ISSN: 3800 - 3917
Volume 14, Number 1, 2025
Advanced Journal of Social Science and Management Research
University of Rajasthan Campus, Rajasthan, India
www.bwjournal.org

COLLECTIVE CAPABILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF THE NIGERIAN CONTENT DEVELOPMENT AND MONITORING BOARD

[1]Prof. K.B.O. Ejumudo & [2]Felix Manasseh Ovie Edemenya
Email: ejumudo.kelly-bryan@dou.edu.ng
[1]Department of Public Administration, Dennis Osadebay University Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria, [2]Department of Political Science, Novena University, Ogume, Delta State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
This study investigated collective capability and organizational performance of the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB). The specific objectives were to examine the link between collective capability, employee retention and employee job satisfaction. A structured questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection from 114 respondents who took part in this study. The data was analyzed and the degree of association between the various variables were assessed using correlation models, more especially the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC). The findings revealed significant and positive association between the variables. Based on the findings, the researcher thus concludes that; there is a strong and positive relationship between collective capability and organizational performance of the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board. Also, there is a strong and positive relationship between the study's predictor variables and the criterion variables. Founded on the findings of this study, the researcher thus recommends that, public organizations should consider collective capabilities imperative to improve performance and seek to enhance their employee's retention and job satisfaction by mainstreaming and focusing teamwork and intelligence sharing as necessary ingredients.

Keywords: Collective Capability, Organizational Performance and NCDMB.

INTRODUCTION
In today's rapidly evolving business landscape, organizations increasingly recognize the significance of collective capability in driving their success. Collective capability has to do with the combined skills, knowledge, and competencies of individuals working together towards common goals (Ebenuwa & Idenedo, 2022). This concept is crucial because it encompasses more than just the sum of individual abilities and it reflects the effectiveness of teamwork, communication, and collaboration within an organization (Godfrey-Wood & Mamani-Vargas, 2016). Collective capability, in fact, extends beyond individual performance to include the dynamics of group interaction and collaboration. It involves a team or organization's collective understanding and expertise, the ability to work effectively with others, including communication, problem-solving, and conflict resolution, the shared values, norms, and practices that facilitate or hinder collective efforts, and the role of leaders in guiding and supporting collective efforts, ensuring that individual contributions align with organizational objectives (Ibrahim, 2016).
In the context of the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB), a parastatal established to oversee the development of local content within Nigeria's oil and gas sector, the relationship between collective capability and organizational performance is crucial. The Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB) is tasked with ensuring that

indigenous companies and workers are effectively integrated into the sector, which requires a high degree of coordination, collaboration, and collective competence among its teams and stakeholders. Despite its strategic importance, the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB) face several challenges that potentially impact its organizational performance. There seems to be a noticeable disparity in the effectiveness of teams within the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB). Some teams exhibit high levels of coordination and productivity, while others struggle with collaboration and communication. This inconsistency affect the board's overall performance and its ability to achieve its mandate effectively. The Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB) also have poor comprehensive metrics and methodologies to assess collective capability accurately. Without a robust framework for evaluating the combined skills, knowledge, and teamwork of its employees, it is challenging to identify areas needing improvement or to benchmark against best practices. There is equally a perceived misalignment between collective efforts and organizational objectives. This misalignment could result in inefficiencies, missed opportunities, and suboptimal performance outcomes.

Besides, the organizational culture at the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB) influence collective capabilities. Issues such as lack of cohesion, unclear communication channels, and varying levels of commitment among employees can impact how effectively the board operates and achieves its strategic goals. The Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board (NCDMB) may have limited insight into best practices for enhancing collective capability and its impact on performance. This limitation affects its ability to implement effective strategies and practices that could lead to improved organizational performance. The core problem this study seeks to address is: How does collective capability influence the organizational performance of the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board, and what are the key factors that affect this relationship.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Collective Capability

Collective capability is a construct that evolved to augment the shortcomings of the capabilities approach (Sen, 2002) which emphasizes individualism. Albeit admitting the impact of collective organizations and social relationships on individual freedoms (Robeyns, 2005), the "capabilities approach focuses mainly on the individual as the ultimate unit whose capabilities need to be enhanced" (Ibrahim, 2016). The construct of collective capabilities was thus introduced to accommodate the importance of collective action in expanding human freedom (Anand, 2007). Collective capabilities require collective action for their achievement (Murphy, 2014). They provide a basis for understanding the importance of collective action in the achievement of various objectives, including overcoming market failures, managing natural resources, and increasing political strength (Murphy, 2014). Collective capabilities also "provide a framework for comprehending the ways organizations contribute intrinsically to people's well-being, by providing them with a sense of identity, cooperation, and enjoyment" (Godfrey-Wood & Mamani-Vargas, 2016).

Thus, collective capabilities do not only complement individual capabilities but are prerequisites to the expansion of human freedoms (Anand, 2007). Collective capabilities are constructs that emerge from social interactions that are propelled by a shared perception of responsibility which enables interacting individuals and groups to undertake activities and achieve results that could not be achieved by individual actions (Pelenc & Bazile, 2022). This conception of collective capabilities is akin to "collective agency" which is described as "a group of individuals acting as agents not only to improve their living conditions but also to bring about changes in their societies thus transcending the limits of their well-being concerns (Ibrahim, 2016) in Pelenc and Bazile (2022). Collective capabilities prompt collective action which (Rauschmayer, Polzin, Mock & Omann, 2017) defined as "the involvement of a group of people carrying out common actions to pursue shared interests (Ebenuwa & Idenedo, 2022).

Concept of Organizational Performance

Performance is defined as the achievement of specific goals as determined by predetermined standards (Richard, 2019; Idenedo & Poi, 2020; Adams et al., 2023). Performance can be evaluated in two directions or dimensions (Bhatti, 2023). Performance can be evaluated from an objective standpoint using monetary and market-based indicators including capacity utilization, profitability, and market share. The second type of performance evaluation, called subjective performance, takes into account staff and customer-based metrics including service quality and satisfaction. The latter measures crucial conditions for profitability and suggests that, in order for a business to achieve successful objective performance, special attention must be made to the service quality offered, as well as to both customer and employee satisfaction (Bhatti, 2023).

All the same, it has been noted that the roles of financial performance employed by organizations are proving to be insufficient as a result of quick changes like improved product quality, increased global human migration, and accelerated technological advancements, which have led to a tendency for firms to be multi-cultural in nature (Moers, 2020). This investigation examined performance from the non-financial perspective of leadership approaches in the light of this. The effectiveness of a stakeholder's leadership is used to evaluate organizational performance. Performance is the execution or completion of work, tasks, or goals to a specific level of desired satisfaction as a result of the employee's training and development. Performance is equally defined as an organization's capacity to meet the expectations of its workforce by utilizing training and development approaches (Adams et al., 2023; Frank & Idenedo, 2023).

Measures of Organizational Performance

Employee Retention: Because of the lack of skilled labor, economic growth, and employee turnover, the employers are facing their biggest challenge: employee retention. Depending on the skill level of the departing employee, turnover costs can reach 200 percent of their pay, according to Griffeth and Hom (2021) in their book "Retaining Valued Employees". The International Association of Professionals in Employment Security newsletter states that losing a valuable employee can cost the employer as much as one-third of the worker's yearly compensation (Edward 2021). While compensation and other benefits are still crucial components of the retention equation, it's important to remember that there is only one possible area for retention in the current HR literature and aren't always sufficient to guarantee a high level of employee commitment. A strong interest in and understanding of how other aspects of working life influence people's decisions to stay with or leave a company has been demonstrated by the explosion of business literature over the past ten or fifteen years on topics such as work-life balance, workplace wellness, employee participation, and other related subjects (Hom & Griffeth, 2015; Edward 2021). Encouraging employees to stay with the company for as long as possible is known as employee retention (Griffeth & Hom 2021; Edward 2021).

Employee Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction simply explains attitude of employees toward their job. In other words, it describes the level of happiness of employees in fulfilling their desires and needs at the work place. Hence, it is the pleasurable feelings that result from an employee perception of achieving the desired level of needs. Job satisfaction as an intangible variable could be expressed or observed via emotional feelings. In other words, it hinges on the inward expression and attitude of individual employees with respect to a particular job. For instance, an employee satisfaction is high if the job provides expected psychological or physiological needs. However, satisfaction is said to be low if the job does not fulfill the psychological or physiological needs (Cook, 2018).

Various schools of thought have in diverse ways tried to explain the meaning of job satisfaction. Locke (2016) states that job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Spector (2017) defines job satisfaction as an extent to which people like or dislike their jobs. Other authors consider job satisfaction as the attitudes people have toward their job (Ivancervich, 2015). In this direction, Mankoe (2022) states that, job satisfaction is a set of feelings which employees have about their work. For example Smith et al. (2019), views job satisfaction as feelings or affective responses to facets of the (workplace) situation. This definition of job satisfaction is an emotional reaction of employees in relation to the aspects of their job and response(s) they experience at the workplace. It describes how happy employees are with the facets of their job. This, to some extent, connotes that a satisfied worker is the one who is contented with the facets of his or her job.

Empirical Review

Lengnick-Hall and Beck (2019) suggests that the capacity of firms to develop resilience derives from "specific organizational capabilities, routines, practices, and processes by which a firm conceptually orients itself, acts to move forward, and creates a setting of diversity and adjustable integration". These organizational capabilities and routines, in turn, are a function of the amalgam of knowledge, skills, abilities and other attributes possessed by individuals that are nurtured and integrated through the firm's human resource management (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2021); and who receive similar training, hold similar core values and have a mind-set that success depend on teamwork, where all act as one, and not on individuals working in silos. Firms thus develop and encourage inter-personal and inter-functional collaborations that bridge the gap between persons and units and allow for the free-flow of ideas that enhance the achievement of collective outcomes (Lengnick-Hall, Beck & Lengnick Hall, 2021).

Cross-fertilization of ideas and sharing of relevant information between and among multiple individuals with diverse knowledge, skills, and values is crucial if firms must confront and thrive in today's markets. Individual members of a group or team develop their understanding of their environment through interactions and shared experiences (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2021) by imbibing the group perspective. Thus, rather than viewing the firm as a collection of individuals, individuals are viewed as a reflection of the group, which can function and achieve feats, only in proportion to the extent individual members pool their capabilities together. According to Gholami and Safavi (2020), "the building block of cooperative and collaborative enterprise among team members is the ability to reason, understand and learn from their interactions".

The dynamic capabilities theory states that the challenge of firms in recent times is neither "economic, in the sense of more or diverse resources and capabilities, more loyal customers nor cognitive and emotional competences; but the capacity to see possibilities that others do not, and the capacity to inspire and mobilize employees to commit competencies and resources to exploit perceived opportunities (Baden-Fuller & Teece, 2019). Thus, firms do not necessarily need heroic entrepreneurs, as the perception of possibilities can be resident in a team or across a wide range of teams all pushing in the same direction. This echoes the point that the resources a firm requires are mostly within, and merely needs assemblage and orchestration. The capabilities of individuals when properly amalgamated transforms to collective capabilities which allow the harnessing of hard and soft skills, abilities, knowledge and brainpower of individuals to enhance human reasoning and analytical capabilities in problem-solving situations (Teece, 2017).

A team that shares a common interest is often smarter than the smartest of its members (Gholami & Safavi, 2020). Collective capabilities thus pass as an important tool for sharing and contributing to knowledge throughout a firm. "Collective capabilities when viewed as the "dynamic aggregation of cognitive, reasoning, and knowledge resources of humans supported by intelligently networked systems" (Wang, Carley, Zeng & Mao 2017) becomes imperative to the survival and sustenance of firms. Wang et al. (2017) also suggest that knowledge management in organizations depends on collective intelligence (capabilities) processes which enable knowledge to be externalized, made explicit and reused. Collective capabilities will therefore likely lead to higher efficiency and productivity (Gholami & Safavi, 2020).

Individuals have often had need to converge in pursuit of shared goals via collective action, characterized by team involvement, a shared interest, as well as cooperative and voluntary actions to pursue that interest (Meinzen-Dick, 2024). The underlying ideal of collective action is the realization of goals that are beyond the scope of individual members. In social cognitive discourses, the term collective agency (Bandura, 2020), which represents the idea that the efforts of a team working together based on the shared belief in collective power produce better results than the sum of individual results lends credence to the efficacy of collective capabilities. In collective agency, individuals work together to accomplish what cannot be accomplished in solo efforts.

Bandura (2020) states that, the perception of the potency of collective effort influences the goals that groups strive to achieve, how well they utilize their resources, how much effort they put into the group activities, their resilience when collective efforts fail to produce quick results or meet forcible opposition, and their vulnerability to the discouragement that can beset team members handling herculean tasks". Collective agency can thus be seen as an outgrowth of collective capabilities viewed as real opportunities available to a team or group of interactants with a common functioning that is collectively perceived as valuable; especially, when this functioning is consistent with goals defined through the process of collective agency (Bandura, 2020).

Prior scholarly efforts have shown that by harnessing the collective capabilities of group or team members, a firm could achieve improved wellness. or instance, Lengnick-Hall et al (2021) observed that managing human resources strategically helps in developing capacity for organizational resilience. It is worthy of note that strategic human resources management encompass gathering, developing and deploying the capabilities of individual members of an organization for synergy. Bustinza et al. (2019) reports that shared technological capabilities enhance resilience capabilities and organizational effectiveness. Relatedly, Tsai and Hsu (2023) found that cross-functional collaborations and knowledge integration enhances company performance. The forgoing reports suggest that harnessing the collective capabilities of

marketing team members have the potential to predict marketing resilience. However, to make statistical tests and interpretations workable, the following null hypotheses are formulated:
$H0_1$: There is no significant relationship between collective capability and employee satisfaction in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board.
$H0_2$: There is no significant relationship between collective capability and employee retention in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board.

Theoretical Framework
This study is anchored on the absorptive capacity theory (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990) and the dynamic capabilities theory (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997; Teece & Pisano, 1994)

The Absorptive Capacity Theory
The absorptive capacity theory (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990) postulates that firms' ability to understand the value of new business intelligence, incorporate it into its operational processes and utilize it toward achieving set objectives improves their competitiveness. The theory assumes that a firm can become more innovative, adaptive and perform better if it incorporates new knowledge in its operational practices and processes. Implicit in this proposition is that, a firm with expertise in the identification, assimilation and application of new knowledge will achieve competitive edge over firms that do not possess such competences. The absorptive capacity theory is built on the premise that the assimilation and utilization of new knowledge requires firms to develop a knowledge base in any of the following ways: (1) conducting own research and development; (2) deriving new knowledge from its own current operations; (3) borrowing new knowledge from other organizations or research institutions; (4) acquiring new knowledge by purchasing new equipment, hiring new talents, or training current employees in the use of a new method. The possession of absorptive capacity is helpful to firms because it creating an absorptive capacity for new knowledge in one period helps the absorption of new knowledge in the another period; and the successful application of new knowledge is self-reinforcing and motivates firms to continue to absorb new knowledge indefinitely (Miles, 2012).
In their effort to re-conceptualize the absorptive capacity theory, Zahra and George (2002) proposed: Acquisition, assimilation, transformation, and exploitation as four essential capabilities; and classed acquisition and assimilation as "potential" absorptive capacity; while transformation and exploitation are classed as "realized" absorptive capacity. Zahra and George (2002) went further to describe acquisition capability as the firm's prior expenditures; existing knowledge base; and intensity, speed, and direction for obtaining new knowledge; assimilation capability is described as operational processes that enable a firm to assess, interpret, understand, and learn new knowledge; transformation capability is viewed as a firm's ability to add, delete, recombine, and reconfigure new knowledge for use; while exploitation capability is seen as the firm's ability to change its operational processes and apply new knowledge.
The absorptive capacity theory is adopted as befitting baseline theory for the current study in lieu of its anchorage on the necessity for firm to identify, incorporate and make use of new knowledge in their operational practices and processes geared towards achieving set objectives. In essence, possessing the ability to sense new knowledge, as well as incorporating and using the new knowledge help firms to build strong knowledge base; set up a knowledge culture in which everyone sees the importance of learning about and using new knowledge to reach goals; monitor the environment to identify better and newer ways of doing things; select knowledgeable people who can adapt and modify new knowledge for the firm; create teams

that promote the acceptance and use of new knowledge; and monitor the progress of new knowledge, keep track of successes and failures, and use that intelligence to keep the cycle.

Dynamic Capabilities Theory (DCT)
Dynamic capabilities theory (Teece, 1997; Teece & Pisano, 1994) is a theory of competitive advantage in a volatile business-scape. The theory emerged as an extension of the resource-based view (Barney, 1991), and seeks to explain the complexities in firms wellness and market position in relation to competitors (Teece, 2012) as the operating milieu becomes more plastic, fluid and intensely competitive. "A capability is a set of learned processes and activities that enable a company to produce a particular outcome, while dynamic capabilities are idiosyncratic and unique to each company and rooted in the company's history" (Teece, 2012). Dynamic capabilities thus represent firms' ability to "integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments" (Teece et al., 1997).
The DCT was borne out of the contention that "it is not resources alone that were critical to competitive advantage, but the services that resources could provide" (Penrose, 1959) in Fainshmidt (2014); and that resources are only "building blocks for the development of capabilities" (Makadok, 2001) that involve "activities and routines inside the firm that spans resources" (Winter, 2003). The growth of enquiries into the antecedents and outcomes of dynamic capabilities gave rise to other definitions of the theory such that Heftat and Winter (2011) define it as the "capacity of an organization to purposefully create, extend, or modify its resource base" in order to compete effectively. The DCT is original to strategic management, but has in recent years, found application in marketing and supply chain management (Fainshmidt, 2014) based on its emphasis that dynamic capabilities provides explanation to how firms achieve seemingly antithetical essentials: Stable enough to continually deliver distinctive value and resilient and adaptive enough to the dictates of the operating milieu.
Thus, the DCT's preoccupation is that, to meet and surmount new challenges, firms and their employees require the potentiality to learn rapidly and to build strategic assets, such as capability, technology, and customer feedback have to be integrated within the company while reconfiguring or refocusing existing strategic assets. In other words, corporate agility in the form of "the capacity to (1) sense and shape opportunities and threats, (2) seize opportunities, and (3) maintain competitiveness through enhancing, combining, protecting, and, when necessary, reconfiguring the business enterprise's intangible and tangible assets is the core mandate of a firm" (Winter, 2003).
The DCT is adopted as a baseline theory for this study based on its emphasis on learning and adapting company operations to emerging circumstances. Since this study intends to examine the predictive power of market sensitivity (learning and responding to marketplace shifts) on marketing resilience (adapting to marketplace shift or rebounding from marketplace shocks), it is only proper to anchor it on the DCT whose underlying argument is that firms can build long-term competitive advantage by using their core competencies to modify short-term competitive positions (Helfat et al., 2007) and by rapidly learning about environmental vagaries and building and integrating new strategic assets while reconfiguring or refocusing existing ones.

METHODOLOGY
This study adopted a descriptive research design. The study's population consists of 114 Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board workers, including management

personnel. The sample size was based on a census of 114, resulting in a total of 114 respondents who took part in this study. The sample size is broken down in the table below:

Table 1. Sample Size Distribution

Management Staff	21
Non-Management Staff	93
Total Staff	114

A structured questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. Three specialists from the Department of Political Science, Novena University, Ogume's evaluated the instrument's face, content, and construct validity. The study topic under inquiry, the research questions, and the hypotheses were provided to the panel members. The researcher adhered strictly to and implemented the panel's corrections, comments, and recommendations. By cross-referencing the data obtained from the various study sources, the study's credibility was assessed. Cronbach Alpha base test was used to assess the instrument's dependability. Using Cronbach's Alpha (CA) based test, the instrument dependability was measured and evaluated.CA offers an estimate of the indicator inter-correlations; a value of 0.7 or greater is considered acceptable, while a value of less than 0.7 denotes low dependability or reliability (Seckaran, 2021). The result from the Cronbach alpha was 0.82. The hypotheses were tested using correlation models, more especially the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC), which was used to assess the degree of association between the various variables. Researcher was able to determine the significance of the overall model as well as the signs of each explanatory variable to the model by employing this method. The regression was performed using the SPSS software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2: Questionnaire Distribution

Numbers	Questionnaire	Percentage (%)
No. Sent out	114	100%
No. Returned	71	62.2%
No. Not Returned	43	37.8%

Source: field survey, 2024.

As shown in table 4.1 above, one hundred and fourteen (114) respondents, or 100% of the sample, were given questionnaires. Of the total number of questionnaires, seventy-one (71) were completed and successfully returned, accounting for 62.2 percent, while forty-three (43) of the total number of questionnaires was not returned, accounting for 37.8%. It is important to note that the analysis is based on the seventy-one (71) questionnaires that study participants returned with their answers.

Analysis of Reliability

To accept the data gathered from the questionnaire, reliability measures were first used to measure the concepts looked at in the research study. The reliability analysis revealed that the variables in Table 3 below had a Cronbach's alpha value of ≥ 0.8, which is regarded as a reliable measure. Therefore, it is appropriate to state that the variables of the study were measured by the research instrument.

Table 3: Result of Reliability Analysis

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Collective Capability	0.883
Employee Retention	0.855
Employee Job Satisfaction	0.910

Source: SPSS 22.0 Output (based on 2024 field survey data)

Data Analysis

This section employed the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC) to test the hypotheses that were formulated. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 was used for all analyses. The decision rule that guided the test of hypotheses is as follows: if the significant/probability value (PV) < 0.05 (level of significance) = reject the null and conclude significant relationship; if the significant probability value (PV) > 0.05 (level of significance) = accept the null and conclude insignificant relationship. Additionally, this study adopted Evans' (1996) categorization key in order to determine the degree or strength of relationship between the variables under investigation.

Table 4: Description on Range of correlation (r) values and the corresponding Level of Association

Range of r with positive and negative sign values	Descriptive level of Association	Remark
0.00 - 0.19	Very Low	Very Weak
0.20 - 0.39	Low	Weak
0.71 - 0.59	Moderate	Moderate
0.60 - 0.79	High	Strong
0.80-1.00	Very High	Very Strong

The direction of the relationship or association between the variables is indicated by the correlation coefficient's sign, which shows a positive relationship for (+) and a negative relationship for (-). The correlation coefficient (r) value, where a zero (0) indicates no relationship and a one (1) indicates a perfect relationship, indicates the strength of the relationship. Therefore, a strong relationship is indicated by a value that is closer to 1, and a weak relationship is indicated by a value that is closer to zero (0).

Table 5: Correlation Analysis between Collective Capability and Employee Retention in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board – Hypothesis HO_1.

Correlations			
		Collective Capability	Employee Retention
Collective Capability	Pearson Correlation	1	.697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	71	71
Employee Retention	Pearson Correlation	.697**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	71	71
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: (SPSS Output 2024).

According to Table 5, there is a strong correlation between collective capability and employee retention, as indicated by the high Pearson's correlation (r) of 0. 697**. There is a positive relationship between them, as indicated by the correlation coefficient's positive sign. That is to say, employee retention in the investigated establishment is linked to an increase in collective capability.

Hypothesis 1

H_{O1}: There is no significant relationship between collective capability and employee satisfaction in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board.

The PV is (0.000), as can be seen above, and this value is less than the significance level of (0.05). As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected, leading the researcher to conclude that there is a significant correlation between teamwork and employee retention

Table 6: Correlation Analysis between Collective Capability and Job Satisfaction in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board – Hypothesis HO_2.

Correlations			
		Collective Capability	Job Satisfaction
Collective Capability	Pearson Correlation	1	.654**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	71	71
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.654**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	71	71
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: (SPSS Output 2024).

The illustration above revealed that the Pearson correlation on the relationship between collective capability and job satisfaction is (0. 654**), based on the categorization in Table 4, the evaluation is high, indicating that a strong relationship exists between collective capability and employee satisfaction. It is a positive correlation coefficient, implying a positive relationship exists between them, i.e. increase in job satisfaction is associated with teamwork.

Hypothesis 2

H_{O2}: There is no significant relationship between collective capability and job satisfaction in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board.

As shown above, the PV is (0.000), and this value is < (0.05) significance level, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and the researcher concluded that there is a significant relationship between collective capability and employee satisfaction in the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board.

Discussion of Findings

The tested hypotheses, as outlined in the subheading above, showed that:

Collective capability and organizational performance measures (employee job satisfaction and retention) are significantly correlated. These results are consistent with the reviewed literature, for instant, Lengnick-Hall and Beck (2019) suggests that the capacity of firms to develop resilience derives from "specific organizational capabilities, routines, practices, and processes by which a firm conceptually orients itself, acts to move forward, and creates a setting of diversity and adjustable integration". These organizational capabilities and routines, in turn, are a function of the amalgam of knowledge, skills, abilities and other attributes possessed by individuals that are nurtured and integrated through the firm's human resource management (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2021); and who receive similar training, hold similar core values and have a mind-set that success depend on teamwork, where all act as one, and not on individuals working in silos. Firms thus develop and encourage inter-personal and inter-functional collaborations that bridge the gap between persons and units and allow for the free-flow of ideas that enhance the achievement of collective outcomes (Lengnick-Hall, Beck & Lengnick Hall, 2021).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the researcher thus concludes that; there is a strong and positive relationship between collective capability and organizational performance of the Nigerian Content Development and Monitoring Board. Also, there is a strong and positive relationship between the study's predictor variables and the criterion variables.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Founded on the findings of this study, the researcher thus recommends that:

1. Public organizations should consider collective capabilities imperative to improve performance.
2. Public organizations that seek to enhance their employee's retention and job satisfaction should consider teamwork and intelligence sharing as necessary ingredients.
3. To attests to the study's findings, it is recommended that the study should be replicated in different ministries or industries in both developed and developing countries.

REFERENCES

Adams, B., Chiyem, L.N. & Idenedo, O.W. (2023). Examining the mediating role of employees' engagement in the relationship between positive organizational practices and organizational performance. *International Academy Journal Business Administration Annals, 9*(5), 54-67.

Baden-Fuller, C., & Teece, D. (2019). Market sensing, dynamic capability, and competitive dynamics. *Industrial Marketing Management*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.11.008.

Barney, J. B. (1996). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage*. Addison-Wesley.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *9*(3), 75-58.

Bustinza, O. F., Vendrell-Herrero, F., Perez-Arostegui, M., & Parry, G. (2019). Technological capabilities, resilience capabilities and organizational effectiveness. The *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *30*(8), 1370-1392.

Anand, P. B. (2007). Capability, sustainability, and collective action: An examination of a River Water Dispute. *Journal of Human Development*, *8*(1), 109-132.

Cook, L. A. (2018). *Job satisfaction and performance: Is the relationship spurious*? M.Sc. Texas A&M University.

Conti, B. & Kleiner, B. (2023). How to increase teamwork in organizations. *Journal of Quality, 5*(1), 26-29.

Edward G. (2021). *The role of employee retention on job performance. A case study of Accra Brewery Company Limited, Accra*. A Thesis Submitted to the Institute of Distance Learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.

Ebenuwa, A. & Idenedo, W. O. (2022). Harnessing collective capability to achieve marketing resilience: the experience of domestic airlines operators in Nigeria. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing*, *7*(1), 200-221.

Frank, V. & Idenedo, O. W. (2023). Digital marketing channels and brand performance of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt. *Academia Networks International Journal of Management Studies, 8*(4), 49-66.

Gholami, B., & Safavi, R. (2020). Harnessing collective intelligence: Wiki and social network from end-user perspective. *International Conference on e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*. DOI: 10.1109/IC4E.2010.49.

Godfrey-Wood R., & Mamani-Vargas, G. (2016). The coercive side of collective capabilities: Evidence from the Bolivian Altiplano. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2016.1199169.

Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W., & Gaertner, S. (2021). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, *26*(6), 463-488.

Helfat, C. E., & Winter, S. G. (2011). Untangling dynamic and operational capabilities: Strategy for the (N) ever-changing world. *Strategic Management Journal*, *32*(11), 1243-1250.

Ibrahim, S. S. (2016). From individual to collective capabilities: The capability approach as a conceptual framework for self-help. *Journal of Human Development*, *7*(3), 397-416.

Idenedo, W. O., Poi, E. L. & Fadare, R. A. (2020). Mobile marketing and eateries performance in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Innovations in Marketing and Business Studies, 7*(1), 41-54.

Lim, S. (2018). Job Satisfaction of information technology workers in academic libraries. *Library and Information Science Research*, *30*(2), 115-121.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2021). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*, 243-255.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., & Beck, T. E. (2019). Resilience capacity and strategic agility: Prerequisites for thriving in a dynamic environment. In C. Nemeth, E. Hollnagel, & S. Dekker (Eds.). *Resilience engineering perspectives*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Makadok, R. (2001). Toward a synthesis of the resource-based and dynamic-capability views of rent creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, *22*(5), 387-401.

Mankoe, J. O. (2022). *Educational administration and management in Ghana*. Winneba: University of Education.

Meinzen-Dick, R., DiGregorio, M., & McCarthy, N. (2024). Methods for studying collective action in rural development. *Agricultural Systems*, *82*(3), 197-214.

Murphy, M. (2014). Self-determination as a collective capability: The case of indigenous peoples. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, *15*(4), 320-334.

Pelenc, J., Bazile, D., & Ceruti, C. (2015). Collective capability and collective agency for sustainability: A case study. *Ecological economics*, *118*, 226-239.

Pelenc, J., & Bazile, D. D. (2022). From individual innovation to collective capabilities for community resource management. *Proceeding at the 12th Biennial Conference of the International Society for Ecological Economics*. 16-19 June.

Rauschmayer, F., Polzin, C., Mock, M., & Omann, I. (2017). Examining collective action through the capability approach: The example of community currencies. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2017.1415870.

Richard, F L., (2020). *Human resource strategy to improve organizational performance: A route for British firms*. Working Paper, 9 EWERC, Manchester School of Management.

Robeyns, I. (2005). The Capability Approach: A theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, *6*(1), 93-117.

Sen, A. (2002). Response to commentaries. *Studies in International Comparative Development*, *37*(2), 78-86.

Spector, P. E. (2017). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Wang, F. Y. Carley, K. M., Zeng, D., & Mao, W. (2007). Social computing: From social informatics to social intelligence. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, *22*, 79-83.

Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185-203.

Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *10*(1), 43-58.

Zhang, H., Wang, Y., & Song, M. (2020). Does competitive intensity moderate the relationships between sustainable capabilities and sustainable organizational performance in new ventures? *Sustainability*, 12, 253. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010253.