies have indicated that evaluation of recognition, pay, and promotion and job security determine how employees perceive employers to be concerned about their well-being (Bakker and Demerouti, 2014).

2.4   Perceived Supervisor Support

Perceived supervisor support involves developing perceptions of how their supervisors care about their contribution, appreciate their extra effort and show concern about their goals, interests while making decisions that affect them (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006). Low perceived supervisor's support occasioned by abusive supervisors has the tendency of increasing counterproductive work behaviours, withdrawal behaviours and adversely affect employees' motivation all of which prevents the organization from achieving its objectives (Bowling and Michel, 2011).

2.5   Perceived Fellow Employee Support

Perceived fellow employee support has been defined as the perceived willingness of the members of a workgroup or fellow employees to exert efforts on behalf of employees when absent, having a heavy workload and experiencing some work and non-work related challenges (Eisenberger, Shoss, Karagonlar, Gonzalez-Morales, Wickham, & Buffardi, 2014). It is the degree to which an employee perceives co-workers to be engaged in helpful behaviours to meet his/her socio-emotional needs (Simosi, 2012).

The general belief concerning the extent to which the workgroup or fellow employees care about their well being is based on the frequency with which

members of their workgroup or colleagues make themselves available either voluntarily or involuntarily to help them when they experience emotional, financial and physical distresses (Hayton, James, Carnabuci, & Eisenberger, 2012). When employees perceive that co-workers value their contributions and care about their well-being they attribute the role-related actions taken by the members of the organisation to the organisation itself. This is because employees ascribe human-like characteristics to the organisation and view organisational members as agents of the organization (Shanock &Eisenberger, 2006). When employees perceive that supportive relationship among co-workers is absent and especially that engaged extra-role behaviours are not a norm in their workgroup, such employees tend to put up undesirable attitudes and engage in counterproductive behaviours (Eisenberger, Shoss, Karagonlar, Gonzalez-Morales, Wickham, & Buffardi, 2014). This suggests that employees reciprocate perceived coworkers support with extra-role behaviours that benefit the organization. Hence, co-workers contribute to shaping and implementing the organisation's values and objectives through the provision of both instrumental and socio-emotional resources that facilitate and enable members of an organisation to accomplish specific tasks or objectives (Ng & Sorensen, 2008).

Albrecht (2012) avers that perceived team support enhances job satisfaction and fosters a sense of belonging among members of the organisation. It influences emotional attachment to the organisation, lowers engagement in withdrawal behaviour (for example, taking longer breaks than usual or taking undeserved work breaks), production deviance (for example, doing work incorrectly), sabotage behaviour (for example; theft, stealing, bribery and cheating, abuse and making fun of someone at work) and breaking corporate rules, values and procedures) (Sulea, Virga, Maricutoiu, Schaufeli, Dumitru, & Sava, 2012).

Drawing on social exchange theory, perceived care from supervisors enacts a feeling of obligation. Employees who perceive care from supervisors engage in positive work-related behaviours to help the supervisors achieve their goals (Rhoades *et al.,* 2001).

2.6   Theoretical Framework
This study is founded on organizational support theory and social exchange theory by Eisenberger *et al.,* (1986) and Blau (1964) respectively. Organisational support theory posits that employees are involved in their jobs to the degree to which organisations value their contributions and care about their welfare through low or high in-role and extra-role performance. It draws from the social exchange theory that hypothesises that employees act in harmony with the rule of reciprocity, exchanging their efforts and commitment to their organisation for perceived organisational readiness and

dedication to the meeting of their emotional needs and reward for increased efforts. Because employees with high perceived organisation support usually judge their jobs more favourably, it is expected that they will also experience increase in job satisfaction, positive employee's engagement and greater willingness to invest more energy in an in-role and extra-role performance.

Studies have identified control, workload, recognition, social support, rewards, and perceived fairness to be associated with perceived organisational support, which consequently influences employee's job involvement (Eisenberger *et al.,* 2014). The key aspects of the job were found to be within the control of employers, supervisors and fellow employees. Therefore, Eisenberger *et al.,* 2014argue that employees' responsibilities are created through a chain of interactions among employers, supervisors and fellow employees who are in a state of reciprocal interdependence. These relationships develop over time into loyal, trusting, and mutual commitments as long as employers, supervisors and fellow employees stand by certain "rules" of exchange (Cropanzano & Mictchell, 2005) that generally include payment or reciprocity rules in which the actions of one party lead to reactions or responses by the other party.

2.7 Empirical Review
Table 2.1: Summary of Empirical Review

S/N	Author(s) and Country	Dimensions studied	Dependent variables	Sampled size and methods of data analysis
1.	Saks(2006); Canada.	Perceived organisational support and supervisor support	Employee engagement	102 employees; Correlation and regression tests
2.	Simosi (2012); United Kingdom	Perceived organisational support, perceived supervisory support and colleague support.	Affective commitment	251 employees; Multiple regression analyses
3.	Tuzun and Kalemci (2012); Turkey.	Perceived supervisor support, organisational support among	Turnover intentions	304 employees; Regression analysis
4.	Mathumbu and Dodd (2013); South Africa.	Perceived organisational support	Organisational citizenship behaviour, discretionary behaviour of employees and work engagement	106 sampled nurses, Regression Analysis
5.	Caesensa and Stinglhambe rb (2014);	Perceived organisational support	Work engagement, job satisfaction, psychological strains and extra role	265 employees and 112 supervisors; Equation model and regression

S/N	Author(s) and Country	Dimensions studied	Dependent variables	Sampled size and methods of data analysis
	Belgium.		performance	
6.	Aninka & Oyewole (2014); Nigeria.	Supervisory support	Employee engagement	174 sampled employees; Regression Analysis
7.	Neves and Eisenberger, (2014), United States	Perceived organisational support (POS)	Trust and risk-taking	346 employee-supervisor dyads ; Regression and structural equation
8.	Eder and Eisenberger (2015); Northeastern United States.	Organisation support	Tardiness, withdrawal behaviour	23 and 94 sampled work groups; Correlation and multiple regressions
9.	Abed and Elewa (2016); Egypt.	Organisational support	Work engagement and citizenship behaviour	139 female and 118 male employees; Correlation analysis and step-wise linear regression analysis
10.	Dai and Qin (2016); China.	Perceived organisational support	Employee engagement	350 employees ; Hierarchical regression analyses
11.	Burns (2017); Southern California, USA.	Perceived organisational support and supervisor support	Work engagement,	382 sampled employees; Structural equation modeling
12.	Chhetri (2017); Nepal.	Perceived organisational support	Job engagement, task performance; organisational citizenship behaviour; counter-productive work behaviours	285 bank employees; Multiple regressions

Source: Author's Compilations from empirical literature review (2018).

3.0   Methodology

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design given that the data needed on variables (dimensions of organisational support and job involvement) were collected from the sample respondents at a specific point in time. The population of the study comprised all employees of approved universities in Edo State, Nigeria that have successfully gone through the NUC accreditation process. Among the universities in Edo State, the study, however, focused on University of Benin, Ambrose Alli University, Benson Idahosa University and Igbinedion University. The justification for focusing on these four universities hinged on ownership classification (federal, state,

and private universities), thereby ensuring universities from the three strata/tiers were represented and year of establishment which ensured that universities of long standing were considered.

The academic and non-academic population of these four universities was nine thousand six hundred and nineteen (9,619), while the individual university population are as follows: University of Benin, Benin City- five thousand eight hundred and ninety (5,890); Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma- two thousand five hundred and forty eight (2, 548); Igbinedion University, Okada- six hundred and eighty six (686) and Benson Idahosa University- four hundred and ninety five (495).

The sample size required for this was ascertained using Yamane's propounded formula for selecting a sample size from a population that is finite. Using Yamane's (1967) formula a sample size of 384 was arrived at. The value of this sample size was distributed proportionately among the four universities based on the proportion of the staff strength of each of the selected universities using Kumar (1976) proportional allocation formula proposed as $n_h = \frac{Nh}{N} \times n$, Where n_h = sample size for stratum h; N_h = population size for stratum h; N = total population. This is demonstrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Administration of Questionnaire

S/N	Selected universities	No. of Staff	Proportionate Sampling
1	University of Benin, Benin City	5,890	$n_h = \frac{5980}{9,619} * 384 = 235$
2	Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma	2,548	$n_h = \frac{2,548}{9,619} * 384 = 101$
3	Igbinedion University, Okada	686	$n_h = \frac{686}{9,619} * 384 = 28$
4	Benson Idahosa University, Benin City	495	$n_h = \frac{495}{9,619} * 384 = 20$
	Total	**9,619**	**384**

The administration of the copies of the questionnaire was done using multi-stage, purposive and convenient sampling techniques. In the first stage, the study divided each of the institutions into academic and non-academic arms. The academic arm was stratified into professors, senior lecturers, and junior lecturers (Assistant Lecturers-Lecturers I) in different faculties and departments in the universities while the non-academic arm was stratified into top management, middle management, supervisory management, technical and support staff in the universities understudy. The last stage was the selection and physical administration of hard copies of the questionnaires to the sampled respondents. This was jointly carried out during or after meetings, classes, seminars and lunch breaks by the researcher and research assistants who were employed and trained primarily for the purpose.

The total number of copies of the questionnaire administered was six hundred (600). Three hundred and eighty four (384) of the number retrieved were

found usable. Specifically, two hundred and thirty five (235) staff in University of Benin, a hundred and one (101) staff in Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, twenty eight (28) staff in Igbinedion University, Okada, and twenty (20) staff in Benson Idahosa University were successfully surveyed.

The research instrument for this study consisted of a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire for job involvement was adopted from Lawler and Hall (1970) while that of organisation support, decomposed into employer support, supervisor support and employee support dimensions, was adopted from several studies (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006; Hayton, *et al.,* 2012; Saks, 2006).

A pilot study was carried out by testing and pre-testing the questionnaire validity with twenty (20) employees, who were randomly selected from the staff of the universities. The questionnaire consisting of sixty nine (69) closed-ended questions was found suitable for the study. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability test was used to ensure questionnaire validity. Each of the variables was found to be reliable for the study. The results are as shown below:

Table 2: Cronbach Alpha

Construct	Variables	Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha
Organisational Support	Employer Support	17	0.898
	Supervisor Support	25	0.873
	Fellow Employees' Support	14	0.864
	Job Involvement	14	0.911

3.2 Model Specification

In order to estimate the relationship between job involvement and perceived organisational support, disaggregated into perceived employers support, perceived supervisors support, and perceived fellow employee's support, the study formulated the model below:

$$JOINV = f (PES, PSP, PFEP) \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

In this study, the long-run equation is specified as follow:

$$JOINV = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PES + \beta_2 PSP + \beta_3 PFEP + U \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

JOINV = Job involvement
PES = Perceived Employer Support
PSS = Perceived Supervisor Support
PFES = Perceived Fellow Employees Support

The Apriori expectations for our variables, which are $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 > 0$ indicated that each of the constructs of perceived organisational support will have a

positive relationship with Job involvement. In analysing the data collected, the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression techniques were employed. The results of OLS were used to test the hypotheses formulated. The tests were conducted at 5% level of significance using Eview version 8.

4.0   Discussion of Results
Table 3: Job Involvement

S/N	Statement Items	Mean (X)	Std Dev (SD)
1	The most important things that happen to me in my life usually occur at work.	3.8020	.88032
2	I live, eat, and breathe my job	3.5381	1.00625
3	The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work performance	3.6929	.90213
4	I genuinely care for and highly concerned about the present work I do	2.8274	.87409
5	I place my present job at the center of my life's interests	2.8680	.72599
6	I always put in my best to meet formal performance requirements of the job.	3.7411	.73722
7	I put extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to meet my work goals.	3.8528	.69065
8	I get depressed when I have less of workload or work to do	2.8883	.68996
9	I come early to work when I have more work to do	2.8553	.69303
10	I willingly accept job responsibilities given to me	3.3147	1.27311
11	I sometimes stay after working hours in order to complete my job.	3.3934	1.28212
12	I prefer spending my free time in activities which are relevant to my job	2.7310	1.00061
13	I feel worried when I am unable to complete tasks or leave work unfinished	2.8249	1.14019
14	I feel that my life fulfillment, self-worth or esteem comes from the work I do.	3.3655	1.23289
Mean and standard deviation for job involvement		**3.263557**	**0.942455**

Table 3 shows results on job involvement in selected universities in Edo State with an overall mean score of 3.2 which is relatively high since it is above the criterion mean of 3.00. The above results show that there is a unanimous agreement on the statement provided, indicating that the employees are involved in the job. Specifically, Eight items (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 14 with means of 3.8020, 3.5381, 3.6929, 3.7411, 3.8528, 3.3147, 3.3934, 3.3655 respectively) indicated that the respondents are involved in their jobs while six of the items (4, 5, 8, 9, 12, and 13 with means of 2.8274, 2.8680, 2.8553, 2.7310, 2.8249 respectively) indicated that the employees are not involved in their job.

Table 4: Employer Support

S/N	Statement Items	Mean (X)	Std Dev (SD)
1	My employer values my contribution to the organisation's well-being	2.2665	1.38973
2	My employer usually fails to appreciate any extra effort from me (R)	1.9898	1.29979
3	My employer really cares about my well-being	2.4645	.89954
4	Even if I did the best job possible, my employers would fail to notice (R)	2.5964	1.19460
5	My employer cares about my general satisfaction at work	2.7817	1.49913
6	If my employer could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he/she would do so	2.7589	1.43927
7	My employer shows very little concern for me (R)	2.5330	1.41966
8	My employer takes pride in my accomplishments at work	2.9975	1.38788
9	My employer would forgive an honest mistake on my part.	2.8706	1.43245
10	It would take only a small decrease in my performance for my employer to want to replace me (R)	2.7284	1.13014
11	My employer feels there is little to be gained by employing me for the rest of my career.	2.8477	1.16005
12	My employer provides me little opportunity to move up the ranks (R)	2.7030	1.16813
13	If I were laid off, my employer would prefer to hire someone new rather than take me back (R)	2.0964	.90845
14	My employer cares more about making a profit than about me (R)	2.6066	.81341
15	If my organisation earned a greater profit, it would consider increasing my salary	2.6066	.81341
16	My organisation is unconcerned about paying me what I deserve (R)	2.7437	1.50412
17	If my job were eliminated, my employer would prefer to lay me off rather than transfer me to a new job (R)	2.2310	1.35540
Overall mean for employer support		**2.577782**	**1.224421**

Table 4 shows how employer support influences job involvement. The results show that there is a unanimous disagreement on employer support. This is evidenced by the overall mean of 2.5778 indicating that employer support is low in the universities. The mean values for all the items are also lower than the mean criterion of 3.0 which further explains that employer support is low in the universities.

Table 5: Supervisor Support

S/N	Statement Items	Mean (X)	Std Dev (SD)
18	My supervisor disregards my best interests when he/she makes decisions that affect me (R)	3.1269	1.38665
19	Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem	3.0838	1.33673
20	My supervisor is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.	3.8223	.66456
21	My supervisor would fail to understand my absence due to a personal problem (R)	3.8579	1.06056
22	Even if I did the best job possible, my supervisor would fail to notice (R)	3.1675	1.36378
23	My supervisor values my contribution to the well-being of our department	2.9670	1.34275
24	My supervisor cares about my opinions	3.0584	1.32279
25	My supervisor appreciates extra effort from me	3.3426	.94740
26	If my supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he/she would do so(R)	2.8553	1.49022
27	My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments	3.8249	1.02005
28	My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me	3.8071	1.11129
29	My supervisor really cares about my well-being	3.9391	.90593
30	My supervisor wants to know if I have any complaints	3.8832	.88905
31	If I did the best job possible, my supervisor would ensure it is noticed	3.7741	.92036
32	My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work	4.0051	.94639
33	My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favour	3.8782	.98868
34	If I decided to quit, my supervisor would try to persuade me to stay	3.1091	1.40547
35	My supervisor would understand if I were unable to finish a task on time	3.1650	1.13276
36	My supervisors do work for me that go beyond what is specified in my job description.	3.3071	1.11871
37	My supervisor wishes to give me the best possible job for which I am qualified	3.1396	1.15616
38	My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible	3.1701	1.27573
39	My supervisor feels that hiring me was a definite mistake (R)	3.0102	1.06286
40	My supervisors are proud that I am a part of this organisation	2.7538	1.12016
41	My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me(R)	3.8401	.72562
42	My supervisor defends my work actions to a superior even without complete knowledge of the issue in question	2.8503	1.20449
Overall mean for supervisor support		**3.389548**	**1.115966**

Table 5 shows that supervisor support influences job involvement. The overall mean is 3.389, which is relatively high since it is above the criterion mean of 3.00. The above results show that there is a unanimous agreement on the item statements provided, indicating that the employees enjoy some degree of supervisor's support. Twenty of the items have their means higher than 3.0 indicating that the employees enjoy supervisor's support while only four items have their means lower than 3.0 indicating that supervisor's support to the employees is not adequate.

Table 6: Fellow Employees Support

S/N	Statement Items	Mean (X)	Std Dev (SD)
43	My co-workers are willing to help me when I need a special favour	3.7944	.80132
44	My co-workers really care about my well-being	3.7817	.94267
45	My co-workers take pride in my accomplishments at work	3.3147	1.11999
46	My co-workers value my contribution to their well-being	3.4569	1.07926
47	My co-workers put extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to further the interests of my work	3.8147	.87002
48	My co-workers do not mind working their hardest for me	3.5838	1.06975
49	My co-workers would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others	2.8832	1.24036
50	My co-workers defends my work actions to a superior even without complete knowledge of the issue in question	2.8367	.83643
51	My co-workers would defend me to others in the organisation if I made an honest mistake	3.7995	1.15157
52	My co-workers willingly give time to help me when I have work-related problems.	3.4721	1.17457
53	My co-workers adjust their work schedule to accommodate my requests for time off.	3.2208	1.04332
54	My co-workers give up time to help me when I have work or non-work problems.	3.4924	1.11715
55	My co-workers offer assistance to me whenever I have heavy duties	3.3959	1.38350
Overall mean for fellow employee support		**3.404831**	**1.079883**

Table 6 shows that fellow employee support influences job involvement. The overall mean is 3.405, which is relatively high since it is above the criterion mean of 3.00. The above results show that there is a unanimous agreement on the statement provided, indicating that the employees enjoy some degree of support from their colleagues. Eleven of the items have their means higher than 3.0 indicating that the employees enjoy support from their colleagues while only two items have their means lower than 3.0 indicating that colleagues support is not appropriate in some areas.

Model Estimation and Interpretation
Correlation
Table 7: Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for All Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	JOINV	PES	PSS	PFES
JOINV	3.227	0.942	1			
PES	2.586	1.226082	.413	1		
PSS	3.382	1.119665	.274	.128	1	
PFES	3.405	1.079883	.350	.350	.195	1

Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation for the dependent and independent variables of the model are shown above in Table 7. From the Table, there is a significant positive correlation at 0.01 level. It also reveals that employee job involvement is positively and significantly related to employer support (r=0.413, p=000<0.01), supervisor support (r=0.274, p=0000<0.01), fellow employees support (r=0.350, p=000<0.05). There is the absence of multi-collinearity in the model as none of the correlation coefficients is equal to or greater than 0.80.

The regression result shows that when the independent variables, employer support, supervisor support and fellow employee support were regressed on job involvement (JOINV) of employees in the selected universities in Edo State, a coefficient of determination (R2) value of 0. 752 was obtained. This value indicates that the independent variables, organisational support dimensions jointly explain 75.2% of the variation in the dependent variable, job involvement (JOINV), while other factors or elements not included in this regression model, but taken care of by the error terms, accounted for 24.8% explanation of job involvement. The R-squared value after adjustment for the degree of freedom was 0.750 in the regression model. This value further confirms that the three dimensions of organisational support, when grouped together explain approximately 75% systematic variations in job involvement (JOINV) after the elements in the model, have been adjusted to a degree of freedom.

The regression results also show that the combined organisational support dimensions has F-statistic of 401.794 at Prob (F-statistic) value of 0.00000 which is less than 5%. This means that generally, there exists a significant linear relationship between organisational support and job involvement (JOINV) at 5% level of significance.

4.2   Testing of Hypotheses
Table 8: Summary of Regression Results

Organisational support and job involvement in selected universities in Edo State							
Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Decision	Hypothesis
	β	Std. Error	β				
(constant)	.626	.084		7.408	.000		
PES	.364	.017	.552	21.530	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
PSS	.075	.022	.085	3.352	.001	Significant	Reject Ho
PFES	.353	.017	.534	20.571	.000	Significant	Reject Ho
DW	R Square	AdjustedR Square	Overall Std. Error	F	Sig.		
1.999	.752	.750	.19810	401.794	.000*		

Predictors: (constant), perceived employer support, perceived supervisor support, perceived fellow employee support: Dependent Variable: job involvement. P-values are significant at 0.05.

The regression coefficients (β), 0. 0.552, 0.085, and 0.534 for perceived employer support, perceived supervisor support and perceived fellow employee support respectively in Table 6 further shows the magnitude of the impact the different dimensions of organisational support exert on job involvement (JOINV). This is relevant for policy formulation with respect to fostering job involvement (JOINV) in tertiary institutions in Edo State. In this regard and on the basis on the magnitude of these coefficients, an increase in perceived employer support, perceived supervisor support and perceived fellow employee support would lead to an increase in job involvement (JOINV) in the selected universities in Edo State, by 55.2%, 8.5% and 53.4% respectively. This suggests that perceived employer support is a powerful predictor of job involvement (JOINV) followed by perceived fellow employees support. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.9 indicates zero first-order serial correlation which further confirms the absence of multi-collinearity in the model as shown by the correlation coefficients in Table 7. Hence, the model has a goodness of fit and can be used for policy making with re-specification.

5.0   Discussion of Findings
This study has provided empirical evidence on the relationship between the organisational support (perceived employer support (PES), perceived supervisor support (PSS), and perceived fellow employee support (PFES) and job involvement (JOINV) in the selected universities in Edo State. The empirical study shows the existence of a significant link between job involvement and organisational support in the selected universities in Edo State. This finding is consistent with our apriori expectations, and with findings of several similar empirical studies. .

The first finding of this study: employer support significantly and positively affects the level of job involvement in the selected universities in Edo State confirms those of Ahmed, et al., (2015), Caesensa and Stinglhamberb (2014), and Dai and Qin (2016). The second finding that supervisor support significantly and positively affects the level of job involvement in the selected universities in Edo State confirms the findings of Saks (2006), Dabke and Patole (2014) and Aninka and Oyewole (2014).

The third finding of this study that fellow employee support significantly and positively affects the level of job involvement in the selected universities in Edo State confirms the results of Simosi (2012), Eisenberger et al., (2001) and Albrecht (2012).

5.1   Conclusion
Generally, the conclusion derived from this study is that job involvement increases with increased perceived organisational support in the selected universities in Edo State. It showed that those employees who received favourable treatment in their organisations were more involved in their work. The study also revealed that increase in perceived employer, supervisor, fellow employee support can help organisations mitigate low job involvement among its employees. Equally garnered from the study is the fact that employees reciprocate positive evaluation which is not based only on judgment of employer's commitment in caring and showing concern about employees' well-being but also on the supervisor's and fellow employee's support (interpersonal treatment).

5.2   Recommendations
Firstly, the management of tertiary institutions in Edo State should increase its level of support provided to employees. They should show more concern and care about the well-being of their employees. This can be done by designing packages where employees can easily get help, aids or secure property (house, car, furniture) loan. The management can also increase their support and caring attitude toward employees by offering flexible work/time, frequent promotion, quality medical care, favourable sick leave policies, on-the-job training, fair salary, and stipend or bonus for extra performance including extra working hours.
Secondly, the management of tertiary institutions in Edo State should direct supervisors to care about the well-being of their subordinates. This can be done by instructing the supervisor to treat subordinates with respect and dignity and refrain from improper remarks or comments. Management should also direct the supervisor to always demonstrate the spirit of servant leadership by going the extra mile to make the job interesting for a subordinate, helping subordinates with heavy duties, difficult task and increased workload.

Thirdly, management of tertiary institutions in Edo State should make considerable effort to make employees support one another. It should make effort to stimulate supportive and caring culture among employees. This can be done by giving award to those employees who engage in altruism, show selfless and sincere concern for the welfare of others, volunteer to assist other employees with excess workloads and those who need special financial and non-financial aids.

References

Abed, F., & Elewa, H. A (2016). The relationship between organizational support, work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviour as perceived by staff nurses at different hospitals. *Journal of Nursing and Health Science*, *5*(4), 113-123.

Ahmed, I., Ismael, T., Khalifah, Z.,Sadiq, M.,&Faheem, M.A. (2015). Graduates expectation gap: The role of employers and higher learning institutes.*Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 7*(2),372-384.https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-05-2014-0056

Albrecht, S. (2012). The influence of job, team and organizational level resources on employee well-being, engagement, commitment and extra-role performance: Test of a model. *International Journal of Manpower. 33.*https://doi.org/10.1108/01437721211268357

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

Aninka, D. O., & Oyewole, A. A.(2014). The influence of individual and organisational factors on employee engagement. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability, 3*(6), 1381-1392.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E.(2014). *Job demands-resources theory*. Wiley Blackwell: New York, NY.

Berg, P. T., & Feij, J. A.(2015). Personality traits, job characteristics, and work behaviours, *Internal Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *16*(1), 26–33.

Bowling, N. A., & Michel, J. S.(2011). Why do you treat me badly? The role of attributions regarding the cause of abuse in subordinates' responses to abusive supervision. *Work and Stress, 25,* 309-320.

Burns, L. K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support as antecedents of work engagement. Master's Theses. San Jose State University.

Caesensa, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Luypaert, G.(2014). The impact of work engagement and workaholism on wellbeing: The role of work-related social support. *Career Development International, 19*(7), 813-835.

Carmeli, A.(2015). Exploring the determinants of job involvement. *Journal of manpower, 26*(1), 57-72.

Chen, Z., Eisenberger, R., Johnson, K., Sucharski, I., &Aselage, J. (2009). Perceived organizational support and extra-role performance: Which leads to which? *The Journal of social psychology, 149,* 119-124.https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.149.1

Chhetri, S. B. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of job engagement: Empirical evidence of bank employees. *Business Perspectives and Research, 5*(2), 1-13.http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2278533717692919

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M.S. (2005). Social exchange theory, an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31,* 874-900.http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

Dabke, D. H., & Patole, S.R. (2014). Do perceived organizational support, perceived superior support, goal clarity, perceived career progression opportunities and job satisfaction predict intention to stay? *International Journal of Research in Management & Technology, 4*(2), 114-126.

Dabke, D., & Patole, S. (2014). Predicting employee engagement: Role of perceived organisational support and supervisor support. *Tactful Management Research Journal*, *3*, 1-8.

Dai, K., & Qin, X. (2016). Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement: Based on the Research of Organizational Identification and Organizational Justice. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 04*, 4657. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.412005

Eder, P., & Eisenberger, R. (2008). Perceived organisational support: Reducing the negative influence of co-worker withdrawal behaviour. *Journal of Management, 1*, 55-68.

Eder, P., &Eisenberger, R. (2015). Perceived organizational support: Reducing the negative influence of coworker withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Management, 1*, 55-68.

Efanga, S. I., & Akpan, G.M. (2015). The relationships between organizational justice and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviour in secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education, 4*(3), 70-82.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Shoss, M. K., Karagonlar, G., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., Wickham, R., & Buffardi, L. C.(2014). The supervisor POS - LMX subordinate POS chain: Moderation by reciprocation wariness and supervisor's organisational embodiment. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 35, 635-656.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharsk, I., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 565–73.

Elankumaran, S. (2004). Personality, organizational climate and job involvement: an empirical study. *Journal of Human Values,* 10 (2), 117-130.

Geldenhuys, M., Laba, K., & Venter, C. M. (2014).Meaningful work, work engagement and organisational commitment. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 40*(1), 1-10.

Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2015). *Handbook of organisational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hayton, James, C., Carnabuci, G., & Eisenberger, R. (2012).With a little help from my colleagues: A social embeddedness approach to perceived organisational support, *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, *33*, 235249.

Ibarra H., & Smith-Lovin L. (1997). Alternative routes: A social network perspective on gender and careers. Creating Tomorrow's Organizations, ed. C Cooper, S Jackson, 359–84. New York: Wiley

Igbinomwanhia, O. R., & Akinmayowa, J. T. (2014). Determinants of citizenship behavior in Nigerian organizations. *European Journal of Business and Management, 6(35)*, 155.

James H., Carnabuci, G., & Eisenberger, R. (2012). With a little help from my colleagues: A social embeddedness approach to perceived organizational support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33,*235249.

Karatepe, O. M. (2012). The effects of co-worker and perceived organisational support on hotel employee outcomes: the mediating role of job embeddedness. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 36*(4), 495-516.

Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A.,

&Adis, C. S.(2015). Perceived organisational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organisational support theory. *Journal of Management, 7,* 8-21.

Ladd, D., & Henry, R.A.. (2000). Helping coworkers and helping the organization: The role of support perceptions, exchange ideology, and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 2028-2049.

Lawler, E. E., Ill, & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 54*, 305-312.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Leader-member exchange theory: Another perspective on the leadership process. *International Journal of Management, Business and Administration*, *1*(13), 32-45.

Mathumbu, D., & Dodd, N. (2013). Perceived Organisational support, work engagement and organisational citizenship behaviour of nurses at Victoria hospital. *Journal of Psychology, 4*, 87-93.

Mudrack, P. E.(2014). Job involvement, obsessive-compulsive personality traits, and workaholic behavioural tendencies. *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, *27*(7), 490-508.

Neves, P., & Eisenberge, R, R.(2014). Perceived organisational support and risk taking. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*(2), 187-205.

Ng, T., & Sorensen, K. (2008). Toward a further understanding of the relationships between perceptions of support and work attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Group & Organization Management, 33*, 243-268.

Oge, G. M., Ifeanyi, E. O., & Charles-Gozie, A.(2015).Organisational justice and counter-productive work behaviour. *Journal of Business and Management Studies, 1*(2), 1-10.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001), Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,*825-836.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A.(2015). *Organisational Behaviour 15thed. New Jersey*: Prentice-Hall International.

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 66-80.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 600-619.

Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R.(2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organisational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 689-695.

Shoss, M., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J.(2013). Blaming the organisation for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organisational support and supervisor organisational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 158-168.

Simosi, M.(2012). Disentangling organisational support construct: The role of different sources of support to newcomers' training transfer and organisational commitment. *Personnel Review, 41*(3), 301-320.

Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 781-790.

Sulea, C., Virga, D., Maricutoiu, L. P., Schaufeli, W., Dumitru, C. Z., & Sava, F. A. (2012). Work engagement as mediator between job characteristics and positive and negative extra-role behaviours. *Career Development International, 17*(3), 188-207

Tuzun, K., & Kalemci, R. (2012). Organizational and supervisory support in relation to employee intentions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology. 27*, 518-534.

Wadsworth, L., & Owens, B. (2007). The effects of social support on work–family enhancement and work–family conflict in the public sector. *Public Administration Review, 67,* 75-87.

Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Edition, New York: Harper and Row.