

AGE-BASED DISCRIMINATION AND EMPLOYEE JOB OUTCOMES: EVIDENCE FROM THE NIGERIAN CIVIL SERVICE

¹Dan-Jumbo, Comfort T.; ²Christine A. Nwuche

¹Department of Hospitality Management and Tourism, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

²Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Abstract

Management literatures acknowledge that age-based discrimination results to high employee turnover, job dissatisfaction, indolence among other negative employee job outcomes. Despite the numerous studies in this area, the high rate of negative employee job outcomes is still witnessed in the Nigeria's Civil Service. This may be attributed to the paucity of empirical studies in this area, especially in Nigeria. Thus, this work attempts to abridge this gap by examining age-based discrimination in the Nigerian public service and its correlates with employee job outcomes, focusing on the Rivers State Civil Service. The results indicate that age-based discrimination increases employee intention to quit and decreases employee commitment. It was recommended that policies should be developed to discourage age discrimination, while promotions, rewards and benefits in the civil service should be based on merit (performance) not on age.

Keywords: Age-based discrimination, employee job outcomes, employee commitment, employee intention to quit.

1. Introduction

All organizations whether privately or publicly owned aim to achieve positive employee job outcomes. Employee job outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour, identification, intention to quit, commitment, involvement are critical for organizations to achieve its objectives (Ram & Prabhakar, 2011; Ali, Kakakhel, Rahman & Ahsan, 2014). Employee commitment as work outcome is highly researched and evidence shows that committed employees are less distracted, more focused, and embrace change. Correspondingly, loyal and satisfied employees find happiness at work and think less about quitting (Mechanic & Irefin, 2014). Therefore, both private and public enterprises aim to have employees with greater positive job outcomes such as commitment, satisfaction, loyalty and identification and lower negative work outcomes such as intention to leave, incivility and dishonesty (Carmeli, 2003; Olori & Dan-Jumbo, 2017).

Today in the public sector, performance is at its lowest level and a dismal service quality (Adamade, 2009; Olori & Dan-Jumbo, 2017; Isaiah, Ojiabo & Alagah, 2017). It is argued that creating positive employee work outcomes may be the solution (Triana, Jayasinghe & Pieper, 2015). Olori and Dan-Jumbo (2017) precisely, opine that having civil servants that are fully committed and contented with their work seems to be the succour for the dwindling performance of public service in the country and Rivers State Civil Service in particular.

Among the problems facing the civil service in Rivers State and Nigeria as a whole is poor employee job outcomes shown in the level of indiscipline which manifests itself in the high rate of personnel lateness to work, nonchalant attitude of workers towards work/clients, impudence, inefficiency, poor level of transparency, unaccountability, dismal level of productivity, indolence and above all corruption (Agwu, 2013; Garba & Jirgi, 2014).

Contemporary scholars have suggested diverse solutions to these problems (e.g. Agwu, 2013; Okurame, 2009; Triana, Jayasinghe & Pieper, 2015; Olori & Dan-Jumbo, 2017). However, the problem of high employee turnover, dissatisfaction, indolence among others still persists, indicating critical levels of negative employee job outcomes. Thus, this work aims to investigate if the presence of age discrimination in the public service could be a possible cause of these problems and solutions proffered. Therefore, this work examines the relationship between age-based discrimination and employee job outcomes, specifically in the Rivers State Civil Service.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Age-Based Discrimination

Workplace age discrimination is a major concern in public institutions. This is because these institutions are confronted with the problem of managing increasingly age-diverse workforce. Age-based discrimination has been studied and examined in different settings, contexts and in relationship with several organizational variables (Shore & Goldberg, 2005; Zacher &

Steinvik, 2015). Age discrimination is sometime called ageism (Zacher & Steinvik, 2015). It is a situation where a worker or group of workers are disadvantaged or subjected to unfair treatment due to their age or belonging to a certain age category (Zacher & Steinvik, 2015).

Age-based discrimination is defined by War (1994) as “not offering employment to an applicant, dismissing an employee from work, giving less pay, denying training, promotions or other entitlements and benefits based on age”. Likewise, CIPD (2003) defines age-based discrimination as a “behaviour from others that disadvantages a person on grounds of age”.

The common form of institutional age discrimination or its manifestations include “biased decision making, negative evaluations, and unfair behaviors in contexts such as recruitment, personnel selection, performance appraisal, promotion decisions, and training” (Zacher & Steinvik, 2015).

Other manifestation of age-discrimination includes the practice of refusing some workers from substantive job responsibility or restricting access to certain career development opportunities (Meiner, 2006). The nature of age-based discrimination differs among nations. The predominant age-based discrimination in Nigeria is “age specification for job seekers” (Okafor, 2010). That, setting age limit for prospective applicants. Okafor (2010) sees this customary practice by employers as discrimination against potential job seekers.

Age-based discrimination can be unintentional or deliberate, unconscious or explicit (Okafor, 2010). However, any practice of treating applicants/employees differently based on their age brackets or stating limits of age is considered age discrimination (Okafor, 2010; Dan-Jumbo, 2018).

Specifying age limits for job seekers seems to be the finest example of age-based discrimination in recruitment (Meiners, 2006). It is also revealed in other forms including “forcing retirement because of age; assigning older workers to duties that limit their ability to compete for high level jobs in the organization; requiring older workers to pass physical examination as a condition of continued employment; indicating an age preference in advertisements for employees such as “young dynamic person wanted” and promoting younger workers while denying older workers promotion because of fewer years to retirement” (Abubakar, 2003).

Nationally, older graduates are discriminated against by the National Youth Service Corps Act, which prohibits graduates who are above 30 years to partake in the compulsory one year service to the country, even when the older graduates are willing to serve.

In a recent investigation on workplace discrimination and commitment, Olori and Dan-Jumbo (2017) opine that age-based discrimination in the civil service is an enchanting issue affecting virtually all arms of the civil service. Also, it is customary in the private sector where managers set age limits for recruitment and retirement (War, 1994; Olori & Dan-Jumbo, 2017). Age-based discrimination is inversely related to positive job outcomes across age groups (Gonzales, et al., 2015).

Some of the ways in which advanced employees are discriminated include limited training opportunities, lower reward and other advancement opportunities. They are denied these opportunities with the excuse of being old and unyielding to new, advanced and complex technology (Snape & Redman, 2003; 2005). Similarly, occasionally young employees are discriminated against in corporate organizations; an action known as ‘youthism’. According to De Lucca (2005) junior employees are discriminated and exploited “in terms of lower pay and outright refusal of employment opportunity because of lack of experience”.

Presently there is difficulty for individuals above 40 years to secure jobs in Nigeria except at the premium levels, for instance, General Manager, Executive or Managing Director. Most advertised jobs prescribe age limit as prerequisite for the jobs; thus, leading to individuals falsifying their age to fall within the age limits required for such job positions. This affects jobs and would-be employees. Moreover, if the job requires some physical roles, older people who lowered their age will not perform like younger ones - a tremendous dilemma in the Nigerian workplace.

Employee Commitment

The state of commitment shown by workers to the realisation of expressed firm’s goals and objective is a sign of positive attitudes towards work by the worker. Benkhoff (1997) posits that workers commitment may be a psychological conception that shows the coordination between the employee and the firm. As submitted by Allen and Meyer (1990), individual commitment explains the link between the worker and the organization It describes the implication of continuing within the cluster. Bayram, (2005) conjointly noted that employees who indicate commitment to the firm, are more compatible, productive, and loyal. Allen and Meyer (1990) expressed some indicators of firm commitment like “affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment”.

Studies have evidenced that commitment is a crucial organisational variable. As such, Colakoglu, et al (2010) asserts that, recruiting loyal employees may be an intimidating task for modern managers. They proffer that obtaining employees who possess feelings of self-worth and feel appreciated is the way forward to the current challenge.

Among the primary definitions of worker commitment is that the conceptualization by Mowday, et al (1982), who expounds it as “an employee’s belief in his firm’s target, objectives, and esteem, and a sequent readiness to place in enough work for his/her firm and a resolve to stay with the firm for an extended amount of time”, whereas, Allen and Meyer (1996), refers to commitment as “a bond between an employee and employer such that the employee does not harbor any intention of walking out of the firm”.

In another instance, Redmon (2010) describes worker commitment as the creation of a legitimate identification and high level loyalty to the organisation or leader. Moreover, Redmon (2010) compactly declared that worker commitment is “the level of a worker’s physical, mental, psychological and emotional attachment towards the organization wherever he or she works”.

Another detailed definition comes from Muthuveloo and Rose (2005), who expressed that commitment is the possibility of the person to simply accept to hold out already expressed firm objectives. This means the person would have belief within the firm's objectives as expressed (Porter, et al., 1974).

Authoritatively, Mullins (1999) concludes that worker commitment is anchored on three basic ideologies. These are "the ideas of being hooked up to a firm, behaving like associates of the firm and trust within the company's leaders". A loyal employee that is dedicated should be seen to exhibit all characteristics and may render his or her optimum within the course of his duty (Martins & Nicholls, 1999). This signify that, it is expected for workers to befittingly used all accessible resources together with time and provides adequate and acutely aware scrutiny to minute details so as to be thought-about as committed.

Still, commitment is seen as associate degree of an individual's reference to and devotion to his or her firm or leader. Therefore, a particularly committed worker can foresee himself as a legitimate and true member of the organisation. There is an opportunity of such an individual to overlook what is going to probably cause discontentedness to others and see his future bright within the firm. Contrarily, an individual lacking commitment can see himself as a bystander (Reichheld, 1993). Another similar definition from Greenberg and Baron (2003) sees company commitment as the magnitude that an employee associate and relate together with his or her firm and can be unwilling to seek for employment elsewhere. The key purpose from this definition is that, a committed worker should show temperament to vary job/organisation and be a relentless sharer within the affairs of the firm. A closely connected definition comes from Wood (1996), he elucidates commitment as "the degree that an individual powerfully identifies with and feels a part of the organization". Moreover, Newstrom and Davis (1997) noted that, committed workers should show a towering degree of enthusiasm to stay and move within the organisation. They must religiously work to accomplish the vision of the leader.

However, Allen and Meyer (1990) projected three facets of commitment. These are "affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment". They outline affective commitment as "the person's emotional attachment to their organization", whereas continuance commitment is "a person's perception of the prices and risks related to going out of their current organization". Lastly, normative commitment takes care of the morale side, it is "a person's felt obligation and responsibility to the organization".

Employee Intention to Quit

Employee intention to quit has been a major discourse in management inquiries and requires urgent attention on how best to make highly competent staff to remain in a given organization. The super-ordinate goal of businesses is to render services and make profits which publicly owned parastatals are no exemption. This goal cannot be successfully attained without the inputs and supports of qualified talented employees. Without employees, business may fail to produce results, achieve organization goals, or meet its financial objectives (Johanin, et al, 2012).

Thus, employee intention to quit or remain with an employer is essential for the progress and well being of the corporation. From modern human resource perspective, human capital is an extremely valuable asset for the organizations (Honore, 2009; Mello, 2011).

Commitment is an indicator of employee intentions and essential condition for high performing organizations. Olori and Dan-Jumbo (2017), submit that commitment “helps to minimize the level of employee absenteeism, reduce employee turnover in the organization, and promote workers’ loyalty”. Thus, to reduce turnover, employee should be encouraged to be committed.

Committed employees are less distracted, more focused, and embrace change. Importantly, loyal, committed and satisfied employees find happiness at work and think less about quitting (Mechanic & Ireffin, 2014).

Age-based Discrimination and Employee Job Outcomes

Studies on the relationship between institutional age-based discrimination and employee job outcomes such as employee commitment and job involvement (Snape & Redman, 2003; Furunes & Mykletun, 2010), shows that workplace age discrimination may result to unwanted employee work outcomes such as poor attitude towards organizational goals, low performance, high employee turnover, incivility and nonconformity to stated rules (Shore & Goldberg, 2005). For the organization, it can lead increase lawsuit (Zacher & Steinvik, 2015), as discriminated individuals may seek redress in the court of law. Thereby leading increase in cost of governance.

Analyzing inequity arising from age differences, Shore and Goldberg (2005), institutional age-based discrimination results in undesirable employee career outcomes including “unfavorable job attitudes, reduced job performance, turnover, and underemployment of highly qualified employees”. Therefore, revealing a nonlinear relationship between discrimination and employee job outcomes.

In Allen, Lynn and Rodger (2003) investigation on the role human management practices has in the turnover intentions of workers. It was reported that as discrimination evolves or become more pronounce in the workplace, the more likely those discriminated against will exhibit deviant behaviour or attitudes such as intention to quit, absenteeism. Therefore, confirming the theory that there inverse relationship among the two variables as postulated by Shore and Goldberg (2005).

Similarly, the negative effect of age-based inequality leads to low employee morale, low individual creativity and application of knowledge, and other abilities (Warr, 1994; Snape & Redman, 2003).

Based on the above submissions, the following hypotheses are developed for this study:

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between age-based discrimination and employee commitment in the Rivers State Civil Service.

H0₂: There is no significant relationship between age-based discrimination and employee intention to quit in the Rivers State Civil Service.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design, Sample and Data collection Procedure

The study focused on the Rivers State Civil Service. Therefore, a cross sectional survey design was found appropriate for the study since the questionnaire was administered at a point in time and the respondents under the control of the researcher (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003; Rindfleisch, Malter, Ganesan & Moorman, 2008). Besides, two variables (age-based discrimination and employee job outcomes) were investigated (Olsen, & George, 2004).

The Rivers State civil service comprises 75 units incorporating ministries, agencies and commissions among which there are total of 51,371 civil servants as at December, 2017 (Civil Records, 2017). However, due to the nature of the constructs being examined – age-based discrimination and employee job outcomes. The five most populated parastatals were chosen as the population for this study. It is expected and believed that the three can adequately represent the civil service.

The five parastatal has a total population of 38706. Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table was used in determining a sample size of 380. A structured questionnaire was personally distributed by the researcher to the research associates. The questionnaire was split into three sections. The first section contains questions inquiring about the demographics of the respondents. The second section inquires about age-based discrimination. The last section pertains to work outcomes.

3.2 Operational Measures of Variables

The study is concerned with measuring the magnitude of relationship between age-based discrimination and employee job outcomes. The explanatory factor of the study is age-based discrimination, while the explained variable is employee job outcomes.

Age-based discrimination was scaled using 9 items including “I have been treated as though I am less capable due to my age”, “I have been given fewer opportunities to express my ideas due to my age” gotten from Jagusztyn (2010).

The explained variable, employee job outcomes studied using commitment and intention to quit. Employee commitment was scaled with nine statement items, 3 items representing each for “affective, normative and continuance commitment”. The items include “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization”, “Too much in my life could be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now”, and “I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization”. These items were adopted from Meyer and Allen (1997).

Employee intention to quit is described using four statement items including “I do not see myself working in the civil service three years from now”, and “if I have another job offer that pays more than the present one, I will quit”. These items were adopted from Rizwan, et al (2014).

3.3 Reliability and Validity of the Measurement Instrument

Validity of the research instrument was confirmed through the assessment of “content validity, construct validity” or nomological validity (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Hair, *et al.*, 2011). Content validity is achieved by establishing items in the instrument to cover all aspect of the construct. This was achieved by a careful review of literature in the area of concern (Cooper & Schindler, 2003; Hair, *et al.*, 2011).

Several means have been suggested to ascertain the reliability of a research instrument. These include “the use of low inference descriptors, multiple researchers/participant researchers, peer examination and mechanically recorded data” (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 34; Nunan, 1999, p. 34).

Table 3.1: Loadings, Reliabilities and AVEs for all the items listed in the model

Latent Variable	Indicators	Convergent validity			Internal consistency reliability	
		Loadings	Indicator Reliability	AVE	Composite Reliability ρ_c	Cronbach Alpha (CA)
		>0.70	>0.50	>0.50	>0.70	0.70 – 0.90
AD	AD ₁	0.712	0.507	0.575	0.924	0.798
	AD ₂	0.811	0.658			
	AD ₃	0.721	0.520			
	AD ₄	0.784	0.615			
	AD ₅	0.755	0.570			
	AD ₆	0.716	0.513			
	AD ₇	0.842	0.709			
	AD ₈	0.754	0.569			
	AD ₉	0.716	0.513			
EJC	EJC ₁	0.802	0.643	0.612	0.934	0.897
	EJC ₂	0.713	0.508			
	EJC ₃	0.753	0.567			
	EJC ₄	0.727	0.529			
	EJC ₅	0.899	0.808			
	EJC ₆	0.752	0.566			
	EJC ₇	0.861	0.741			
	EJC ₈	0.768	0.590			
	EJC ₉	0.743	0.552			
EIQ	EIQ ₁	0.912	0.814	0.710	0.924	0.786
	EIQ ₂	0.806	0.648			
	EIQ ₃	0.882	0.748			
	EIQ ₄	0.798	0.626			
	EIQ ₅	0.846	0.716			

Note: AD = Age-based Discrimination, EJC = Employee Job Commitment, EIQ = Employee Intention to Quit.

Source: SPSS Output on research data, 2018

Table 3.2 Square root of AVE and Latent Variable Correlations

	AVE	AD	EJC	EIQ
AD	0.575	0.758		
EJC	0.612	0.584	0.782	
EIQ	0.710	0.321	0.419	0.843

Note: AVE = Average Variance Extracted, AD = Age-based Discrimination, EJC = Employee Job Commitment, EIQ = Employee Intention to Quit.

Convergent Validity

To confirm the convergent validity, the AVE was examined. In conformity with the criteria posited by Campbell and Fiske (1959), and Fornell and Larcker (1981) the variables returned values greater than .5, thus fulfilling the convergent validity. This is contained in table 3.1 and 3.2 above.

Discriminant Validity

Matched with the suggestion by Fornell and Lacker (1981), was Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998) among other scholars, the discriminant validity of the latent variables were resolved by comparing the correlations among the latent construct with square roots of AVE, shown in table 3.1, the square root of the AVE were higher to correlations among latent constructs, indicating adequate discriminant validity.

Reliability

In this study the Cronbach Alpha values and Composite reliability were used to assess the instrument reliability (Cronbach, 1955; Burns, 1999). The results of the analyses are contained in table 3.1 and 3.2 above, and explained in the subsequent paragraphs.

Composite Reliability

To assess the composite reliability of the items in the scale, the composite reliability was adopted. According to Bagozzi and Yi (1988), the composite reliability has a lesser level of bias in estimating reliability in comparison to Cronbach's Alpha. Just as in the case of Cronbach alpha, Bagozzi and Yi (1988) and Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998) suggested that an item should have a composite reliability value of .7 for it to be assume reliability. By the limit stated above, each of the items in the latent variables showed sufficient internal consistency.

Cronbach Alpha

Assessing the Cronbach Values of the constructs revealed that all were above the .7 threshold suggested by Nunnaly and Bernstein (1994). Thus, the items in the scale can be said to be reliable as all the latent variables (McIver & Carmines, 1981).

4. Results and Discussions

The data generated from the respondents are analyse in this section. Hypotheses developed earlier are tested using Kendall_tau correlation coefficient. As earlier stated 380 copies of the structured questionnaire was distributed, 263 copies were returned, thus achieving a 69.2% percent returned rate. This number was used in final analysis as shown in table 4.1 and 4.2.

4.1 Results

Test of hypothesis one

The hypothesis stated that: There is no significant relationship between age-based discrimination and employee commitment.

Table 4.1: Correlations between age-discrimination and employee job commitment

			Age-based Discrimination	Employee Job Commitment
Kendall's tau_b	Age-based Discrimination	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.550
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
		N	263	263
	Employee Job Commitment	Correlation Coefficient	-.550	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
		N	263	263

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Analysis showed that, age-based discrimination is inversely correlated with employee job commitment with tau_b = -.550, $p < .05$ and $n = 263$. From the analysis the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative accepted.

Test of hypothesis two

The hypothesis stated that: There is no significant relationship between age-based discrimination and employee commitment.

Table 4.2: Correlations between age-discrimination and employee intention to quit

			Age Discrimination	Employee intention to Quit
Kendall's tau_b	Age Discrimination	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.511**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	263	263
	Employee intention to Quit	Correlation Coefficient	.511**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	263	263

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Analysis showed that, age-based discrimination is inversely correlated with withdrawal intention with $\tau_b = .551$, $p < .05$ and $n = 263$. Based on the outcome above, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative accepted.

4.2 Discussions

The analyses examined the associations between age-based discrimination and employee work outcomes (employee commitment and intention to quit). The two hypotheses were rejected since the variables were significantly correlated. The outcomes showed presence of moderate level of age-based discrimination in the state civil service. However, the first hypothesis which examines the nexus between age-based discrimination and employee commitment shows a significant but inverse association between the constructs. While the second hypothesis that investigated the association between age-based discrimination and employee withdrawal intentions indicated a significant but directly correlated values.

Studies by May, Coleman and Jackson (1996), Sanchez and Brooks (1996), Buchanan and Fitzgerald (2008), and more recently Olori and Dan-Jumbo (2017) found similar outcomes in their investigation between these variables. Schneider, et al. (2000), Pavalko, Mossakowski and Hamilton (2003), and Parkins, Fishbein and Ritchey (2006) in their research on age-based discrimination and negative workers attitude (workers turnover intention, withdrawal attitude, and workplace incivility) found direct relationship. This signifies that, the more workers perceived age-based discrimination in the service, the more they will display negative work outcomes. This may ultimately lead to exhibition of high rate of withdrawal behaviour.

In a study “the effect of perceived discrimination on workers attitude”, Triana, Jayasinghe and Pieper (2015) submits that workers attitudes such as job commitment, loyalty to organisation, and OCB is non-proportionally related with perceived discrimination, thus, corroborating the finding of this study. Correspondingly, Ensher, Grant-Vallone and Donaldson (2001) investigated age-based discrimination in corporate enterprises and work outcomes. They concluded that in an atmosphere where discrimination is high, employees’ well-being is compromised. Thus, leading to low job commitment, high rate of incivility included increased withdrawal intention.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

From the analyses of the data and the discussion carried out above, it is concluded that age-based discrimination has enormous effect on the employee work outcomes in the State civil service. The presence of age-based discrimination results to increase in negative work outcomes such as intention to quit, lateness to work, disloyalty and moonlighting. However, the lesser the employees perceived being discriminated against, the higher the positive job outcomes such as commitment, loyalty and identification.

Recommendations

On the foundation of conclusions above, the recommendations below are postulated to make the Rivers State Civil Service a better place to work:

- i. The Civil Service Commission in conjunction with the State House of Assembly should formulate and implement policies that will protect workers' rights especially as it pertains to age-based discrimination.
- ii. Stricter punishments should be put in place for those who are found culpable of discriminating others because of their age or age bracket.
- iii. The use of age as a criteria for employment into the civil service or retirement from service should be expunged from Civil Service Commission Code.
- iv. Promotions, rewards and benefits in the civil service should be based on merit (performance) not on age.

References

- Abubakar, S. L. A. (2003). *Assessment of availability and access to primary education in the southern part of Adamawa State. A case study of Jada, Ganye Toungo LGA.* Unpublished M.Sc, Thesis, Submitted to the Department of Geography, FUT, Yola.
- Adamade, S. S. (2009). Quality of work life, working conditions and public servants' performance in Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Labour Law Review*, 3(4), 43-59.
- Agwu, M. O. (2013). Organizational culture and employees commitment in Bayelsa State Civil Service. *Journal of Management Policies and Practices*, 1(1), 35-45.
- Ali, N., Kakakhel, S. J., Rahman, W. & Ahsan, A. (2014). Impact of human resource management practices on employees' outcomes (Empirical evidence from public sector Universities of Malakand Division, KPK, Pakistan). *Life Science Journal*, 11(4), 68-77.
- Allen, D. G., Lynn, M. S. & Rodger, W. G. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 99-118.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 49, 252-276.
- Bagozzi, R. & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structure equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74-94.
- Buchanan, N. T. & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2008). The effects of racial and sexual harassment on work and the psychological well-being of African American women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(2), 137-151.
- Burns, A. C. & Bush, R. F. (2002). *Marketing research: Online research applications* (4th ed.), Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Campell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.
- Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8), 788 – 813.
- CIPD (2003). *The challenge of age.* Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London.
- Colakoglu, U., Culha, U. & Atay, H. (2010). The effects of perceived organisational support on employees' affective outcomes: Evidence from the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 125-150.

- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2003). *Business research methods* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281–302.
- Dan-Jumbo, C. T. (2018). *Workplace discrimination and employee work attitudes*. An unpublished dissertation. Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt.
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J. & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1), 53-72.
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J. & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1), 53-72.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. G. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Furunes, T. & Mykletun, R. J. (2010). Age discrimination in the workplace: Validation of the Nordic age discrimination scale (NADS). *Scand J Psychol*, 51(1), 23–30.
- Garba, A. & Jirgi, I. M. (2014). Civil service and sustainable development in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(21), 41-45.
- Gonzales, E., Marchiondo, L. A., Ran, S., Brown, C., & Goettge, K. (2015). *Age discrimination in workplace and its association with health and work: Implications for social policy*. Boston, MA: Boston University, Research Brief 201502.
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Honore, J. (2009). Employee motivation. *Consortium Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*, 14(1), 63-75.
- Isaiah, O. D., Ojiabo, U. & Alagah, A. D. (2017). Workplace discrimination and employee performance in Nigerian food and beverage sector. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research - Social & Management Sciences*, 3(11), 61-85.
- Jagusztyn, N. E. (2010). *Perceived workplace discrimination as a mediator of the relationship between work environment and employee outcomes: Does Minority Status Matter?* Graduate Theses & Dissertations. <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/3657>.

- Johanim, J., Tan, F.Y., Zurina, A., Khulida, K.Y. & Mohamad, N.A. (2012). Promoting employee intention to stay: Do human resource management practices matter?. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 6(2), 396 – 416.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Martins, H. & Nicholls, L. (1999). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 42, 625-638.
- Mays, V. M., Coleman, L. M., & Jackson, J. S. (1996). Perceived race-based discrimination, employment status, and job stress in a national sample of black women: Implications for health outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 319-329.
- McIver, J. P., & Carmines, E. G. (1981). *Unidimensional scaling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mechanic, M. A. & Irefin, P. (2014). Effect of employee commitment on organizational performance in Coca Cola Nigeria Limited Maiduguri, Borno State. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(3), 33-41.
- Meiners, E. R. (2006). *The legal environment of business* (9th Ed.). Thomson West publication.
- Mello, J. A. (2011). *Strategic management of human resources*. Canada: Nelson Education, Ltd.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1982). *Employee – organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Mullins, L. T. (1999). *Management and organizational behaviour* (5th Edn.). London: Financial Times Management.
- Muthuveloo, R. & Rose, R. C. (2005). Typology of organizational commitment. *American Journal of Applied Science*, 2(6), 1078 – 1081.
- Newstrom, J. W. & Davis, K. (1997). *Organizational behaviour: Human behaviour at work* (10th ed.). New York. McGraw Hill.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Eighth printing.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Okafor, G. O. (2010). Factors affecting women education In Maiduguri, Borno State. *knowledge Review Volume*, 21(4), 61-69.
- Okurame, D. E. (2009). Mentoring and Organisational Constraints as Predictors of Attitudes to Work in the Nigerian Public Health Sector. *Journal of Health & Human Services Administration*, 32(3), 342-371.
- Olori, W. O. & Dan-Jumbo, C. T. (2017). Workplace discrimination and employee commitment in the Rivers State Civil Service. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(8), 51-57.
- Olsen, C. & George, M. M. M. (2004). *Cross-sectional study design and data analysis: The young epidemiology scholars program*. Walden University Chicago, Illinois.
- Parkins, I. S., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. N. (2006). The influence of personality on workplace bullying and discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 2554-2577.
- Pavalko, E. K., Mossakowski, K. N., & Hamilton, V. J. (2003). Does perceived discrimination affect health? Longitudinal relationships between work discrimination and women's physical and emotional health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43, 18-23.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, M. R., Mowday, T. R. & Boulian, V. P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603-609.
- Ram, P. & Prabhakar, G. V. (2011). The role of employee engagement in work-related outcomes. *Journal of Research in Business*, 1(3), 47-61.
- Redman, T., & Snape, R. (2006). The consequences of perceived age discrimination amongst older police officers: Is social support a buffer? *British Journal of Management*, 17, 167-175.
- Reichheld, F.F. (1993). *Loyalty-based management*. Harvard Business Review, 71(2), 64-73.
- Rindfleisch, A., Malter, A. J., Ganesan, S., & Moorman, C. (2008). Cross-sectional versus longitudinal survey research: Concepts, findings, and guidelines. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(3), 261-279. <http://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.3.261>.
- Sanchez, J. I. & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 704-719.

- Schneider, K. T., Hitlan, R. T., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2000). An examination of the nature and correlates of ethnic harassment experiences in multiple contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 3-12.
- Shore, L. M., & Goldberg, C. B. (2005). Age discrimination in the workplace. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 203–225). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Snape, E. & Redman, T. (2003). Too old or too young? The impact of perceived age discrimination. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(1), 78-89.
- Triana, M. D. C., Jayasinghe, M., & Pieper, J. R. (2015). Perceived workplace racial discrimination and its correlates: A meta - analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(4), 491-513.
- Warr, P. (1994). Age and employment. In Triandis, H. C., Dunnette, M. D. & Hough, L. M., *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. (eds.) Vol. 4. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Wood, S.(1996). High commitment management and payment system of job satisfaction. *Found of management studies*, 33(1), 53-57.
- Zacher, H. & Steinvik, H. R. (2015). *Workplace age discrimination*. In The Encyclopedia of Adulthood and Aging.

APPENDIX II

A Questionnaire on Age-based Discrimination and Employee work Outcomes

This questionnaire is provided to elicit responses that will be used to determine the correlations between Age-based Discrimination and employee work outcomes of civil servants in Nigeria.

The instrument is made up of three. Section A contains statements about the demographic details and personal data of the respondent; Section B has statement items pertaining to Age-based Discrimination, section C comprises statement items describing Employee Work Outcome.

I implore you to be rational and objective while filling this questionnaire. On my part, I shall keep the data private. Please provide answers to all the stated items, even if you feel they are repeated, as this will ensure statistical validity of the instrument.

Section A

Personal Data:

1. Name of Establishment
2. Gender: Male Female
3. Age: 20-35 36-50 51 Above
4. Marital status: Single Married
5. Educational Qualification: WAEC-OND/Professional certificate HND/B.Sc
M D
6. Position in the organization
7. Your organization's years in operation: 0-10 11-20 21-
31-50 51-Above

Section B

Age-based Discrimination (AD) Construct

Kindly, indicate how often you experienced the following at work

Where: 1=Never. 2=Rarely. 3=Sometimes. 4=Often. 5= Always

S/N	Age-based Discrimination	1	2	3	4	5
1	I have been treated as though I am less capable due to my age					
2	I have been given fewer opportunities to express my ideas due to my age					
3	I have unfairly been evaluated less favorably due to my age					
4	I have been passed over for a work role/task due to my age					
5	I receive less social support due to my age					
6	My contributions are not valued as much due to my age					
7	I have been treated with less respect due to my age					
8	Someone has delayed or ignored my requests due to my age					
9	Someone has blamed me for failures or problems due to my age					

Section C
Employee Attitudes

Please tick the extent to which you agree with the following statement, as it relates to your present employment.

Where: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = nor disagree nor agree, 4 =agree, 5 = strongly agree

Positive Employee Work Attitudes (PEWA)						
S/N	Employee Job Commitment					
1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization					
2	I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization (R)					
3	I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization (R)					
4	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to					
5	Too much in my life could be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now					
6	It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now (R)					
7	I think that people these days move from company to company too often.					
8	I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization (R)					
9	Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me (R)					
Negative Employee Work Attitude (NEWA)						
S/N	Employee intention to quit	1	2	3	4	5
1	I do not see myself working in the civil service three years from now					
2	if I have another job offer that pays more than the present one, I will quit					
3	I often think of changing my job					
4	I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months.					