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The problem with which this study is concerned is to determine the relationship between the motivations to work for Nigerian lecturers and their perceptions of their academic organizational climate. The related purposes of the study are to determine the motivations to work for Nigerian lecturers, their perceptions of the academic organizational climate in which they work, and the relationships that exist between motivations and type of organizational climate.

The respondents to this study are 252 lecturers at three Nigerian universities. Two survey instruments were used, which are the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Educational Work Components Study questionnaire. The data were analyzed using frequency, means, one-way analysis of variance, and the t test for two independent groups.

From the analyses of data, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.

1. Based upon responses from this study, it is difficult to determine a discernible pattern in the academic organizational climate of Nigerian universities.
2. The way in which respondents view their academic organizational climate (open or closed) appears to be unaffected by intrinsic work motivation factors (opportunities for creativity, responsibility, competition, and accomplishment, excessive or temporary work loads).

3. The way in which respondents view their academic organizational climate (open or closed) appears to be affected by extrinsic work motivation factors (physical surroundings and working conditions).

4. It appears that the organizational climate of Nigerian universities is not conducive to rewarding the individual meritorious accomplishments of their lecturers.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Motivation to work depends partly upon what job characteristics the individual considers desirable. Additionally, some human behaviorists believe that differences in the level of job performance in organizations may be contingent upon the types of organizational climates characterizing the working environment. Hellriegel and Slocum view organizational climate as a set of attitudes about a particular organization and its subsystems. This set of attitudes may be induced from the way that organization and its subsystems deal with their members and environment (8, p. 256). It is proper to assume that the highest motivation to work is present when the job characteristics one desires and the perceived organizational climate match each other.

Halpin and Croft, in their 1962 study "The Organizational Climate of Schools," established six categories of organizational climates along a continuum ranging from "open" to "closed" (6, p. 63). Halpin, the principal investigator, describes open schools as those in which teachers work well together, are not burdened by busywork, and experience considerable job satisfaction.
He asserts that administrators in open schools serve as facilitators, models, and leaders. Their behavior is an appropriate integration of personality characteristics and professional role requirements (5, p. 458). At the other extreme, Halpin reports that teachers in closed schools obtain little satisfaction from task achievement. Their social needs go unmet. Teachers in such schools tend to be disengaged; they have difficulty working together. The administrator, according to Halpin, is aloof and impersonal, not inclined to seek the welfare of teachers (5, pp. 180-181).

These important findings of Halpin and Croft about working environments are analogous to McGregor's work motivation theories. McGregor classifies as Theory X the traditional concept that people are passive, that they dislike work, avoid responsibility, and are dependent upon the whims of management. Theory Y, on the other hand, asserts that this traditional assumption of man is not necessarily true. Under favorable working conditions the average human being is likely to be active and independent, love to work, and learn not only to accept but also to seek responsibility (9, pp. 225-228).

In essence, the application of Theory Y specifies the creation of a working environment that provides guidance and arranges organizational conditions. Under these conditions, people can achieve their own goals by directing
their efforts toward attainment of the organization's objectives. Workers in a given organization will naturally tend to view their organizational climate as different from that of other contemporary organizations. Carlisle's thinking seems to agree with this assertion by indicating that, to be successful in today's environment, organizations need to become as skillful in managing their external relationships as they are in their internal ones (2).

According to most experts, the primary responsibilities of colleges and universities to society are teaching, research, and service. The tasks related to these three prominent institutional goals cannot be properly executed in an undesirable atmosphere. Similarly, the attainment of these objectives is hindered if academic organizations do not adopt systems of having faculty with appropriate levels of talents and skills in the right job at the right time, performing the right activities in the right environment.

Unlike most industrial organizations, universities, particularly in the developing societies today, are becoming more performance-oriented than employee satisfaction-oriented. William Glueck attempts to represent employee performance by the following formula: "Human performance = ability x motivation" (4, p. 50). Most management experts have found that managers overemphasize the ability side of the equation. That is, managers too quickly attribute failure to lack of ability. This notion is not
limited to industrial organizations; it is common, too, in institutions of higher learning. Contrary to this view, Glueck believes that failure is often the result of lack of motivation (4, p. 50). A person who is somewhat deficient in ability can compensate for his deficiency through higher motivation leading to hard work. Maslow has extended his theory of motivation to emphasize the importance of providing an organizational environment in which an individual can achieve maximum "self-actualization" (11, p. 8).

The fact that there are significant differences in the levels of employees' job performance in their respective organizations cannot be disputed. This assertion, however, in argumentive terms, raises a question. To what can be attributed the differences among academic staffs in job performance and their overall contributions to the educational organizations in which they are employed? Differences in performance among people doing the same kind of work, according to Vroom and Acci, are reflections of differences in ability and motivation (16, p. 56). These two factors, skills and levels of motivation, are critical to organizational efficiency, effectiveness, and improved job performance.

Lytle asserts that a traumatic personnel shake-up in the Philadelphia schools provides evidence indicating that teachers prefer to work in schools which provide an organizational framework allowing them autonomy and the
opportunity to obtain psychic rewards even though such conditions require more effort (10, p. 700). Concerning Nigerian universities today, Olaniyan asserts that complexities embodied in the administration and management of these universities make the experience of students and lecturers painstaking ones. He indicates that the "ivory tower" concept in the Nigerian academic situation has undergone some great changes in recent years (12, p. 9). Further observations of Nigerian academic organizations reveal the working environment on today's university campuses as having changed dramatically from what it was in the past. In order to provide creative, constructive, satisfying, and productive work situations among university lecturers, it is necessary that their working environment improve so as to satisfy their social and emotional needs.

This study, therefore, seeks to identify the current perceptions of lecturers regarding the types of academic organizational climate in which they work. In addition, this study seeks to relate these perceptions to differences in motivation to work. Such evidence may provide more understanding of the impact of organizational climate upon work motivation.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine the relationship between Nigerian lecturers' work motivation and their perceptions of their organizational climates.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are as follows:

1. To determine Nigerian university lecturers' work motivation;

2. To determine Nigerian university lecturers' perceptions of the academic organizational climate in which they worked;

3. To determine the relationship between work motivation and perceived organizational climate;

4. To discuss the results of the foregoing in terms of actual and potential significance for job performance, faculty morale, and academic organizational climate in Nigerian universities.

Research Question

Considering the problem and purposes of this study, the following research question is used.

What is the relationship existing between the following motivational factors and lecturers' perceptions of academic organizational climate?
1. The desirability of a job which provides opportunities for creativity and responsibility and which stresses individual ability.

2. Whether an individual seeks job situations where the salary is determined by merit, the competition is strong, and accomplishment is emphasized.

3. Attitudes toward job situations in which work loads may be extreme or excessive.

4. The respondent's wish for security, including well-defined guidelines for promotion and job routines.

5. A person's willingness to perform interesting work despite the fact that the job might be a temporary one.

6. The individual's concern with the general aspects of the job.

Background and Significance of the Study in Nigeria

The traditional academic setting pervading organizational climates in universities in most advanced countries also characterizes the premier universities in Nigeria in their early years of establishment. The first university in Nigeria, the University of Ibadan, strictly patterned after the British university, was established as a University College in January, 1948 (3, p. 1716). At the time of this study, seventeen universities were located in the major cities and states of Nigeria to provide educational facilities
throughout the country (15, p. 8). The six oldest of
the universities are the University of Ibadan (UI), in
Ibadan in Oyo State; the University of Nigeria (UN), in
Nsukka in Anabra State; Ahmadu Bello University (ABU),
in Zaria in Kaduna State; the University of Ife (UNIFE),
in Ile-Ife in Oyo State; the University of Lagos (UNILAG),
in Lagos in Lagos State; and the University of Benin
(UNIBIN), in Benin City in Bendel State (3, pp. 1766-
1767; see Appendix A).

These universities were originally established as
autonomous institutions by a state or the federal govern-
ment of Nigeria. By military government decrees in recent
years, all these universities have now been taken over
by the federal government for funding, management, and
control. Along with equalizing wages, salaries, and
other conditions of service of university personnel with
those of their counterparts in the civil service, direc-
tives designed to make all institutions alike came from
the federal government Cabinet Office directly to all
university administrators. To ensure effective communi-
cation between the federal government and these univer-
sities, a body known as the National Universities Commiss-
ion (NUC) has been established as a liaison. The NUC
also established Nigerian Universities Offices in many
parts of the world, including one in Washington, D.C.
(15, p. 1).
Recently, according to some observers, less desirable interactions between the government and academic community apparently have pervaded the academic atmosphere of higher education institutions (7, 12, 14). These interactions have also tended to tarnish the image of academe.

In addition to these conditions, several other premises give impetus to this research project. The primary reason, however, is a study by John Oni in which he advocates studies of lecturers' satisfaction in Nigerian universities. Oni asserts that the outcomes of such studies would be useful for comparative purposes and for generating a common measure of what faculty seek from their jobs (14, p. 9).

Oni's study examined the factors that influence the job satisfaction of lecturers in one of Nigeria's institutions of higher learning. He also examined the importance that lecturers attach to the various job aspects as a measure of their work (14, p. 6). He made suggestions that research efforts should continue to determine the precise nature of job outcomes that people work for through in-depth interviews and more case studies (14, p. 9). According to Carlisle, the ideas of Fayol and Weber, which resulted in the classical principles of organization, are no longer generally applicable to all human organizational climatic conditions. The organizational principles are not only
structurally too rigid and too static but also have limited effects on individual creativity and commitment to academia (2, p. 34).

Today, then, it appears that the environment of universities in Nigeria can no longer be looked upon as stable. The necessity for adequate compliance with the plethora of government regulations probably gives support to this position. Olowu reports that a court judge indicated that the University of Lagos, and indeed any university in Nigeria, is a creation of the federal government. In the case of the leadership crises of the University of Lagos, he adds that matters relating to the removal of the vice-chancellor are within the visitor's (president's) power (13, p. 1). This incident can be interpreted as one man's use of absolute power in university affairs.

Change in the higher education institutional environment of Nigeria has emerged rapidly and unexpectedly with adverse social values imposed by economic change and changes of authorities in political institutions. The academic environment in Nigeria has witnessed sporadic, abrupt dismissals of professors and administrators from employment based upon alleged charges without adequate trials. Following his sudden dismissal from the University of Lagos, one professor wanted a court injunction
restraining the university or its agent from terminating or removing or threatening to terminate or remove him from office or employment as a professor without satisfying the conditions stipulated in the decrees (13, p. 1). Testifying to a similar incident that occurred earlier, Oni gives as an example of unnecessary government intervention in university affairs the removal of two vice-chancellors and some lecturers from their posts as a result of their role in the student unrest characterizing some of the Nigerian universities toward the end of the 1977-1978 academic session (14, p. 9).

The loyalty of university lecturers to their profession also appears to have been eroded. This may be because of the apparent undesirable climate of their work environment. Highly qualified lecturers are often seen relocating from the academic environment to industrial organizations because they are progressively becoming disillusioned with academic life. Many such lecturers are in professional fields such as business administration, engineering, environmental design, medicine, and law. Additionally, these lecturers appear to consider the internal administration of criteria for promotions intolerable.

The practice of unnecessary meddling in university affairs by the university authorities outside the campus appears to have upset the climate of academic organizations.
It is possible that these conditions are limiting the performance of lecturers in Nigerian universities. Today, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find new lecturers to commit themselves totally to academe for fear of poverty, insecurity of job and tenure, and uncertainty of promotion.

Apparently these problems have not been studied through investigations into what the organizational climate looks like in academic settings in Nigerian universities. In addition, Borrevik commented in 1972 that, from the view of the studies by Halpin and his associates, it was apparent that

(1) little research had been completed in organizational climate of academic departments in colleges and universities, and
(2) an Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) applicable to the investigation of the nature of academic departments in colleges and universities needs to be developed (1, p. 7).

Borrevik then designed an appropriate instrument, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), for academic departments in colleges and universities based upon the research which validated the original instrument developed by Halpin and Croft (1, p. 44). The availability of this validated measuring instrument is of significance to this study.

Unlike in the past, the academic environment in Nigeria today leaves much to be desired. Much more is
expected of this type of environment. It should offer many more incentives, more encouragement, and more dynamic challenge to faculty at all levels. What lecturers constantly experience in their academic institutions appears to be causing them to accept employment elsewhere. Commenting on the management of Nigerian universities, John Kondouun, the Pro-Chancellor of the University of Maidugiri, Nigeria, indicated that the exodus of academic staffs and the general inertia in these institutions were the result of undue interference in university affairs and warned that such situations were deleterious to sound academic development (7, p. 1). In order to retain these threatened lecturers and make them more productive, it appears that they need to be highly motivated.

The theoretical importance of motivation to work and its possible relationship to how lecturers in Nigerian universities perceive academic organizational climate make this a significant area of study. A better understanding of these two variables by university authorities can have far-reaching implications in terms of lecturer performance, organizational effectiveness, and, in the final analysis, the quality of education that college and university students receive.
Definition of Terms

The following terms related to Nigerian higher education are defined as they are used in this study.

ASUU--Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities.

Faculty--a school or college for instruction in a special field that grants a degree at the bachelor's, master's, or doctoral level within a university.

Faculty officer--an administrative officer of good academic background who is assigned by the university registrar to every faculty (college) to handle administrative details.

University authorities--leadership as represented by visitors, the National Universities Commission (NUC), councils, university administrators, and academic heads.

Visitors--heads of state at federal and state levels.

National Universities Commission--the body serving as an intermediary between government and universities in Nigeria and thus enabling the universities to make their financial requests through a constituted body which in turn satisfies itself as to the reasonableness of these requests and advises the government accordingly.

Council--a university governing board, patterned after the British civil universities in some respects. It assumes the general management of the affairs of the university, particularly the control of university property and expenditures.
Board of studies--the body composed of academic staffs within a specific faculty (college or school) and elected outside members entrusted with the responsibility for deliberation on academic matters and making recommendations to the senate and the vice-chancellor.

Motivation--the complex of forces which start and keep a person in an organization. These forces are factors such as drive, instincts, tension states, and psychological mechanisms within the person which start and maintain his activity toward achieving his personal goals.

Organizational climate--a situationally determined process where the climate variables are either causative factors or moderators for performance and attitudes. It has characteristics that influence the behavior of people in the organization and are relatively enduring over time. It is, in effect, what people react to--the whole context of stimulation, confusion, and frustration where they work.

Decree--a formal and authoritative ordinance or edict set forth by the military government.

Limitations

The findings and conclusions of this study are not necessarily applicable to lecturers in universities in Nigeria not included in this study.
Summary

Chapter I has introduced the study, stated the problem, the purposes of the study, the research questions to which answers were sought, and the background and significance of the study in Nigeria. It has also provided definitions of terms and outlined the limitations of the study.

A review of literature based upon pertinent information related to work motivation of academic staff in an innovative organizational environment is presented in Chapter II.

Chapter III describes the study, defines the population and the survey instrument, and discusses the details of the procedures followed in completing the study.

The analysis and evaluation of the data collected by the use of two sets of questionnaires are presented in Chapter IV.

A summary of the study, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research based upon the investigation are given in Chapter V.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Since 1971, a total of 2,087 studies and articles on motivation in industrial and non-industrial organizations has appeared in the literature surveyed by ABI/INFORM, a resource database for managers and executives in business, industry, and academia. One hundred thirty-three articles, according to further computer search, have been written mainly on organizational climate, and sixteen have been published dealing with climate and either motivation or perceptions (36). Yet, few studies have been made concerning the academic organizational environment in Nigeria.

As a result of this lack of research in the area of work motivation and perceptions of Nigerian academic organizational climate, citations from specific studies with Nigerian flavor are limited. However, the materials reviewed include books, journal articles, newspaper accounts, professional organization reports, narrative records of panel discussions, reports from constituted commissions, and other accounts deemed feasible for the fulfillment of the purpose of this study.
This review of literature is undertaken to provide an understanding of faculty motivation to work in an academic organizational environment. The sequence of this presentation is (1) the concept of motivation to work; (2) organizational climate, work environment, and motivation; (3) universal applicability of management theories and practices; and (4) faculty development and management practices in Nigeria. Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief summary of the related literature.

The Concept of Motivation to Work

The concepts of organizational behavior have been strongly influenced by Maslow's (77, p. 3) concept of work motivation that includes the factors that energize, direct, maintain, and sustain employees in organizations. Littlefield and others (74, p. 434) seem to support this concept by their claim that motivation influences a person to take action or accomplish a goal. In other words, according to their view, motivation is conceptualized as an urge that moves human beings in certain activities.

Believing the concept of motivation to work to be a byproduct of social sciences, Richards (105, p. 347) urges management people to utilize social sciences as an instrument of management in making human organizations truly effective. In their concept of motivation, Littlefield and others (74, pp. 60, 434) view high employee motivation
and efficient work flow as basic keys to organizational success. They also stress the need to motivate people in organizations if efficient and effective performance is expected of them.

In their review of the literature, Griffin and others (43, p. 655) find that motivation or demotivation is a concept of task design and performance. They explain task-job design in terms of the overall set of work-related activities performed by an employee. These reviewers contend that motivation of employees depends on the nature of task and job characteristics, which refers to specific dimensions such as variety, autonomy, feedback, identity, and task significance.

Perhaps one of the most crucial reasons for a person not being motivated to work is inflexibility of job design. Gruneberg's (44, p. 90) survey reports Edward Lawler's study as stating that the psychological literature on employee motivation contains many claims that changes in job design can be expected to produce better employee performance. The concern about job content has stimulated a plethora of ideas for the humanization of work. Among the proposed solutions are suggestions for fundamental revisions in the way in which work is conditioned, organized, and performed (99, p. 481).
Another concept of motivation identified by Richards (105, p. 481) stems from Herzberg's concept of job enrichment. Job enrichment, according to this concept, is essentially an attempt to put back into work the opportunity for real achievement—and thus for satisfaction and motivation. Realizing that skill and motivation levels are practically crucial to the effectiveness of an organization, Miskel suggests the need for further study in motivating educators as educational personnel in an organizational setting. He asserts that "research and theory building with regard to motivation in organizational context have great potential for contributing to the knowledge base of solving acute operational problems in public schools" (92, p. 52).

Motivation research that is based on work motivation concepts, report Hersey and Blanchard (51, pp. 4-5), shows that employees could maintain their jobs by working at 20 to 30 per cent of their objectivity. The study also shows that employees work at close to 80 to 90 per cent of their ability if they are highly motivated. The authors conclude that motivation is a key determinant in employees' level of performance and company profitability.

Maslow (77, pp. 82-84) argues that wages and most jobs are sufficient to fulfill the basic physiological needs of people and that tenure ensures satisfaction of most of the safety needs. Under these circumstances, the first and
second orders of needs continue to be motivations of human behavior.

In discussing concepts of motivation research accomplished in industrial organizations, Kast and Rosenzweig (64, p. 230) credit Herzberg's (55) motivation-hygiene concept of the attitudes of people toward their work. Herzberg conceptualizes and asserts that some factors are satisfiers when present on the job but are not dissatisfiers when absent; other factors are dissatisfiers, but positive motivation does not result when such factors are eliminated.

The five work factors that stand out as strong determinants of job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement (111, p. 248). On the other hand, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions are identified as major dissatisfiers (112, p. 229). Herzberg (55, p. 135) identifies the work environment variables as hygiene factors, indicating an analogy to the concept of preventive maintenance. He also labels the satisfier factors as motivators, implying their effectiveness in evoking individual behavior toward superior performance.

Blum (16, pp. 317-321) also makes significant contributions to the knowledge of work motivation. His research
findings reveal the behavior of certain individuals who might be willing to work in an environment where uninterrupted employment and monetary safeguards are job security factors. This assertion is relevant to Herzberg's (55) belief that a good hygiene environment can prevent job dissatisfaction, although it may not necessarily create true job satisfaction or happiness. Attempting to further establish this concept of motivation, Herzberg (53, p. 50) states that, in a situation where drives (motives) are not relieved, a person becomes discontented; at a time, Herzberg further claims, when drives are relieved, the effect is only temporary. As an example, after a person has eaten, he ceases to be hungry, yet after a period of time he obviously becomes hungry again. The same reaction indiscriminately occurs to a person's wage or salary in a work situation. However, Herzberg explains that the motivator needs (satisfiers) and the hygiene needs are mutually exclusive. They are separate and distinct; thus, they are reciprocal.

Littlefield and others (74, p. 435) recall an important question that managers and supervisors frequently ask: "How can I motivate my employees?" Although there is no definite answer to this question, according to the authors, a knowledge of some of the fundamental concepts of behavioral management science provides valuable information
to the manager. They argue that this knowledge, if properly utilized, can enable the manager to become more effective in motivating and leading personnel to achieve desired results. Assuming that no simple formula for motivation has emerged, these authors still emphasize motivation research, the results of which, they believe, can yield considerable insight into the "why's" of human behavior.

Presumably the study of motivation and human behavior is a prudent search for answers to perplexing questions about human nature and behavior. Littlefield and others (74, p. 436) recognize that human behavior is too complex to be explained by one or a few concepts. They suggest that a clear understanding of the basic motivational concepts of Herzberg (53, 54, 55, 56, 57) and Maslow (77) can provide useful insight for managers in organizational settings.

Some researchers, such as Hersey and Blanchard (51, pp. 15-17) and Litwin and Stringer (75, pp. 7-27) appear to be unanimous in providing a conceptual framework for the relative understanding of the meaning of motivation to work. They agree that human behavior is goal-oriented. In other words, this means that human behavior is generally motivated by a desire to attain some goal within a work environment. Additionally, before the attainment of
such goals is reached, the value of motivators should be accepted as crucial to generating individual behavior to superior work performance. Hersey and Blanchard (51, p. 16), realizing that motives or needs are the mainsprings of action, suggest that managers who wish to motivate employees should provide an environment in which appropriate incentives are available for need satisfaction.

A great deal of literature on motivation to work conceptually claims that satisfied needs decrease in strength and normally do not motivate individuals to seek goals to satisfy them. Similarly, blocked motives apparently result in frustration, which Hersey and Blanchard (51, p. 19) define as thwarting of goal attainment. They believe that irrational behavior may occur in several forms when blockage to goal accomplishment continues and frustration develops.

In addition to citing Brown's postulations that frustrated people tend to give up constructive attempts at solving their problems and regress to more primitive and childish behavior, Hersey and Blanchard affirm that frustrated individuals will direct their hostility against the object or the person that they feel is the cause of frustration. The angry worker may try to hit her boss or may undermine his job and reputation through gossip and other malicious behavior (51, pp. 19-70).

Consultation, an essential ingredient of motivation, is an effective management technique for eliminating this
type of frustration in organizations. The "Log of Demands" of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) of Nigeria states,

The Government's non-consultation with our Union before coming out with its white paper and, more importantly, the failure of the white paper to tackle the basic problems facing the universities have necessitated continuation of the industrial dispute and action. For a speedy resolution of the dispute, therefore, it is necessary that the Government and our Union sit down and negotiate over the remaining critical areas of conflict before we can feel that the basic conditions of returning to work have been created. These remaining areas of contention are broadly university funding, university autonomy, and conditions of service (1, p. 1).

Dominico (29, p. 50) sees participatory management as a systems approach to motivating workers and averting human problems in organizations. He views participation as a humanistic, motivating management technique for dealing with people who work in organizations. According to Dominico, participative management—a term that originated in industry—is concerned with the involvement of workers in the decisions that affect them. In agreement with Chaney and Teel (23) and Likert (72), Dominico states,

By involving workers in the formulation of activities within organizational goals, participative management has increased production, has developed favorable attitudes, and has improved union-management relations (29, p. 51).

In a given organization, when plans are being formulated and solutions to human problems considered, Sweeney (120, p. 77) assumes that people can be made to perform in
a given way. This perception of Sweeney's generates another conceptual assertion about motivation which states that getting people to do successfully the right things that they like to accomplish on the job is what motivation to work is all about.

Herzberg (56, pp. 53-62) suggests that the answer to motivation is in job characteristics. This answer is to create the kind of jobs in which personal needs for achievement can be satisfied and recognition can be gained from contributions made to an organization. When jobs are structured to include opportunities for satisfying the needs for achievement, recognition, and power, employees should be motivated to do what should be done. If they are not, something has gone wrong. Herzberg suggests that the first concern should be to determine whether something has been taken away from the job that should not have been taken away. Presumably, what may have been taken away is motivation to work.

Making his own documentation on the subject of motivation, Sweeney (120, p. 91) reviews the conceptual works of behavioralists. He reports Herzberg's job enrichment, Meyer's goal setting, Odiorne's management by objectives, and Maslow's hierarchy of needs as being four different approaches to motivation. He further stresses that a review of these motivational approaches shows that superior
employees can motivate their subordinates. This can only be achieved if jobs are structured in a manner to allow subordinates to satisfy their needs for achievement, recognition, power, and self-actualization.

Viewing self-goal-setting as a concept of work motivation, Myers (93, p. 42) asserts that setting personal goals has more motivational significance than the goals set by others. Observing the self-goal-setting procedures as a motivating technique in his company, Myers is convinced to the point of generalizing that people at all organizational levels work harder and set higher goals for themselves than others dare to set for them. From practical experience, he contends that goals which have minimum motivational value are influenced by the goal setter. Additionally, the internal commitment that results from this process can create a motivational force greater than that created by imposed goals.

In describing the relationship and similarity between motivation and morale, Stogdill (118, p. 213) defines motivation as a function of drive and confirms desirability estimates regarding various alternative satisfactions with morale as freedom of restraint in action toward a goal. He argues that an individual may be highly motivated but unable to act. With freedom to act, the degree of morale may be highly related to the strength of motivation. In
a sense, morale may be regarded as motivation demonstrated in overt action toward a goal. In this instance, therefore, motivation provides potential for morale.

Similarly, Siegel (113, p. 282) views morale as a resultant state encompassing the willingness to cooperate and expressing the degree by integration among conflicting interests. Motivation, according to him, is an active force, directing behavior by (1) causing individuals to see one of several available goals and (2) causing individuals to seek certain goals not present at the moment. From the point of view of McFarland (84, p. 538), motivation is similar to the morale concept in that the supervisor or executive must estimate the extent of motivation of each subordinate. He contends that this cannot be done simply by surveys but must be accomplished by observing and interpreting the subordinate's behavior. He suggests that, if individuals or groups are poorly motivated, executives must try to remedy the situation.

Hellriegel and Slocum (50, p. 474) appear to take a slightly different position concerning the concept of motivation to work. They seem to claim that motivation is not only an embodiment of behavior but also sustains behavior. These behaviorists examine this concept and conclude that motivation is a puzzling subject for management because, according to them, many motives cannot be
seen but are inferred from behavior. Giving some ideas on how to motivate people, these behavioralists suggest that people should not be motivated to work by fear because employees are the most important assets entrusted to organizations.

According to McCarthy, Minichiello, and Curran (80, p. 460), the members of an organization usually must have a reasonable commitment to the achievement of organizational endeavors. To gain this commitment, the organization not only requires the effective leadership of its top management and other managers but also a concurrent motivation on the part of organizational members to achieve the desired goals. Motivation, then, in their view, is a most vital element in implementing strategy. Conversely, however, they suggest that motivation can, in large measure, be accomplished by the reward-punishment syndrome.

Relevant to this seemingly negative view of motivation—the reward-punishment system—is what Feeney (34, p. 60) refers to as monetary reward, the single most powerful reinforcer. According to Feeney, if money is temporarily denied because of inadequate productivity, with a promise, however, that the reward will be a consequence of the employee meeting his employer's expectation, the employee will be geared to better performance. In support of his argument with the myth held by some management people that money is not a strong reinforcer, Feeney states,
What makes money so powerful is the multitude of reinforcers you can buy with it. And the reward does not have to be a lot either. We have found that small amounts of cash, given very often, are among the most potent incentives we have tried. In my own office, I used money very successfully to get my secretary to do the billing. Instead of a raise requested, I offered an extra $25 every month if she got the billing out accurately and on time. The first month she missed the deadline; I withheld the $25. She complained, but the next month and for 44 consecutive months she got it out on time (34, p. 61).

Industrial actions and strikes emanating from organizations, as in the institutional environment in Nigeria, are common occurrences in this decade (104, p. 3). It is possible that these events are provable evidence of inadequate motivation of workers who are committed to achieving a great deal for their organizations. The events also may be a result of lack of proper understanding by management about the complex nature of man (84, pp. 14-18).

The view of McFarland (84, p. 559) is relevant to this discussion. He stresses that organizations which are not for profit and without tangible outputs of products or services have different problems of motivation than profit-making firms. McFarland suggests that the intrinsic appeal of the nature of the work is a basic route to motivation. He believes that human beings are motivated in the work situation not by money alone but by many factors that include the quality of leadership and the attitudes of management toward employees (84, p. 560). It is Armstrong's
(13, p. 187) strong impression that the complexity of the motivation process arises because people have different needs and varied perceptions about the actions that are likely to help them achieve their goals.

McFarland (84, p. 536) submits that motivation is inherent in numerous complex aspects of human behavior. This human behavior is motivated in that it is directed toward the satisfaction of physical, emotional, socially conditioned, or psychological needs.

Shartle (114, p. 151) conceptualizes motivation as a reported urge or tension to move in a given direction or to achieve a certain goal. The presence of tension, energy, and drive in motivation, similarly, according to McFarland (84, p. 538), is important in that the motivational process begins with a tension or drive that makes the individual acutely conscious of unfilled needs.

Feeney's (34, p. 60) statement concerning individual needs and goal setting in organizations dramatizes the importance of motivational activity-related rewards. Based on different activities performed in different organizations, Feeney states,

Employees will generally indicate the kind of reinforcers that will work for them. Listen to what they ask for, what they complain about. Whenever you have the choice, give your employees what they want when they exhibit the desired behavior (34, p. 60).
Anthony and Nicholson (11, p. 78) consider the terms "urges," "drives," "desires," "aspirations" or "needs" in reference to motivation to work as forms of tension occurring within individuals. These forms of tension, according to the authors, result in behavior aimed at reducing, eliminating, or diverting the tension. They believe that an understanding of the needs, drives, and their resulting tensions helps to maintain and predict human behavior. It also ultimately provides a sound basis for managerial and motivational decision and action. As a supportive contribution to this view, Schneider (108), Seashore and Bowers (112, p. 116), and Sikes and others (115) postulate that understanding and motivation of the individual are important in building team membership within an organization.

Cohn and Lindberg (36, pp. 44-45) interpret McGregor's Theory Y in terms of a philosophy which accepts that people have to work to survive, and they stress that work provides a major source of positive self-image and satisfaction of social needs. In addition, they feel that the concept or a combination of the concepts of motivation lies behind every compensation plan. Any motivational concept, therefore, that disregards individual make-up is impractical and factually invalid.

McCormick (83, p. 275) accepts the fact that human behavior is directed gradually toward the fulfillment of
the needs that people have. To the extent that this is true, he explains that assumptions could be made that the work behavior of people is influenced by their motivation to fulfill their needs. He contends, however, that, although there are various concepts emanating from theories about human motivation, caution must be taken against any particular motivational concept or theory adopted in toto. This is because, from the viewpoints of Littlefield and others (74, p. 435) and McCormick (83, p. 275), no single concept or theory has been demonstrated to be universally suitable to explain the basis for why people behave as they do.

Recognition of employees in a job situation can be construed as a concept of motivation to work. In connection with recognition as a reward system, Chait (22, p. 35) refers to a study which suggests that faculty members value not only tenure and merit increments but also other forms of recognition such as teaching awards, very modest sums for travel, and research or teaching assistance. Moreover, such studies (22, 53, 55, 56, 57) indicate that the sense of achievement and the sense of recognition are very important to worker motivation.

With the major limitations of motivational techniques, the difficulty posed on the approaches usually taken to solve human problems in organizations cannot be
overemphasized. These approaches, however, prove to be of great value, not only by creating orientations of thinking about managerial practice but also by influencing behavioral scientists and managers alike to seek better ways of understanding the motivational process in organizations (117, p. 56).

In recent years, a determined effort has been made by behaviorists (18), psychologists (28), and various writers to research the concept of motivation to work. Research findings and articles presented in this area indicate that motivating people to work is one of the most difficult problems facing today’s leaders of both industrial and non-industrial organizations.

It is implied in the literature that the concept of motivation to work involves energetic behavior toward some kind of goal. With this energetic behavior in view, it is assumed that there is some kind of need, want, or desire. According to the implications of the concept of motivation, it appears that the employee is seen as having certain material needs or desires which management should satisfy for work well done.

Organizational Climate, Work Environment, and Motivation

This section focuses on the literature related to organizational climate, work environment, and the
relationships between them and motivation to work. It also examines the criticisms of organizational climate.

According to Becker (15, p. 25), the concept of organizational climate was developed by Litwin and associates (75) in the research division of the Harvard Business School in the 1960s. This concept holds that organizational climate is not exclusive of work environment. Related to this assertion, McFarland's (84, pp. 70-71) review of literature indicates that studies of internal work environments are those that relate to organizational climate.

In view of its vital importance in management practices and within the content of organizational environment and motivational theory, climate is defined in diverse ways that are interrelated with human motivation to work and the environment in which human beings work (21, p. 418). Litwin and Stringer (75, p. 1) view organizational climate as referring to a set of measurable properties of the work environment, which are perceived differently or indifferently by the people who live and work in this environment and which are assumed to influence their motivation and behavior. Payne and Mansfield (101, p. 517) claim that organizational climate is generally viewed as a property of the organizational system. It deals with the behavior of organization members and the environment in which they work.
Proposing their own definition, Campbell and others (20, p. 106) state that climate is a set of attributes specific to a particular organization. They also believe that the crucial elements in climate are the individual perceptions of the relevant stimuli, constraints, and reinforcement contingencies that govern the job behavior (20, p. 390).

This definition of organizational climate, however, represents an adaptation of conceptions set forth by some contemporary experts in management such as Gibson and others (41, p. 315), Howe (60, p. 159), and McFarland (84, p. 331). This adaptation of conceptions claims that the organizational climate may be one of trust and confidence or one of fear and reprisal. In general terms, these authors believe that organizational climate may be viewed as a perceivable set of attributes that pervades a particular organizational environment (41, pp. 523-530).

In general terms, Halpin (47, p. 137) refers to organizational climate as the internal quality of an organization, especially as experienced by its members. In specific terms relating to educational institutions, he views organizational climate as a set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of the people in it. Halpin emphasizes that


the climate is an end product of the institutional groups--students, teachers, and administrators--as they work to balance the organizational and individual dimensions of social systems. These products include shared values, social beliefs, and social standards. Shared values are agreements as to what is desirable--for example, kindness, success, materialism, and work. Social beliefs are ideas concerning the nature of man and his social life--for instance, mutual attitudes toward students, teachers, and administrators. Finally, social standards are agreements specifying appropriate behavior in a school (47, pp. 137-138).

Since the definition of organizational climate seems to be an elusive and complex issue, the following definition developed by Gibson and others appears to summarize the factors associated with organizational climate:

Organizational climate is a set of properties of work environment perceived directly or indirectly by the personnel who work as a major force influencing their behavior on the job (40, p. 315).

Studies in climate, work environment, and human motivation reveal the facts that seem to influence management practice relative to human welfare and performance in organizations. Becker (15, p. 65) hypothesizes that effective management within an organization will depend upon an understanding of human motivation. This type of assumption necessitates a systematic method of gathering pertinent information that has developed into organizational climate surveys. Based on these climate surveys, writers on organizational behavior appear to believe that unit performance tends to suffer when demotivational managerial
practices disrupt the organizational environment (107, p. 515).

Becker (15, p. 25) refers to recent studies that relate to the emergence of organizational climate as a means of delineating the subjective environmental factors which affect organizational performance. The assumption underlying such studies, he claims, is that a manager can improve the climate and raise the level of motivation and work performance in his work environment. This can be done, according to Becker, if the manager understands the positive or negative impact of his practices. As it seems clear that individuals in any type of organizational settings interact in different ways with persons who are their subordinates, their colleagues, and their superiors, this concept may also pertain to educational institutions.

Schneider (110, p. 447) states that the concept of climate is based on some infrequently specified assumptions about human beings. The assumptions are that (1) human beings attempt to apprehend order in their environment and to create order through thought and (2) humans apprehend or attempt to create order in the environment so that they can effectively adapt behavior to the work environment. Schneider claims that the "order assumption" is associated with the two major principles of Gestalt psychology, which state that the task of the receiver is (1) to apprehend the
order which objectively exists in the world and (2) to create new order by a process of integration through thought. The apprehension of order, then, in Schneider's summary, has direct implications for behavior-climate perceptions.

After reviewing the experimental works of Frederiksen, Jensen, and Beaton, Schneider says that "employees working in consistent climate had higher production than those working in the inconsistent climate where productivity appears to be significantly different" (110, p. 450). This finding seems to suggest the existence of a climate effect on level of performance and also appears to show that patterns of performance are attributable to the climate under which people work.

It is, therefore, proper to assume that organizational climate has considerable impact upon human motivation to work effectively. This is evident in the work on organizational climate that occurs in several disciplines, primarily psychology (68, pp. 166-177), education (61, pp. 11, 83-94), and management (38, pp. 171-183).

According to McFarland's (84, p. 71) finding, psychologists have taken an added interest in organizational climate as an environmental influence on the behavior of the individual. He notes that the work of most researchers in this area seeks to identify and measure the variables
in organizational climate as well as the total climate and the effect of the variables on such behaviors as work motivation.

In terms of motivation to work, Robbinson and others (107, p. 430) state that the organizational climate may be one of trust and confidence or one of fear and reprisal within the context of organizational environment. Supporting this belief is Forehand and Gilmer’s (37, pp. 361-382) conception of organizational climate as a characteristic that influences the behavior of people in an organization. As a result of his research findings, McFarland (84, p. 717) presents a slightly different view of organizational climate that is somewhat analogous to the conception of industrial workers toward the environment in which they work and their company as a whole.

Meyer (87, pp. 151-166) observes that the impact of job characteristics cannot be overemphasized. Perceptions of the organizational climate in which one works, he maintains, also seem to be a powerful influence on one's attitudes toward the factors that motivate one to work, and the differences in these attitudes may be related to perceived organizational climate.

Most motivation studies appear to be carried out by psychologists (94, pp. 1-6). These studies seem to focus on such elements as employees, work, jobs, occupations,
rewards, performance characteristics, and the like (66, pp. 127-128). Characteristics of motivation which appear to be psychological in nature have essential linkage with the reality of organizational climate, performance, and work environment (69, pp. 90-94).

Advocating a desirable organizational climate that is conductive to high level performance, Miles develops ten dimensions of a healthy organization:

1. Goal focus
2. Communication
3. Adequacy
4. Optimal power
5. Equalization
6. Resource utilization
7. Morale
8. Innovativeness
9. Autonomy
10. Adaptation (88, p. 13).

From the personal point of view of Hillman (58, p. 22), understanding the principles of receptivity to change appears to be the same postulates that underlie successful organizational management in matters that depress workers and reduce their level of performance in the work environment. These principles include an organizational climate that fosters participation and parallels organizational needs and goals to individual needs and goals (120, p. 26).

Miller (89, p. 1), from a humanistic operational management standpoint, believes the beginning point in human governance to be the establishment and maintenance of a positive working environment. He argues that the
behavior of administrators, in attempting to deal with the organizational environment, positively affects each person's operational performance. According to Miller, the humanistic manager has no other choice but to be interested in supporting individual success, which is to be experienced in a positive working climate.

Herzberg (54, p. 147) feels that there is no doubt that an individual's orientation and performance are greatly influenced by his environment. From one of his studies in industry, also mentioned by Adams (4), Herzberg and his associates are reported to have found that, when people feel dissatisfied with their jobs, they are concerned with the environment in which they work. In Herzberg's opinion, superior performance can be generated through concentration on satisfiers that relate to the needs of ego and self-fulfillment, provided that reasonably good environmental conditions abound (54, p. 148).

Other researchers also have found that a particular type of climate is associated with high employee performance as a result of being adequately motivated. Friedlander and Margulies' (38, pp. 287-295) study of the hardcore unemployed indicates that workers who perceive their climate as supportive have higher levels of performance than those who perceive the climate as less supportive. Hall and Lawler (46, pp. 339-354) found that higher
performing research and development laboratories are more likely to be described as low on emotional control and high on dominance than vice versa.

Pritchard and Karasick (102, pp. 110-119) found that only two of their eleven climate items (performance-reward dependency and achievement) correlated significantly with managerial performance. They indicate that it does not seem, however, that a cause and effect relationship exists between organizational climate and motivation to work and job satisfaction. In other words, according to the authors, it is not easy to discern whether work motivation and job satisfaction cause climate or whether climate causes work motivation and job satisfaction. However, from their systems theory viewpoint, it is reasonable to expect considerable interrelationship between the two concepts.

The relationship of organizational climate (work environment) with human motivation is one that attracts the attention of writers. Burke (19, pp. 60-61) and McFarland (84, pp. 548-549) believe that Herzberg's (55) theory of job attitude is the basis of motivation to work. Herzberg indicates that, when employees feel satisfied with their jobs, all that they express is the description of factors related to their work success, professional advancement, or occupational growth. Their dissatisfaction, on the other hand, is expressed not in relation to the
performance of the work but concerns certain elements in
the working environment such as physical working condi-
tions, quality of work, interpersonal relations, salary,
organizational policies and administrative practice,
employee benefits, and job security.

In a similar study involving 5,000 teachers in an
institutional setting, Redefer (103, pp. 59-62) found that
the main factors which motivate people to work are related
to certain phenomena present in a work environment. These
factors are boards of education and administration, per-
sonnel practices, school equipment, and educational leader-
ship of the school system.

The essence of this type of motivation in human man-
agement is probably to provide a kind of environment for
employees that will move them voluntarily to action. The
action can be made possible with management furnishing
the setting of incentives and rewar es (85, pp. 203-205).

As pointed out in the literature, organizational
climate can vary from a description of the managerial
style of the administrator in charge of a division in an
organization (52, p. 58). McGregor refers to the style
as "managerial climate" (85, pp. 33-34), whereas Miles
depicts it as "organizational health" (88, p. 13).
Miles indicates that it should be the first priority for
any administrator who is seriously concerned with innova-
tiveness in an educational environment.
Hayes (49, p. 2) laments over the proliferating government regulations and the ever more intricate tax systems that pervade the industrial organizational environment. To be able to cope with numerous staffing needs and generate more progress in understanding human motivational relationships, he urges the industrial specialists to respond to the widening concerns for working environment and quality of life.

Similarly, according to a report by the Academic Staff Union of Universities of Nigeria (2, pp. 1-2), constant attempts have been made by academic staff in Nigeria to dispel the undesirable situations that pervade the academic environment in that country. Attempting to motivate the university staffs, the head of state in Nigeria appointed a presidential commission to examine the conditions of service of university staff, charging them "to advise generally on other issues which might lead to a healthy working environment in the universities as well as a satisfied and committed university staff population" (33, p. 4).

In an organization certain activities should take place if the organization is to survive. Waters and others (124, p. 465) refer to these activities that motivate people to work effectively. They feel that, for individual members within the organization, climate takes a set of expectancies which describe the organization in
terms of motivational characteristics and behavior-outcome contingencies.

A good climate promotes positive changes within an organization. Nelson and Purdy point to the following factors, which are indicative of organizational climate, that relatively facilitate changes in an educational work environment:

First, a philosophy that permits and promotes change and innovation, an organization, a structure, a system that facilitates change, leadership by the teachers, by the principals, or by the superintendent, or perhaps within the community; it may come from many sources, but it may be dynamic, it may be related to the beliefs and concerns of the people. Expectations for quality education on the part of many different people are inherent in this, such as the individual staff member, the staff of a group, the administration, the board of education, and the community. Another factor was internal security within each person himself. This evolves from the working environment, personal relationships, and mutual respect among staff members. They must have this in order for these practices to evolve and to develop (94, pp. 32-33).

With these assertions, Nelson and Purdy postulate that there are multiple related factors which contribute to an organizational climate that are necessary in order for desirable changes to occur in educational organizational settings. The interplay of these climatic factors appears to focus on individual and organizational needs that determine the selective receptivity of individuals to positive change (94, p. 30).
Parallel to these climatic factors in organizational environment is Miles' (88, pp. 17-21) equation of positive organizational health, which is based on an organizational climate study that is related to Maslow's (77, p. 13) self-actualization. The matching of the two premises suggests a feeling that individual needs must be met in a healthy organizational climate in order for the change process to occur which results from motivational effort.

In addition, Hillman (58, p. 33) observes that, in an atmosphere that is free from competitive pressures and where there is open communication and a feeling of pulling together, teachers are willing to share methods and ideas. He postulates that, in an environment of openness and mutual respect, people are more receptive to ideas and change.

Drucker's connotation of an organization relates to the organizational climate.

Management by objectives tells the manager what he ought to do. The proper organization of his job enables him to do so. But it is the spirit of the organization that determines whether he will do it. It is the spirit that motivates, calls upon a man's reserves of dedication and effort, that decides whether he will give his best or just do enough to get by (31, pp. 144-145).

In their view about humanizing the organization, Meltzer and Wickert (86, p. 152) contend that self-actualization as a concept fails to give sufficient weight to the individual as person embedded in a particular
work environment. This means, according to them, that self-actualization says more about what the person ought to be and how the environment might provide experience to promote the interest of such a person. In motivational terms, it does not look at what the person-environment ought to be.

Additionally, Meltzer and Wickert (86, pp. 151-153) feel that the development of self-management systems can increase the pursuit of humanistic aims in organizations without conflicting with the materialistic goals of the enterprise. They further indicate that organizations that provide environments and develop people to foster self-management are likely to achieve a heightened level of effectiveness, where effectiveness is measured in terms of long-term satisfaction of its sponsors, its clientele or customers, and its members.

Miller (89) suggests that a positive working environment can be established and maintained by the executive administrative team of an organization. Based upon a literature review, he presents the following eleven positive components of a working climate that can be created within an organization:

1. Thinking and acting reactively toward colleagues.
2. Meeting and reinforcing psychological needs of individuals.
3. Practicing acts of basic courtesy.
4. Maintaining dignity in the position.
5. Dealing with extreme behavior.
6. Safeguarding against playing favorites and surrounding himself with sycophants.
7. Developing an openness in interpersonal relationships.
8. Being continuously concerned about how things look to others.
9. Paying little attention to squeaky wheels.
10. Judiciously using the proceedings process.
11. Emphasizing a diverse staff (89, p. 45).

A significant finding by Adams (4, p. 149) is relevant to the above listing. The study reveals that a seeker of healthy working climate in an environment of achievement, growth, and recognition tends to adopt the values of the motivator-seeker.

It seems that most of the studies in this area report significant correlations between organizational climate, motivation, and job satisfaction. Studies conducted in this area by Friedlander and Margulies (38, pp. 171-183), Hall and Lawler (46, pp. 339-354), Kaczka and Kirk (63, pp. 253-272), Schneider (110, pp. 248-256), and Schneider and Hall (111, pp. 447-455) report data which indicate that climate, performance, and motivation are related.

Much research evidence collected from a variety of occupations, according to the report of Churchill and others (25), suggests that a worker's satisfaction influences his job behavior. Among the most consistent findings of this research are the following: (1) A negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and job turnover; dissatisfied workers are more likely to
quit and look for other jobs (25, p. 323).  (2) A negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and absenteeism (42, p. 178).  (3) A negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and accidents on the job, although it is unclear which factor causes the other (29, p. 99).  
(4) In a majority of studies, a positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and job performance, but there is much controversy over whether high satisfaction causes good performance and leads to satisfaction with the job or both satisfaction and performance are determined by other factors (101, pp. 79-80).

Despite the fact that the stated research findings are inferred from other occupations, the researchers maintain that the findings are substantive. It is suggested that the low morale and discontent among salesmen can cause major problems for sales and marketing managers. At the same time, the findings may lead management to improve sales force morale directly by modifying company policies and procedures governing compensation, motivation, etc. (107, pp. 79-90).

In an experimental study of organizational climate construct, Litwin and Stringer found job satisfaction, a byproduct of motivation, to be highest in a climate dominated by "affiliation" (75, p. 71). In this type of climate, job satisfaction is relatively high in "achievement" but
low in the climate in which exercise of "power" is a dominant feature. Based on these findings, the researchers conclude that motivation to work in an organization may be an outcome of a work environment and exists under different types of climate to varying degrees.

Despite its impact upon the behavior of individual employees who work in a particular enterprise, the concept of organizational climate seems to be under attack on several fronts. Forehand and Gilmer (37, pp. 361-382) view the organizational climate construct as being based on the assumption that individuals within a given system in an organization and at a given hierarchical level should have similar perspectives about their climate.

Forehand and Gilmer (37) point to a number of studies that report climate consistency, which they indicate would be difficult to explain as representing only a process of averaging extreme individual differences. Additionally, they observe that many of the climate studies reveal a lack of systematic effort to determine whether perceptions of climate vary significantly when evaluated on a demographic basis. These are subjective individual measures such as age, sex, educational level, years of service, and organizational practices.

In his contribution, Johannesson (62, pp. 363-382) is greatly concerned about perceptual measures of climate
in contrast to objective climate assessment. He believes that there are potentially as many climates as there are people in the organization. Based on the studies reviewed, this appears to represent a hypothesis that warrants further research.

Other observations come from Guion (45, p. 121), who feels that many researchers in the field appear to be confused about whether climate refers to attributes of organizations or people. A great deal of literature in this field, however, apparently considers organizational climate on its merit, in terms of its attributes. It is difficult to discern how this could be interpreted as referring primarily to people's attributes.

A further area of criticism of this subject concerns what Guion (45, pp. 121-125) calls a possible overlap and redundancy between job satisfaction and climate. Stimson and LaBelle (116, pp. 333-349) feel that the intent of the organization scale is to evoke perceptual rather than attitudinal or other types of responses. This means, according to these experts in organizational study, that the scales stimulate or intend to stimulate the responding participant to orient himself with specific facts and express his own opinion as to how he perceives those facts, not whether he likes them or not.
This part of the literature review reveals that several variables are involved that wedge organizational climate, work motivation, and organizational environment together. Becker (15, p. 26) refers to such variables as a range of factors that influence the climate of an organization. These factors, Becker postulates, include previous environments and their evolution, formal organizational constraints, and the needs, values, and expectations of workers as well as the practices of the manager, which have been proven to be the most important and dramatic determinants.

The individual's perception of the atmosphere or climate in which he works is no doubt related to his motivation, behavior, and attitudes, as suggested by Friedlander and Margulies' (38, pp. 121-183) research. Payne and Mansfield (101, p. 210) also assert that perceptions of organizational climate depend on (1) factors within the organizational environment that influence the real nature of the climate and (2) factors that affect the individual's perception of it.

The literature reveals that organizational climate was conceptualized within the last two decades. Seemingly, there are as many definitions of the term "organizational climate" as there are authors who have studied the concept. It appears, however, that there is a common thread tying all such definitions together, although differences
apparently surface among the definitions that ordinarily reflect variations in the choice of words and word order. The research studies conducted in this area suggest that relationships exist among organizational climate, work environment, and motivation. However, the concept does not lack criticism.

Lawler and others (69, p. 554) express their view concerning the criticism which other writers have raised against organizational climate. They assert that, when individuals become organizational members, a generalized perception of the organization tends to develop as a result of their experiences within it. The generalized perception of the organization, they further indicate, obviously determines the nature of its climate. According to them, although organizational climate has been an appealing metaphor for many theorists, conceptually it has been questioned on many grounds.

Hellriegel and Slocum (50, pp. 9-10) seem to take a remedial position in support of this particular criticism. They believe that organizational climate is characterized by conceptual difficulties. However, these authors suggest that recasting organizational climate with a focus on communication relationships can ameliorate some of these conceptual difficulties. This is because, they further state, communication linkages describe more concretely
the vehicle by which perceptions are shared among organizational members.

Universal Applicability of Management Theories and Practices

Management theories and practices generally are regarded as being universally applicable to business organizations and to institutions of higher education. Anthony and Nicholson (11, p. 11) observe that the university, in view of its complex structure, is being increasingly regarded as an organization to be managed just as other organizations are managed.

Supporting the universality of management practices, Anthony and Nicholson (11, pp. 11-16) assert that recognition is being given to the fact that managerial processes are universal. This is true regardless of the organization to which they are applied. The authors contend that the systems approach and other management theories and concepts are as applicable to a university as they are to any other business organization.

Another contribution made in support of the universal applicability of management theories and practices is Hayes' assertion (48, p. 3). Assuming that it were possible to freeze all organizations in the world on a given day, Hayes indicates, the various management beliefs, theories, and practices to which managers subscribe could
be identified. He also believes that the present-day organizations are saddled with human problems. As a result, Hayes explains, many theories of management are being offered as approaches to resolving organizational conflicts in any society.

It is Stogdill's (117, p. 18) strong impression that humanistic theory has pervaded much of the management literature of the last two decades. In his opinion, the basic premise of the humanistic approach is that it is the function of organizational leadership to provide for freedom of the individual to realize his own motivational potential for fulfillment of his own needs and at the same time contribute to the accomplishment of organizational goals.

To accomplish the universal organizational task of leadership, Patton (100, p. 56) claims that a variety of theories of administrative leadership has been developed to explain the factors involved in the emergence of the true leader-manager. He identifies them as "great man" theories, personal situational theories, interaction expectation theories, humanistic theory, and exchange theories. Miller (89, p. 1) recognizes the existence of the problems of governance structure within the organizational structure. He identifies the problems that an administrator faces as those of direction, coordination,
decision-making, and communication. To be able to cope with these organizational problems, he advocates a consistent way of perceiving human interaction in operational management. In his view, this significantly unified, interpersonal, and humanistic action is supposed to pervade any structural governance arrangement.

A key idea of Elkins (32, p. 241) appears to be related to other contemporary authors' work on the applicability of management theories and practices. He maintains that motivation theories generally have one applicable common denominator--they look at all human beings as a complex bundle of needs, abilities, and motivations.

Some organization management researchers view these theories as the critical elements in explaining behavioral actions at the managerial level. Several other theoretical and practical approaches to solving organizational problems have evolved. This bundle of theories is described by Koontz and O'Donnel as the management theory of the jungle (67, pp. 9-12).

Most observers in the field of management believe that the study of management has developed into a management science. In spite of the apparent absence of a general theory, the scientific terminology involved in management lends support to this view (65, 72, 73, 84).

The apparent practical evidence of human development and technological advancement in most contemporary societies
in the world, note Kast and Rosenzweig (64, pp. 141-144), suggests that management theories and practices are universally applicable. Anthony and Nicholson (11, p. 25) seem to recognize this assertion and indicate that administrative analysis and practices of global universities are not only universal in nature but have also heightened in recent years.

As a challenge to authoritarian management practices in organizations, Dominico (29, p. 36) reports that numerous authors in the area of business management worldwide have advanced management theories which embrace the humanistic theory of leadership and the worth of the individual as a contributing partner in the decision-making process. These theories, according to Dominico, concentrate on what has been the human approach to management with an emphasis on basic human needs. They also focus on how those needs can be met in a work situation for the mutual benefit of both the employee and the organization. These theorists include Argyris (12), Herzberg (53), Leavitt (70), Maslow (77), and Mayo (79).

The world of decisions to be made and actions to be taken in all types of human organizations makes it compelling to search for rules and principles that make for understanding of the field of management (49, pp. 40-49). Douglas (30, pp. 40-49) seems to support this assertion.
when he admits that theory is needed to better explain, predict, and control the phenomena occurring within the complex enterprise and to guide managerial actions in reliable directions.

Litchfield (73, pp. 3-24) advances a series of fundamental propositions around which he proposes to establish a total theory of administration. Additionally, McFarland (84, p. 21) submits a set of management theories that are universally applicable to organizations. He refers to the theories of subordinate theoretical impacts coming from such fields as (1) organization theory (2) decision theory, (3) personality theory, (4) game theory, (5) communication theory, (6) learning theory, (7) group theory, and (8) information theory.

McConkey (82) asserts authority on the universal applicability of management by objectives (MBO), a management philosophy, to non-profit organizations. He states that people who might question this authority would do well to answer "no" to the following questions:

1. Does any type of organization have a mission to perform?
2. Does management in any form of organization have assets (money, people, plant, and equipment) entrusted to it?
3. Is management accountable to some person or authority for a return on the assets?
4. Can priority be established for accomplishing the mission?
5. Is it possible to evaluate the performance of key personnel (82, pp. 5-21)?
McConkey assumes that answering "no" to any of the questions is an impossibility. This is because he feels that any manager who answers "no" places himself in the position of advocating ineffective management.

According to McConkey (82), MBO is making rapid strides in non-profit organizations everywhere. Although its progress has not been as dramatic or widespread as with business firms, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a category of non-profit organizations in which MBO has not been successfully applied. McConkey further reports that over twenty years of MBO experience has demonstrated the value and applicability of MBO to all types of organizations. The non-profit sector is no exception to the need for good management.

The literature reveals that most authors and researchers believe in general terms that management processes and techniques are universally transferable within organizations. Terry (121, p. 133) believes in significant, universal application of the management process. He stresses that the fundamental functions of management are basic and are performed by managers regardless of the type of enterprise--business or non-business--the major activity, or the level at which the manager works. Terry argues that it is not only in a business but also in other non-profit enterprises that management exists. He relies on one
philosophy, however; this philosophy is that individual differences lie in such things as the types of objectives, the plans with their accompanying actions, the magnitude of the decisions made, the organizational relationships affected, the amount of leadership required, and the complexity of performance measurement.

Terry (121, pp. 136-137) concludes with a simple equation that, since the management process is universal, what is meaningful about one manager's work applies to that of all managers. He contends that managers in industry can successfully serve in government posts not necessarily because of their intimate knowledge of government but because they can apply effectively the fundamental management functions. The same, according to Terry, holds true for management members in the educational field.

Terry (121, p. 5) postulates that management means getting work done in organizations through people. Supporting this statement, Barzun (14, p. 95) lists people first among a university's resources. He states that a college or university is a labor-intensive enterprise. Its accomplishments are dependent upon the caliber, the zeal, the effectiveness, and the management orientation of the human beings who make it up, particularly the faculty and also the large numbers of non-faculty personnel.

The humanistic approach to management practices can probably be best ascribed to Drucker, who states,
Management is the development of people in any part of the world, and not the direction of things. It is the totality of the process necessary to change people to high purpose, to involve them significantly in planning and decision-making, and to help them develop working relations among themselves that are satisfying and productive in accomplishing the aims of the institutions of which they are a part (31, p. 167).

As viewed by Gibson and others (40), most executives or administrators universally believe that an organization-wide sense of job satisfaction is a reliable index of good management practices. Similarly, the belief in the worth and dignity of the individual workers and the satisfaction of their needs and aspirations in organizations is amplified by the work of Miller (90), Oweren (98), Patton (100), and Stogdill (117) in the field of management and administration.

A number of studies have been conducted concerning the concept of the universality of management theories and practices. McFarland (84, p. 626) has made extensive literature reviews on the similarities and differences between managerial practices in different cultures. Reporting the findings of some studies on this subject, he states that certain researchers consider management as a science and it should therefore be universally applicable.

McFarland (84) believes the assertion to be a controversial idea because of the varying views of researchers on the subject. Argument is advanced that (1) some
researchers contend that it is not feasible to find principles and laws that work under different conditions in the varying cultures and (2) others perceive feasibility in the search for basic administrative theory as evidenced in the transferability of administrative skills among firms, industries, and any other types of organizations within a given culture. McFarland (84, p. 627) discusses a study that seems to confirm the belief in the universal application of managerial thought, philosophy, and conceptualization.

This study found that the fourteen developing countries studied were grouped into definite clusters and there were substantial similarities within the cultures. Only 25 to 30 per cent of the observed differences in the data was ascribed to national origins of the respondents, which means that the influence of culture is present and substantial but not overwhelming. The researchers found a strong tendency for managers in the various groups to express similar beliefs about management (84, p. 628).

Drawing a conclusion in one of his analyses of a similar aspect of this discussion, Gabriel (39, p. 28) notes that, for purposes of industrialization and industrial development, it seems clear that management skill is an exportable commodity. He also finds it to be one of the important exports of the multinational or
international firms. As well as in other places, evidence for this, in remarkable measure, seems to have been found in different Nigerian organizational environments (9, p. 44).

In support of the situational view of the management theory and practice, Fiedler (35, p. 67), an organizational psychologist, makes a valid contribution. He demonstrates in his studies on leadership that a contingency approach to leadership, emphasizing the factors that make it effective or ineffective, is superior to the generalized management approaches of the past. He emphasizes the fact that the contingency approach to administration has become a worldwide management philosophy.

Making conclusive statements in his Hawthorne studies, Mayo (79, p. 33) indicates that people in human organizations work better if they are treated like human beings and that to achieve this end management must concern itself with human relations. Herzberg (53, pp. 90-91) makes extensive comparisons between "motivator needs" (ego status, self-actualization) and "hygiene factors" (creature comforts, safety needs). He also concludes his studies by explaining that the factors which motivate people to work may be essentially different from those factors which create job satisfaction but are the same in any type of human institution. Maslow (77, p. 98) lists self-esteem
and self-actualization among his hierarchy of needs as paramount to human satisfaction. He submits that all of these should be vitally important to leaders in human organizations as paramount characteristics of higher levels of need satisfaction that provide direction for sound management practices.

The idea of the universal applicability of management theories and practices, in spite of the arguments in its support, has come under attack. All of these theories and practices are not without basic problems of application in organizational settings. It is McFarland's (84, p. 21) strong impression that the managerial implications of these theories need to be separated from their non-managerial ones in order to demonstrate and support conclusions applicable to management theory. Submitting his own argument, Carlisle (21, pp. 18-19) postulates that the contingency management approach holds that there are few universal solutions to management problems; there is often not just one way to solve a management problem or one best course of action to achieve a desired condition.

Condemning a general approach to solving organizational problems, the president of the American Management Associations contends that, if all the theories of management were comparable, individuals are so arrayed in organizations that what may work for one group may send another
into complete disarray (48, p. 3). Observing that the best management organizations are flawed, even though they are essentially healthy, this executive notes that only inexperienced managers expect the application of perfect management theory to result in a perfect organization.

McGregor (85, pp. 33-34) concludes his Theory X assumptions about human beings by observing that management approaches to organizational effectiveness which develop from these assumptions are not only universally inapplicable owing to their inaccuracy but will also often fail to motivate individuals to work effectively toward organizational goals. He therefore feels that management needs practices which are based on a more accurate understanding of the nature of man and human motivation.

Closely related, Carlisle (21, p. 37) reports, is the charge that traditional theory overemphasizes the universalism concept. The universalism postulates of traditional theory, according to him, are based upon two assumptions. One is that the management process remains the same in all organizations and is composed of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling functions. The same view is held by Terry (121, pp. 129-132). The second assumption is that management theory is equally applicable to business firms, social groups, governmental organizations, and any other activity involving joint human endeavor.
Like any other concept or theory, it is subject to the critique of experts. Carlisle's survey repeats one criticism that propositions which hold for such diverse phenomena as an army, a trade union, and a university must necessarily be either trivial or so abstract as to tell hardly anything of interest about concrete reality. Supervisors managing different activities face different situations that call for the selecting of concepts appropriate to that situation, not the reliance on principles to be applied universally (21, p. 37).

Matcalf (78, p. 277) credits the papers written by Mary Follett, an American social worker and philosopher, who was recognized in the 1920s with the law of the "situation." Follett noted even then that there are different types of leadership and that different situations require different types of knowledge.

In modern times, Howe (60, p. 13) believes, management has come to be equated in theory with practices that seem to increase workers' satisfaction in organizational settings. As too many internal and external environmental variables confound the relationship between theory and practice, however, it can be realistically stated that some management theories and practices work in certain situations and not in others (43, p. 13).

Expressing his own view, McFarland (84, p. 11) indicates that a unified, integrated, comprehensive theory of management has yet to be formulated, although an impact has
been made. However, he explains, an accumulating body of theory in management which includes organizational theory, human relations theory, administrative theory, and decision theory has been assembled.

Hellriegel and Slocum (50, pp. 56-58) support the credibility of Fayol's development of fourteen principles and practices of management as usable concepts for organizational efficiency and effectiveness. According to them, however, the same management principles, in their limiting scope, are seldom applied in exactly the same way.

In the field of education, apparently some administrators are skeptical about the transferability of industrial management practices to effective use in educational enterprise. McClenney (81, pp. 26-33), referring to the college president as a manager, gives an account of a management seminar where community college administrators were encouraged to examine their approaches to institutional management.

The administrators, according to McClenney, were confronted with the functions of management, which include principles of organization, planning systems, leadership styles, and standards of performance. Some college administrators attended the seminar only because they recognized the changing realities in college administration. The reaction of other administrators was to dismiss or at
least explain away the finding of researchers working in private business or industry. This group of administrators viewed education as unique, they were not sure that strategies pursued in business could be made to work in colleges, and they did not view themselves as managers. They contended that, because the word manager is a business or industrial term, business employed managers to direct marketing and production activities. Community colleges, on the other hand, simply were not involved in that type of enterprise (81, p. 35).

Wright (126, pp. 144-155) refers to a question that arises from the problems encountered in introducing and applying U.S. management to activities in different environments. The question is whether or not the U.S. management practices can be transplanted successfully into the very different environments.

Wright (26) reports that the question is addressed by both universalists and environmentalists. The universalists argue that there is a fundamental management philosophy--well developed in most American firms or multinational corporations--that can promote maximum efficiency wherever it may be applied. The environmentalists, on the other hand, view environmental constraints--local education; sociological, political-legal, and economic conditions; and cultural differences--as the primary
determinants of the effectiveness of a particular managerial philosophy. These constraints, according to Wright, are limiting factors to universal applicability of management theories and practices.

Parsons (99, p. 489) expresses some doubt as to whether certain management practices can be applied in academic settings. He contends that control, a management function, cannot be strictly applied in managing academicians. This is because, according to Parsons, a prime attraction of college teaching for the individual faculty members is their freedom from control and direction. He further argues that a strong body of thought holds that evaluation of the performance (another function of management) of the college teacher-researcher is not feasible.

In contrast to the views of critics on the possible applicability of management practices to academic organizations, Corson (27, p. 161) observes that experience demonstrates that the management techniques developed in business and government during the 1960s have noticeably improved the level of university administration. These techniques, he further states, particularly operations research, management by objectives, and systems, can continue to contribute significantly to the efficiency with which a college or university's large and numerous businesslike activities are run.
In his supportive contribution to this ongoing discussion, Bogard states,

By the application of management techniques—plus imaginative curiosity—in making the decisions, trustees and presidents of colleges and universities can not only increase the efficiency with which campus activities are carried on and control costs, but can also influence significantly the character of the institution (17, p. 3).

Bogard summarizes his remarks in this connection by observing that turning colleges and universities to highly decentralized organizations is the result of effective management.

It appears that management literature reveals much thought and many general points of view concerning the universal application of management theories and practices. The literature on management studies apparently claims that management is of universal importance. Management also appears to pervade almost every human activity since few people in the world can escape its influence. Most people are either managers in one way or another or they are being managed.

For modern and traditional societies to function efficiently, it is assumed that effective management of human resources should be thoughtfully considered (106). Researchers seem to recognize the importance of basing management practices upon systematic knowledge of human motivational processes. Most of their reports appear to
underscore the understanding of the universality of management theories and practices, and they indicate that an exercise of this type of applicability will be characterized by problems arising from constraints such as environmental and political conditions, cultural differences, and educational backgrounds. The belief that some management theories and practices are applicable to higher educational institutions, however, seems to stand unchallenged.

Faculty Development and Management Practices in Nigeria

Today it appears that most universities are caught in an increasingly difficult dilemma. Strong demands are being made for the establishment of new curricular programs and offerings. All of these are for the improvement and expansion of existing programs and services to the nations in which such universities are established. Academic staffs are obviously the agents of these changes (92, p. 135). Yet, many environmental constraints in terms of management practices of these universities appear to be limiting professional advancement.

Woodburne and Lloyd (125, p. 20) view individual faculty advancement in terms of promotions in rank as being contingent upon the motivational promises of initial appointments. They argue that promotions are the means,
aside from salary, by which true effectiveness is rewarded and the morale of the academic staff improved. Altbach (10, p. 20) notes that the academic profession remains an important group in most societies. He stresses the need for individual improvement through effective management practices. If the academic staff is underdeveloped, he contends, the quality of instruction at a university cannot be high.

Miner (91, p. 133) attempts to project the type of educational professional organization that will function effectively in the world of the future. In so doing, he cites Bennis as drawing heavily on the professional model as reflected in universities, the base for research and development organizations. Miner feels that more and more developed professionals will enter the academic community. To have a meaningful commitment to their professions and professional organizations, according to Miner, academicians need an environment that is steadily conducive to the development of human thought in order to grow intellectually.

Altbach (10, p. 20) emphasizes the need for encouraging the academic professionals' interest in research in order to further their advancement and to create new knowledge. If this is lacking, he argues, research productivity
will inevitably be abated and scientific and technological development slowed.

In its quest to improve the socioeconomic and political standard of a society, as viewed by Akintunde (8), no higher educational enterprise is likely to succeed without an adequate, highly qualified, and advancement-oriented academic staff. Akintunde, perceiving the need to reward individual improvement efforts, decries Nigeria's National Universities Commission's (NUC) directive to curtail advancement of academicians. He describes the move as a dangerous and demotivational attempt to strangle the university community. It seems that the directive seeks to limit the number of full professors and senior lecturers in each faculty of the universities and, consequently, slow the pace of their progress. The circular states that "not more than 15 per cent of the academic staff of a university should be full Professors and Readers (Associate Professors) and not more than 20 per cent should be Senior Lecturers" (8, p. 3). Akintunde argues that such a constraint on faculty advancement will not only be demoralizing but will also paralyze Nigerian higher educational institutions as well as bringing them to ridicule in the international community.

In this connection, Adeyemo's (7) view seems to be positive in a proposal made for the growth and development
of members of the staff of the faculty of business administration at the University of Lagos. In an effort to make recommendations on staff development to the vice-chancellor of the University of Lagos, he says, "We have it on authority that large additions to staff at the right levels are not only feasible, but can also be achieved by the faculty, provided that the development perspective is adopted" (7, p. 27).

Alarmed at the shortage of academic staff both in terms of quality and quantity, Adeyemo (7) notes that a large number of existing staff in his faculty are inadequately trained or prepared for the task of teaching and research in the university. He observes that this type of problem especially affects the morale of lecturers in addition to their lack of promotions and confirmations of appointments (tenure). To remedy this situation, the dean suggests an immediate need for staff training opportunities for growth for both the faculty and the university (7, p. 5). In his proposal for staff training and development, Adeyemo states,

Those members of staff, at present on the ground, who require further training in research and teaching, should be enabled to embark on further training, either locally or overseas, as soon as possible. It is now becoming obvious that the university expects continued competency in terms of teaching, research, and publications from those of us who have never been trained to bring forth these fruits (7, p. 27).
In a similar situation, McGregor (85, pp. 42-43) comments on the upward movement of industrial workers. He stresses that all the things that provide satisfaction at work are more available to people on top of the organizational structure than to those on the bottom. He feels that there is a gradient as one moves up the organizational ladder from the bottom to the top. He therefore emphasizes the need for management to encourage individual efforts to grow in the organization. Additionally, according to McGregor, the opportunities for enjoyment and satisfaction in one's work become greater the higher up the line one goes.

Among the factors that mitigate against innovations and steady advancement of academicians, one college president (122) says that the most important is economic limitations. In his managerial capacity, speaking in favor of the need for faculty advancement, the university president warns against cutbacks in educational budgets and advocates the need to pay higher salaries to academic staff in return for doing a good job of educating the next generation (122, p. 1).

Martorana and Nelson (76, p. 3) make a relevant contribution to this position. They mention that limited financial resources to underwrite the cost of such items as faculty exchange programs in higher education are among
the factors undercutting the need for international programs among colleges and universities in the United States. This situation, according to them, not only limits the maintenance of educational programs in these universities but also retards the professional advancement of institutional personnel.

The issues which tend to hinder individual growth and development in organizations appear to be inadequate conditions of service (7, pp. 5-6). These issues also seem to generate the inability of management to retain efficient and competent personnel (96, p. 183).

Adesola (6), in a convocation address, projects an increase of 40 per cent in the allocation to post-graduate programs in Nigeria and anticipates that a majority of its graduates will be hired in Nigerian institutions of higher learning. In view of this situation—the lack of opportunity for individual development apparently existing in the universities—Adesola expresses doubt about the retention of graduates in academic careers. He contends that retaining them depends upon rewarding atmospheres and favorable conditions of service being created to ensure adequate financial rewards and job satisfaction. Otherwise, he further argues, these graduates of the post-graduate programs may be easily lured away by the greater attractions of the private sector (6, p. 1).
At the time of this study, the Academic Staff Union of Universities of Nigeria (ASUU) has declared a trade dispute with the federal government of Nigeria. The dispute, which resulted in a strike action, concerns issues that center on salary and conditions of service of university staff in Nigeria. These issues, as noted in ASUU's report, caused a setback to the academic progress of faculty (2, p. 1).

In a publication of ASUU entitled "The University Crisis: Our Case" (2), a major cause of declining morale of academicians is said to be the impairment of the professional advancement of lecturers due to a lack of funds to make provision for essential elements such as the following:

a. Chalk, dusters, duplicating papers, stencils, typing sheets, blackboards, slide projectors, and overhead projectors to facilitate teaching.

b. Chairs and desks in classrooms so that students will not have to stand while listening to teaching instructions.

c. More laboratory space and equipment so that students will not need to share seats, microscopes, etc.

d. Conduct of meaningful research into pressing national, social, agricultural, engineering, and medical problems.

e. Paying staff reasonable salaries.

f. Enabling universities to organize industrial work experience and field trips for students.

g. Providing books, journals, and other materials necessary for teaching and research.

h. Arresting the ongoing mass exodus of highly qualified academic staff from universities to the private sector (2, p. 3).
These 1981 ASUU complaints appear to be based on a similar submission by Adeyemo (7) in 1978. Adeyemo, in his capacity as a dean, complains of lack of faculty development and shortage of physical facilities:

The greatest hindrance to development of faculty from the earlier times has come from inadequate supply of office space and classrooms. Due to shortage of physical facilities, it has been difficult in the past to attract staff of the right quality and quantity. Consequently, the lack of office space has been one of our major constraints to the growth and development of staff in the faculty. The degree of quality has now declined to the "rock bottom," and there is, therefore, an urgent need to effectively tackle the problem by breaking the vicious circle now (7, pp. 5-6).

Adeyemo's (7, pp. 1-4) statement and a similar one by his successor, Nwankwo (96, pp. 1-9), were sent to the central administration of the University of Lagos.

Many university professors and lecturers in Nigerian universities believe that they are unable to grow well professionally (2, p. 1; 96, p. 3). According to them, this is due in part to inadequate facilities in their laboratories. Writing on the financing of higher education currently in Nigeria, Olaniyan (97, p. 9) comments that the post-graduate scheme in most Nigerian universities is believed to be seriously hampered by lack of funds, adding that the science discipline is hardest hit.

Over the years, according to Adesola (5, p. 4), who is vice-chancellor of the University of Lagos, the facilities of that university have been viewed with great concern.
The facilities have been so overtaxed that the effort that is made to increase these facilities is quickly outweighed by the pressure placed on them.

Adesola (6, pp. 4-5) also complains that the lack of academic space hinders advancement and stresses this shortage of facilities. He emotionally states that, if universities are to play a meaningful role in the life of the nation and if they are to be agents for social change, it is clear that the government can no longer treat universities with indifference. They must be provided, he emphasizes, with the wherewithal to perform their function.

Yusuf (127, p. 217) makes a supportive contribution to the opinions on faculty's lack of commendable growth and development in Nigerian institutions of higher education. He observes that there is, generally, considerable inadequacy in the facilities at the different educational levels of Nigeria.

Other contemporary literature on advancement and growth of employees in organizations stresses the significance of reward as a motivational factor (70, p. 11; 123, pp. 59-60). Holt (59, pp. 197-218) predicts that the reward that may become most frequent in the 1980s is the mechanism that allows more advancement among college and university, government, and industry personnel. In order to foster excellence, according to Holt, universities have
to battle for adequate support for the research activities of their finest scholars. He argues that adequate support for research is a key reward for serious scholars who are determined to grow professionally.

Stoner (119, pp. 420-421), dealing with the immediate work environments that offer opportunities for employee growth and advancement, subscribes to adequate reward systems for enhancing personal growth. He believes that the organizational actions that generally have the greatest impact on the motivation and performance of individual employees, leading to their advancement, are the rewards that they are offered.

In a review of literature on the process theories of motivation relative to employee development, Stoner (119, p. 408) makes a relevant assertion. He indicates that individual workers can be developed by being motivated through goal setting and reward systems. This way, Stoner claims, it is possible for individual employees to see strong possibilities for receiving some reward in terms of salary increases. This reward becomes an incentive or motive for their behavior. In some cases, particularly in the less advanced societies, this type of reward may lower the level of employee turnover, stabilize mobility, and lay the foundation for employee advancement on the job (9, pp. 10-13).
Chait (22) views the issue of reward from a different but pertinent perspective. He postulates that colleges and universities only marginally employ economic reward structures for the following reasons:

1. Colleges and universities are non-profit by charter.
2. Much discretionary money is unavailable.
3. The bases for allocating economic rewards are uncertain, because of unclear goals as well as difficulty of performance evaluations (22, p. 24).

However, Chait cites critical prestige, recognition, and intellectual fulfillment as alternative "currencies" that are most valued by academicians. These rewards, according to Chait, are believed to enhance advancement in an academic environment.

Some studies have been undertaken in this area in Nigeria. At the time when the business administration faculty members of the University of Lagos were reacting to the impediments to their advancement, a study by Nwankwo (96, p. 1) was conducted on resignations from the faculty. Based on its findings, the committee on recognitions made the following recommendations on faculty remuneration:

a. Remuneration of faculty should be increased through faster promotions, particularly for those who merit them.

b. Entry points for new appointments should be made at higher points on the salary scales.

c. Staff members should be involved in consultancy projects secured by the faculty (96, p. 6).
The primary rationale behind the last item is to give individual faculty members the opportunity for professional advancement through management consultancy (96, pp. 11, 13).

Additionally, the committee is reported to have found lack of advancement prospects as the third most important cause of staff resignations, which, the committee observes, has a direct relationship to remuneration. Faculty members might tend to lessen the emphasis on remuneration if the prospects for advancement were bright (96, p. 3).

Along with this assumption, Olaniyan (97, p. 9) identifies many conflicts in operational methods of administering universities in Nigeria, which, he says, are not helpful to faculty advancement.

The report of the investigation by the Udoji Commission (95) on the conditions of service in academic organizations seems to be less favorable to academicians in Nigeria. Earlier the Committee of the Vice-Chancellors of Nigerian Universities expressed concern about the conditions of service in Nigerian universities. Based on the investigation conducted, the Committee of Vice-Chancellors comments,

The universities would have preferred and would prefer to stress the need of adequate salaries rather than large fringe benefits. Fringe benefits are accepted all over the world as a part of remuneration, and they are paid by all major employers, public and private, in Nigeria. Looking at remuneration more broadly, the attractions of any professional career are a combination of
monetary rewards, the satisfaction derived from the work itself, advancement prospects, prestige, and social status, along with other elements. No profession would continue attracting worthwhile talent if it failed in offering one of these elements, but their relative importance may change. The Nigerian academic today is not sure of his future place in a changing society. Society seems to be increasingly bestowing status and prestige as a consequence of financial success and less on the basis of education or position, although it still expects the educated to refrain from publicly pressing financial claims. At the same time, many academic staff feel inadequate job satisfaction and professional advancement (95, pp. 28-29).

In accordance with the attempt made by the federal government of Nigeria to resolve these issues generally, a presidential commission was appointed to examine the conditions of service of university staffs. The first charge to the commission emphasized the need to study the salaries of academicians elsewhere in the world, to study the international need for academicians, and to recommend a relevant salary structure for all categories of academic staff in Nigeria (33, p. 1). According to the commission, Adamolekun reports,

The organization, structure, mission, and operating method of the university system differ from those of either the civil service or the public corporations. To create development opportunities for university staffs, therefore, the conditions of service of universities in Nigeria should be tailored to suit the university's peculiar environments (3, p. 2426).

The commission (104, p. 141) reported and recommended that the university system should be removed from the unified public services established for all public sector
organizations in 1975. This is considered necessary in an effort to improve the management practices that enhance staff development in Nigerian universities.

It is the considered view of the commission that the existing salary grade level 01 to 17, established for public workers in Nigeria, be abolished for universities. In its place, the new university system salary scale (USS) 01 to 15 is recommended (33, p. 3). Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix K show the relationship of the two different salary grade level systems. Figure 2 is a reflection of the increase proposed for the basic salaries at all levels of academic professional status. Because a substantial increase in salaries has a positive relationship with the economic security which influences their professional development, college and university lecturers and professors generally agitate for salary increases (98, p. 29).

Summary

The subjects of motivation to work and organizational climate have aroused new interest among both academicians and policy-makers during this decade. This rising interest is not limited to advanced societies; it seems to pervade the organizational environments of most developing nations, such as Nigeria, as well.

At the theoretical level, the concepts of motivation in human organizations and of organizational climate are
stimulating. They emphasize the role of behavioral re-
search, symposia, seminars, and academic publications
as instruments for professional growth and development
(64, pp. 1-4). At the policy level, planning for develop-
ing performance and potential, improving working condi-
tions, maximizing human productivity, recruitment, and
retention of highly qualified professionals is recognized
as an important element in the achievement of social goals
in both academic and industrial organizations.

The concept of climate presumably provides a frame-
work that is valuable and useful to organization leaders
in understanding the behavior of those with whom they must
work. It not only fosters the understanding of the ef-
facts of leadership actions and informal style upon human
motivations but is also useful in developing more effective
approaches to motivational and organizational problems in
relation to professional growth and advancement of em-
ployees based on the reward system.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING AND TREATING DATA

Chapter III presents the methods and procedures that were utilized in the collection of the data for this study. The following areas are discussed: population of the study, description of the instrument, procedures for the collection of data, and analysis of data.

Population of the Study

The target population of 300 lecturers for this investigation was randomly determined from all university lecturers in three of the first six oldest Nigerian universities. These higher education institutions are the University of Ibadan, which opened as University College, Ibadan, in 1948; the University of Nigeria, Nsukka; the University of Lagos, Lagos; the University of Ife, Ile-Ife; Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, which opened in the early 1960s; and the University of Benin, which opened as the Institute of Technology, Benin City, in 1980 (3, p. 5).

The other newly established universities were not included or considered for participation in this study because experienced opinion was a primary criterion in that
phase of the study. In addition, this randomized selection was necessary in view of the great distances between Nigerian universities. These three of the oldest universities in Nigeria were selected on the assumption that they constituted a valid source of information from which data for the analysis could be elicited.

The Survey Instruments

Two sets of questionnaires, for which permission for use was sought and obtained, were utilized to collect the data for this study (see Appendix F). One of them, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-HE), is designed to determine the academic organizational climate as perceived by academic staff. The other, the Educational Work Components Study (EWCS), is designed to measure work motivation in the academic organization. Both instruments indicate occurrence through the use of a five-point scale. Written permission for the use of these survey instruments was obtained from Borrevik, Miskel, and Educational Testing Service, respectively (Appendix G).

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-HE) was developed by Borrevik in 1972 (2, p. 1). This instrument, modeled after Halpin and Croft's 1963 study of elementary school climate (4, p. 84), was purposely constructed to permit portrayal of the organizational climate of academic departments within colleges and universities
as perceived by academic staffs. Borrevik analyzed faculty members in seventy-two academic departments in twelve Pacific northwest institutions in developing the instrument (2, pp. 1-2).

The original researchers, Halpin and Croft, hypothesized that, in general, schools have distinct "personalities" or organizational climates (4). Halpin and Croft designed the original instrument to test this hypothesis. Borrevik composed Likert-type items similar to the original items to represent eight factors or subtests of academic organizational climate. Four of the factors especially relate to characteristics of the "group as a group" and the remaining four to characteristics of the "department head as a leader." The eight OCDQ subtests are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Staff Behavior</th>
<th>Department Head Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disengagement</td>
<td>1. Aloofness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hindrance</td>
<td>2. Production-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esprit</td>
<td>3. Thrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intimacy</td>
<td>4. Consideration (Appendix B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six organizational climates which are listed below were then identified by Borrevik (2, p. 78). They were conceptualized by the investigator along a continuum ranging from the preferred "open climate" at one end of
the continuum to the least desirable "closed climate" at
the other (2, pp. 41-42).

1. The Open Climate
2. The Autonomous Climate
3. The Controlled Climate
4. The Familiar Climate
5. The Paternal Climate
6. The Closed Climate (Appendix C)

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire
indicates frequency of occurrence through use of a five-
point scale of values. Each lecturer respondent was asked
to indicate the extent to which the behavior in each of
the fifty items characterized his or her university. For
example, for the statement "Lecturers call each other by
their first names" responses could range from "almost al-
ways occurs" to "almost never occurs." Items on the OCDQ-
HE which were cited by respondents as "almost always oc-
curs" received a five-point value, those cited as "fre-
quently occurs" received a four-point value, those cited
as "approximately equal in occurrence and non-occurrence"
received a three-point value, those cited as "infrequently
occurs" received a two-point value, and those cited as
"almost never occurs" received a one-point value.

The OCDQ-HE, based on the original OCDQ, is valid
because the author indicates that its validation was ac-
complished through use of construct validity and cross-
validation techniques (2, p. 1). Concluding his abstract,
the author also mentions that the findings of his
investigation were (1) the OCDQ-HE is a valid instrument to assess the organizational climate of academic departments, and (2) the consolidation in this investigation in higher education of the same factors found in the original study was shown.

In order to measure the factors of lecturer motivation to work, the Educational Work Components Study (EWCS) questionnaire was used. Although it was originally designed for use in industrial settings by Borgatta to serve as an industrial selection device based on Herzberg's theory of work motivation (1, pp. 1-11), it was adopted for use in educational organizations by Miskel (5). Miskel accomplished this by subtracting words related to industrial situations. Miskel determined the factorial stability of the EWCS and calculated Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient to establish internal consistency of the items.

The measure is composed of thirty-six Likert-type items which provide responses to the factors most desired in a job which motivate one to work. These factors are as follows:

1. Potential for personal challenge and development—the desirability of a job which provides opportunities for creativity and responsibility and which stresses individual ability.
2. Competitiveness desirability (and reward of success)—whether an individual seeks job situations where the salary is determined by merit, the competition is strong, and accomplishment is emphasized.
3. **Tolerance for work pressure**—attitudes toward job situations in which work loads may be extreme or excessive.

4. **Conservative security**—the respondent's wish for security, including well-defined guidelines for promotions and job routines.

5. **Willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty**—a person's willingness to perform interesting work despite the fact that the job might be a temporary one.

6. **Surround concern**—the individual's concern with the general aspects of the job (5, p. 44).

The EWCS was administered in a self-report form. Following each item, as listed below, were five Likert-type responses which range from "extremely undesirable; would never take the job" to "extremely desirable; would favor the job greatly." A five-point scale of values was assigned to each item to indicate the respondents' judgment for the value of each item as follows:

1 = Extremely undesirable; would never take the job
2 = Undesirable; would avoid the job
3 = Neither desirable nor undesirable
4 = Desirable; would favor the job
5 = Extremely desirable; would favor the job greatly

The third part of the survey instrument contains the demographic items. The demographic data items are designed to collect personal data on independent variables within the population. The selection of these demographic data items is based on their value in relation to the study. The demographic data items are sex, age, field of specialization, teaching experience in the particular university of study, highest educational qualification,
professional rank, the institution where the highest academic degree was obtained, nationality, and confirmation of appointment or tenure (Appendix H).

Procedures for the Collection of Data

At the early stage of the study, a letter seeking permission to conduct field research in Nigeria was sent to the researcher's sponsor, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Lagos. The official letter of permission to undertake the field trip to Nigeria was received in May of 1981 (Appendix D).

A letter was then sent to the vice-chancellor of each university in Nigeria involved in the study. The letter, which explained the objective of the study, sought the permission and cooperation of each university to carry out the investigation (Appendix D). Official letters of permission to administer the instruments were received from each university concerned (Appendix E), and the researcher traveled to Nigeria to direct the administration of the questionnaires.

In order to obtain a representative sample of lecturers who were employed to work full-time in the participating institutions at the time of the study, the six universities were listed in alphabetical order. From this list, the names of three universities—the University of Lagos, the University of Ife, and Ahmadu Bello
University--were randomly selected. Current lists containing the names of Boards of Studies of lecturers working in each faculty of each of the three universities selected were assigned a number, beginning with one. Ten lecturers were selected from each list, using a table of random numbers, for participation in the study. In each of the three universities a subtotal of 100 lecturers was selected; a total of 300 lecturers was finally selected from all three universities.

The survey questionnaires, along with the background data sheet, each in an addressed envelope bearing the participant's name, were hand-delivered to the faculty officer for distribution to the selected participating lecturers (Appendix H). A covering letter was included with each instrument explaining the reasons for the survey, requesting the cooperation of each respondent, and specifying the return date of the instruments (Appendix I). Each respondent was provided with a self-addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaires.

The investigator, assisted by faculty messengers, selected interested lecturers, departmental secretaries, and the faculty officers, located the respondents to facilitate the early return of the survey instruments and secure a greater return than was originally anticipated. As instructed in the covering letter, the completed
questionnaires were returned to the faculty officer who distributed them initially, and they were then collected by the researcher. The Department of Business Administration in the University of Lagos was the base for the field researcher. The respondents outside Lagos who had not returned their surveys during the researcher's field trips later returned them by mail to Lagos. The last group of questionnaires was returned by mail from Nigeria to the investigator in the United States for analysis. The numbers and percentages of returns obtained from the distributed questionnaires are reported in Chapter IV.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

In order to effectively organize the data for presentation and analysis, the following steps were taken:

1. The demographic data were compiled and presented in tabular form.

2. All lecturers in the sample were classified and presented in tabular form according to their perceptions of one of the six academic organizational climates. This classification was determined by using the procedures set forth by Halpin and Croft (4).

3. It was initially determined that, if the data resulted in an insufficient number of distribution in one or more of the six climates, the climates would be collapsed, as suggested by Halpin and Croft (Appendix J).
4. The mean was calculated from each lecturer respondent on each of the six EWCS subtests (factors). Steps 2 and 4 are displayed in tabular form.

5. A one-way analysis of variance was originally proposed to be performed with organizational climate as the independent variable and the respective score on the EWCS as the dependent variable. Six one-way analyses of variance were also proposed to be used. The data resulted in an insufficient number of distribution in one of the six climate categories, and the climates were collapsed. Two major climate categories, open and closed, resulted from this collapsed technique.

6. A t test, an appropriate statistical procedure for two independent groups, was performed. This was used to determine the difference in the way lecturers perceived their academic organizational climate and the factors that motivated them to work. A level of confidence of .05 was set for these analyses.

Computer processing at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, was used to assist in analyzing the data and the statistical calculations in this study. Based on the results of these tests, conclusions were drawn and presented in Chapter V according to the items that were tested in the questionnaires and reported in Chapter IV.
Summary

Chapter III has described the population used to secure data for this study, the survey instruments, the procedures for collection of data, and the treatment of data. The types of statistical analyses used to treat the data were also discussed. The analyses of data are presented in Chapter IV.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

Introduction

The analyses of data for this study are presented in this chapter. The study seeks to determine the relationships between work motivational factors and the perceptions of Nigerian lecturers regarding the academic organizational climate of their institutions.

Table I contains data reporting the numbers and percentages of returned questionnaires by universities.

TABLE I

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS BY UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Number Distributed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Lagos</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ife</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadu Bello University</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data were obtained from lecturers in three universities that were randomly selected from among the six oldest universities in Nigeria. A total of 300 full-time lecturers was selected for this study; 252 (84 per cent) of the subjects returned completed questionnaires.

Analyses of the Data

The analyses of the data are organized into four parts. The first analysis profiles the respondents who participated in the study. The second analysis presents a summary of the responses of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-HE) and classifies the perceptions of the 252 lecturers according to the manner in which they perceived their academic organizational climate. The third analysis shows the data findings that pertain to the six specific work motivation factors, as indicated by responses to the Educational Work Components Study (EWCS) questionnaire. The fourth analysis groups the responses of the lecturers according to how they perceived their academic organizational climate (open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, or closed) in conjunction with the work motivation factors measured by the EWCS. This analysis also examines the relationships that were found to exist between the six specific factors that motivated lecturers to work and their perceived organizational climate.
General Background Data on Lecturer-Respondents

The lecturer participants, who were randomly selected from the University of Lagos, the University of Ife, and Ahmadu Bello University, were asked to furnish personal data. As shown in Table II, those data reveal that 74.21 per cent of the respondents are male and 25.79 per cent are female. The largest group of lecturers responded from the University of Lagos and the smallest group from Ahmadu Bello University. It is possible that the variance between these two universities is due to geographical location. The University of Lagos was the base for the research, and the University of Ife is not geographically far from it; Ahmadu Bello University, however, is located some distance away in the northern part of Nigeria.

Fifty per cent of the respondents are between 31 and 40 years of age. For the total group of lecturers, the three largest areas of academic specialization are education, social sciences, and business administration or public administration. Twenty-two (8.73 per cent) of the respondents have only one year or less of teaching experience; 93 (36.90 per cent) respondents have between 2 and 5 years of experience, 100 (39.68 per cent) have between 6 and 10 years, and 37 (14.69 per cent) have more than 11 years of teaching experience. The percentage of the respondents
### TABLE II
DEMographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>University of Lagos</th>
<th>University of Ife</th>
<th>Ahmadu Bello University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field of specialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/public administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental design</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/continuing education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching experience (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>University of Lagos</th>
<th>University of Ife</th>
<th>Ahmadu Bello University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-classified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer/senior fellow</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer I/Fellow I</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer II/Fellow II</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant lecturer/research assistant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where highest degree obtained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-classified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment confirmed (tenure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>University of Lagos</th>
<th>University of Ife</th>
<th>Ahmadu Bello University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Nigerian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

who have worked in a university environment for 11 years or more was small (14.69 per cent) compared with those who have worked for less than 11 years (85.31 per cent).

The majority of the respondents are employed at the lecturer grade II and I levels (65.89 per cent). The educational background of the respondents is predominantly at the master's (47.62 per cent) or doctoral (41.67 per cent) degree level. Nigerian industry, seemingly in competition with the universities, prefers to employ personnel with advanced educational qualifications.

Although most of the lecturers (73.02 per cent) obtained their highest degree outside Nigeria, 26.98 per cent of the respondents earned their highest degree in Nigeria. The appointment of 83.73 per cent of the lecturers is confirmed (they are tenured); only 16.27 per cent had yet to receive tenure. The majority of the respondents (58.33 per cent) are Nigerian; 41.67 per cent are not citizens of Nigeria.
Lecturers' Perceptions of Academic Organizational Climate

The Nigerian university lecturers view their academic organizational climates as being open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed. These six different academic organizational climates were determined by using Halpin's prototypic climate procedure.

Table III depicts the prototypic climates of the OCDQ that Halpin developed for his original study of school organizational climate. In order to determine the academic organizational climate perceived by the respondents in this study, the following steps were taken:

1. A computation was made of the absolute difference between the standardized scores on each subtest for each of the six prototypic profiles.

2. A comparison was made of each lecturer's standardized scores with each of the six prototypic profiles in order to derive profile similarity scores. To accomplish this, each of the lecturer's eight standardized scores (representing the eight OCDQ subtests) was subtracted from the prototypic profiles for the six organizational climates, and the results indicated the placement of each lecturer-respondent in one of the organizational climate categories (see Appendix J for the items composing
**TABLE III**

**PROTOTYPIC CLIMATES OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCDQ Subtests</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The eight subtests of the OCDQ in numerical terms. The results of the analyses are presented in Tables IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX. As indicated in each of these tables, the resulting numbers, after the subtraction exercise, were added within each of the six climate categories; after a profile similarity was calculated for each prototypic profile, the prototype with the smallest total sum (score) indicates the academic organizational climate perceived by that group of lecturers.
The data in Table IV reveal that the smallest total absolute difference (64.35) appears in the open climate column. This indicates that 41 lecturers perceive their academic organizational climate as being open. These 41 lecturers appear to feel that their working environment was humanistic, encompassing a warm, trusting, caring, people-centered, open atmosphere.

As shown in Table V, the autonomous column yields the smallest total absolute difference (67.21). This indicates that these 21 lecturers perceive their academic organizational climate to be autonomous. The lecturers in this group appear to feel that they work in an atmosphere of freedom which is characterized by social interaction and few hindrances, one in which goals could be achieved with little or no difficulty.

The data in Table VI show the smallest total absolute difference (64.60) in the controlled climate column. This indicates that these 55 lecturers feel that their academic organizational climate is controlled. This group of lecturers perceive the environment in which they work as void of interpersonal and social needs satisfaction. It is possible that these lecturers are dominated by authoritarian rules and regulations that force involuntary submission.
### TABLE IV

**ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF LECTURERS: OPEN CLIMATE**

*(N = 41)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>50.90</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- O--open climate,
- A--autonomous climate,
- CO--controlled climate,
- F--familiar climate,
- P--paternal climate,
- CL--closed climate.
TABLE V
ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF LECTURERS: AUTONOMOUS CLIMATE (N = 21)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>50.74</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>58.02</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>55.73</td>
<td>15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O--open climate, A--autonomous climate, CO--controlled climate, F--familiar climate, P--paternal climate, CL--closed climate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>53.45</td>
<td>11.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>51.23</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>90.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O--open climate, A--autonomous climate, CO--controlled climate, F--familiar climate, P--paternal climate, CL--closed climate.
The data in Table VII show that the familiar column has the smallest total absolute difference (58.42). This indicates that this group of 47 lecturers view their academic organizational climate as familiar. The working environment of this group is perceived as one in which activities that lead to goal achievement are monitored in a friendly manner which exercises little or no control.

In Table VIII the paternal climate column yields the smallest total absolute difference (66.55), which indicates that a group of 36 lecturers perceive their academic organizational climate as paternal. These lecturers appear to perceive their organizational climate as one in which they do not enjoy friendly relationships with each other and the leadership is ineffective in terms of motivation, group control, and satisfaction of social needs.

The data in Table IX indicate that the smallest total absolute difference (63.27) is in the closed column. This indicates that 52 of the lecturers perceive their academic organizational climate as closed. These lecturers appear to perceive their institutions as having a work environment that is distinguished by functional rigidity. These lecturers probably do not obtain much satisfaction from task achievement or in their social needs and freedom to perform their duties.
TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF LECTURERS: FAMILIAR CLIMATE (N = 47) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>50.86</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>52.03</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>56.26</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>57.31</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O--open climate, A--autonomous climate, CO--controlled climate, F--familiar climate, P--paternal climate, CL--closed climate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>55.39</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>46.35</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>55.47</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>53.07</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total               | 87.09   | 98.74  | 87.11  | 82.49  | 66.55  | 80.82  |

*O--open climate, A--autonomous climate, CO--controlled climate, F--familiar climate, P--paternal climate, CL--closed climate.
TABLE IX
ANALYSIS OF ABSOLUTE DIFFERENCE OF ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FROM PROTOTYPIC CLIMATE OF LECTURERS: CLOSED CLIMATE (N = 52)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Standardized Scores</th>
<th>Absolute Difference from Subtests of Prototypic Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>18.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50.19</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>50.91</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>47.82</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>42.95</td>
<td>18.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O--open climate, A--autonomous climate, CO--controlled climate, F--familiar climate, P--paternal climate, CL--closed climate.
The percentage distribution for the lecturers' perceptions of their academic organizational climate is shown in Table X. Of the 252 lecturers who participated in the survey, 41 (16.27 per cent) perceive their academic organizational climate as open, 21 (8.33 per cent) feel that their academic organizational climate is autonomous, and 55 (21.83 per cent) feel that it is controlled. Forty-seven respondents (18.63) view their academic organizational climate as familiar, 36 (14.29 per cent) feel that it is paternal, and 52 (20.63 per cent) perceive their academic organizational climate as closed.

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE GROUPINGS BY PERCEIVED ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Type of Academic Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous climate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled climate</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar climate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal climate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grouping of Lecturers into Climate Categories According to Behavioral Perceptions

Lecturers' perceived academic organizational climates are collectively classified in Table XI. These data reveal that lecturers' perceived academic organizational climates encompassed all six OCDQ climate types.

In the development of prototypic profiles of schools for the OCDQ, Halpin and Croft standardized each of the eight subtest scores across a sample for each subtest. In this way, all eight subtests were standardized according to the mean and standard deviation of the profile scores, institution by institution.

An arbitrary standard-score system based on a mean of 50 (\( \bar{X} = 50 \)) and a standard deviation of 10 (SD = 10) was selected for completion of the standardization process. Using these standardized scores, a score in excess of 50 on a particular subtest indicates (1) that a particular given institution scored above the mean of the sample on that subtest and (2) that the score on that subtest was above the mean of the institution's other subtest scores. The converse of this assertion applies to scores below 50.

For this study, Table XI shows the standardized subtest scores, the mean raw scores, and the standard deviations across eight OCDQ subtests for the six groups of lecturers as classified by perceptions of academic
### TABLE XI

**LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AS MEASURED BY OCDQ-HE SUBTESTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Climate Perceived by Lecturers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Lecturers' Perceptions of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Lecturers' Perceptions Regarding Behavior of Department Heads and Other University Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>44.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>27.15</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous climate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>48.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled climate</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>53.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar climate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>50.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>16.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal climate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>55.39</td>
<td>46.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>17.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130
### TABLE XI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Climate Perceived by Lecturers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Lecturers' Perceptions Regarding Behavior of Other Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers' Perceptions Regarding Behavior of Department Heads and Other University Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>49.48</td>
<td>50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>31.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Z--standardized scores, X--mean raw scores, SD--standard deviations; D--disengagement, H--hindrance, E--esprit, I--intimacy, A--aloofness, P--production emphasis, T--thrust, C--consideration.
organizational climate. Standardized subtest scores above 50 (mean or average score) are considered as high scores, while standardized subtest scores below 50 are considered as low scores.

Table XI also shows that OCDQ subtests 1 through 4 (disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy) measure lecturers' perceptions of the behavior of their fellow lecturers. Subtests 5 through 8 measure the lecturers' perceptions of the behavior of their heads of departments and that of other authorities in their academic community.

Collapsing the Climate Categories

In Table XII, the six different academic organizational climates are collapsed or combined into two major climate categories. In situations in which fewer than 30 respondents appear in any climate category, Halpin suggests that two types of combinations (three major categories or two major categories) may be used to ensure a minimum of 30 respondents (see Appendix J). This study used the two major categories combination, composed of the first three climates (open, autonomous, and controlled) that tend toward being open and the last three climates (familiar, paternal, and closed) that tend toward being closed.

Table XII shows how the climate categories were collapsed. As indicated, 117 lecturers perceive their
### TABLE XII

**LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AS MEASURED BY OCDQ-HE SUBTESTS: COMBINED GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Climate Perceived by Lecturers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Subtests of OCDQ-HE</th>
<th>Lecturers' Perceptions Regarding Behavior of Other Lecturers</th>
<th>Lecturers' Perceptions Regarding Behavior of Department Heads and Other University Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td>50.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>31.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.78</td>
<td>50.56</td>
<td>50.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>31.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>49.96</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>31.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Z--standardized scores, X--mean raw scores, SD--standard deviations; D--disengagement, H--hindrance, E--esprit, I--intimacy, A--aloofness, P--production emphasis, T--thrust, C--consideration.
academic organizations as having an open climate and 135 lecturers feel that their academic organizations have a closed climate.

In institutions that have open climates, Halpin asserts that faculty members obtain satisfaction quite equally with respect to both task accomplishment and social needs. In terms of its components, Halpin describes the open climate as being characterized by (1) high esprit, thrust, and consideration; (2) average intimacy; and (3) low disengagement, hindrance, aloofness, and production emphasis (see Appendix B).

In the open climate that has autonomous characteristics, more emphasis is placed on social needs satisfaction than on task achievement; the almost complete freedom accorded to faculty members distinguishes this climate. In the open climate that has controlled characteristics, task achievement is stressed highly at the expense of social needs satisfaction.

Based on how the 117 lecturers in the open climate group perceive the behavior of their fellow lecturers (subtests 1 through 4), the data in Table XII indicate low or slightly low standardized scores on three of the four subtests. However, on the subtest measuring esprit, the open-climate group of lecturers have a high standardized score.
Concerning the group perceptions of the behavior of heads of departments and other authorities in the academic community (subtests 5 through 8), the data indicate low or slightly low standardized scores on the subtests measuring production emphasis and consideration and high standardized scores on thrust and aloofness.

An institution with a closed climate has components of both familiar and paternal climates. Extremely high social needs emphasis characterizes the familiar climate, with little or nothing being done to direct or control the behavior of the group toward goal achievement. Halpin indicates that the familiar climate is (1) high in disengagement, intimacy, consideration, and thrust; (2) average in esprit; and (3) low in hindrance, aloofness, and production emphasis.

The paternal-type institution that has a closed climate is characterized by perceived ineffective attempts to control faculty members and to satisfy their social needs. Halpin describes the behavior of principals in such organizational climates as non-genuine and non-motivating; the paternal climate is (1) high in disengagement and production emphasis, (2) average in consideration and thrust, and (3) low in hindrance, intimacy, esprit, and aloofness. As shown in Table XII, the group of 135 lecturers in the closed climate category score
relatively high on the eight subtests of the OCDQ, with the exception of the consideration category, for which the score is slightly below average.

Table XIII presents the percentage distributions of perceived organizational climate based on the collapsed categories. According to the collapsed climates, Table XIII shows that 117 (46.43 per cent) of the lecturers perceive their academic organizations as having an open climate. On the other hand, 135 (53.57 per cent) of the lecturers perceive their academic organization as having a closed climate. The collapsing of the six climates into two major categories in Table XIII reveals that (1) the open climate in the lecturers' academic organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Type of Academic Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Number of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate (open, autonomous, controlled)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>46.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate (familiar, paternal, closed)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LECTURERS' PERCEIVED ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE BASED ON COLLAPSED TYPES
could be characterized by a high degree of satisfaction in human relationships, and (2) the closed climate could be indicative of a low degree of satisfaction with human relationships and production.

**Perceptions of Lecturers Concerning Motivation to Work**

Table XIV presents the data on perceptions of the respondents pertaining to their academic organizational climates as indicated by mean scores on the factors of motivation as revealed by their responses to the EWCS questionnaire. The respondents' numerical scores were totaled for all items within each subscale (factor) of the EWCS, and raw scores were obtained for each of the six EWCS factors: (1) potential for personal challenge and development, (2) competitiveness desirability, (3) tolerance for work pressure, (4) conservative security, (5) willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty, and (6) surround concern (concern for surroundings).

Eighteen is the mean score for each of the six EWCS factors. A high score on a factor is an individual or group mean score above 18; a low score on a factor is an individual or group mean score below 18. A high score on a factor (subscale) indicates a high degree of desirability for the characteristics comprising that particular factor;
TABLE XIV
LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SIX ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATES
AS INDICATED BY MEAN SCORES ON EWCS MOTIVATING FACTORS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Climate Perceived by Lecturers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>22.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous climate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled climate</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>22.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar climate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>21.34</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>22.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal climate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>23.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>22.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factor 1--potential for personal challenge and development; Factor 2--competitiveness desirability (and reward of success); Factor 3--tolerance for work pressure; Factor 4--conservative security; Factor 5--willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty; Factor 6--surround concern.
a low score on a factor is indicative of a low degree of desirability for the characteristics comprising that particular factor.

As shown in Table XIV, all groups of lecturers in all climate categories have high mean scores on EWCS Factors 1, 2, 3, and 6. Conversely, all groups in all climate categories (except for the autonomous climate group) have low mean scores on EWCS Factor 5; the autonomous climate group has a mean score that is slightly above average on Factor 4.

Table XV presents data on the two groups of lecturers and the combined or collapsed categories. As indicated in Table XIV, the autonomous climate group contained fewer than 30 respondents, a statistically unacceptable sample size; therefore, for the purpose of this particular analysis, the six climate groups were collapsed into two major types, whereby, as previously explained, 117 lecturers were grouped into the open climate and 135 lecturers were grouped into the closed climate. Table XV reveals that the open climate group of lecturers have high mean scores on EWCS Factors 1, 2, 3, and 6 and a score that is slightly below average on Factors 4 and 5. The closed climate group of lecturers have high mean scores on EWCS Factors 1, 2, 3, and 6 and low mean scores on Factors 4 and 5.
### TABLE XV

LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF COLLAPSED ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATES AS INDICATED BY MEAN SCORES ON EWCS MOTIVATING FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Climate Perceived by Lecturers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>22.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factor 1—potential for personal challenge and development; Factor 2—competitiveness desirability (and reward of success); Factor 3—tolerance for work pressure; Factor 4—conservative security; Factor 5—willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty; Factor 6—surround concern.
To determine the relationships existing between each of the six EWCS factors of motivation to work and the perceptions of 252 lecturers of their academic organizational climates, six one-way analysis of variance tests were planned on the assumption that none of the six climate categories would have fewer than 30 respondents. The collapsed situation, which produced two groups, made it necessary to utilize the t test to determine and compare the groups' mean differences.

The t values of these combinations are reported in Table XVI, which also presents the results of the t test. A significant difference at the .05 level was employed as the criterion for investigating and interpreting the possible relationships, which was determined to be a t value equal to or greater than 2.57 with 250 degrees of freedom. If the calculated t value is greater than 2.57, a significant difference exists between the groups' means, which indicates a positive relationship between a factor of motivation to work and the perceived open-closed climate. In relation to the combined climate categories, the EWCS factors are discussed only if the difference is at the .05 level of significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EWCS Factors</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Diff. Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for personal challenge and development</td>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness desirability</td>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for work</td>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative security</td>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty</td>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surround concern</td>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level.
Data Findings Relative to the Research Question

Part 1.--Part 1 of the research question concerns the relationship that exists between EWCS Factor 1, potential for personal challenge and development, and perceptions of academic organizational climate (open through closed). As shown in Table XVI, this relationship produced a t value of 1.95 (p = .052), which is statistically non-significant. Therefore, no relationship exists between the factor of potential for personal challenge and development and academic organizational climate.

Part 2.--Part 2 of the research question concerns the relationship that exists between EWCS Factor 2, competitive desirability, and perceptions of academic organizational climate (open through closed). As shown in Table XVI, this relationship produced no significant difference with a t value of 1.05 (p = .294). Therefore, no significant relationship exists between competitive desirability and academic organizational climate.

Part 3.--Part 3 of the research question concerns the relationship that exists between EWCS Factor 3, tolerance for work, and perceptions of academic organizational climate (open through closed). Table XVI shows that this relationship produced no significant difference with a t value of 1.27 (p = .205). Therefore, no significant
relationship exists between tolerance for work and academic organizational climate.

**Part 4.**--Part 4 of the research question concerns the relationship that exists between EWCS Factor 4, conservative security, and perceptions of academic organizational climate (open through closed). The data in Table XVI indicate that this relationship produced a $t$ value of 0.37 ($p = .712$). This non-significant difference indicates that no significant relationship exists between conservative security and academic organizational climate.

**Part 5.**--Part 5 of the research question concerns the relationship that exists between EWCS Factor 5, willingness to secure reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty, and perceptions of academic organizational climate (open through closed). The data in Table XVI show a $t$ value of 1.28 ($p = .202$) for this relationship, which indicates that no significant relationship exists between willingness to secure reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty and academic organizational climate.

**Part 6.**--Part 6 of the research question concerns the relationship that exists between EWCS Factor 6, surround concern, and perceptions of academic organizational climate (open through closed). Table XVI shows a $t$ value of 2.62 ($p = .009$) for this relationship, which indicates
a significant difference at the .05 level. Therefore, a positive relationship exists between surround concern and academic organizational climate.

Summary of Data Findings

This study represents an initial endeavor to discover how Nigerian university lecturers feel about the climatic conditions of the organizations in which they work. It is a necessary step in the development of a meaningful understanding of human motivation, the concept of morale, and environmental factors that affect organizational performance in academic settings. These findings appear to be useful in furthering the understanding of the complexities associated with these phenomena.

The data were analyzed with reference to (1) the data-collecting instruments (Appendix H) and (2) the six parts of the research question. The findings that relate to this research are as follows.

OCDQ-HE Survey Instrument Data Findings

1. Of the 252 lecturers selected from the Nigerian universities, 41 perceive their academic organizational climate as being open, 21 perceive their academic organizational climate as being autonomous, 55 perceive a controlled climate, 47 perceive a familiar climate, 36 perceive
their climate as being paternal, and 52 perceive their academic organizational climate as closed.

2. After collapsing the six climates into two major climates, open and closed, 117 lecturers appear to perceive the academic organizational climate as open (open, autonomous, or controlled) and 135 lecturers appear to perceive the academic organizational climate to be closed (familiar, paternal, or closed), although the difference is not statistically significant.

EWCS Survey Instrument Data Findings
1. The data on all six factors of the EWCS reveal a similarity in the mean scores of lecturers regardless of how they perceive the academic organizational climate.

2. The highest mean scores achieved by lecturers are for EWCS Factors 1, potential for personal challenge and development, and 6, surround concern. Next highest are the scores for Factors 2, competitiveness desirability and reward of success, and 3, tolerance for work pressure. The lecturers scored lowest on Factors 4, conservative security, and 5, willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty.

3. In determining relationships between the work motivational factors and lecturers' perceptions of academic organizational climate, no statistically significant differences appear for the following five motivation to work
factors among the responses of lecturers who are classified according to their perceptions of academic organizational climates.

**EWCS Factor 1.** --The desirability of a job that provides opportunity for creativity and responsibility and that stresses individual ability.

**EWCS Factor 2.** --Whether an individual seeks job situations where the salary is determined by merit, the competition is strong, and accomplishment is emphasized.

**EWCS Factor 3.** --Attitudes toward job situations in which work loads may be extreme or excessive.

**EWCS Factor 4.** --A desire for security that includes well-defined guidelines for promotions and job routines.

**EWCS Factor 5.** --A willingness to perform interesting work despite the fact that the job might be a temporary one.

4. Considering the direction and magnitude of the difference between groups, a statistically significant relationship exists between EWCS Factor 6, the individual's concern with physical surroundings and the general aspects of the job, and the lecturers' perceptions of academic organizational climate.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter is composed of a summary of the purposes, methodology, and procedures of the study, followed by a presentation of the data findings as they pertain to the data-collecting instrument and research questions. Based on the findings, conclusions and implications are drawn, and recommendations for future research are submitted.

Summary

The problem with which this study is concerned is determining the relationship that exists between Nigerian lecturers' work motivation and their perceptions of their academic organizational climates. The methods and procedures utilized in the study were designed to accomplish the purposes of the study: (1) to determine Nigerian university lecturers' perceptions of the academic organizational climate in which they work, (2) to determine Nigerian university lecturers' work motivation, (3) to determine the relationship between work motivation and
perceived organizational climates, and (4) to discuss the results of the foregoing in terms of actual and potential significance for job performance, faculty morale, and academic organizational climate in Nigerian universities.

Two sets of questionnaires were utilized in collecting data for this study. The instruments are the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the Educational Work Components Study (EWCS). Both instruments were administered to 300 randomly selected lecturers from three of the six oldest universities in Nigeria: the University of Lagos, the University of Ife, and Ahmadu Bello University. Usable questionnaires concerning the lecturers' work motivation and perceptions of their organizational climate were returned by 252 (84 per cent) of the respondents.

Using the data obtained from the OCDQ questionnaire, lecturers were classified and categorized according to their perceptions of climates in academic organizations. Data obtained from the EWCS instrument also determined lecturers' perceptions regarding motivation to work.

Data analyses were both descriptive and inferential. Previously developed formulas and prototypic climate profiles were employed to determine and identify academic organizational climate. A t-test procedure was employed to determine differences, at the .05 level of significance,
in the way that lecturers perceive their academic organizational climates and the factors that motivate them to work.

Summary of Data Findings

This study represents an initial endeavor to discover how Nigerian university lecturers feel about the climatic conditions of the organizations in which they work. It is a necessary step in the development of a meaningful understanding of human motivation, the concept of morale, and environmental factors that affect organizational performance in academic settings. These findings appear to be useful in furthering the understanding of the complexities associated with these phenomena.

The data were analyzed with reference to (1) the data-collecting instruments (Appendix H) and (2) the six parts of the research question. The findings that relate to this research are as follows.

**OCDQ-HE Survey Instrument Data Findings**

1. Of the 252 lecturers responding from the Nigerian universities, 41 perceive their academic organizational climate as being open, 21 perceive their academic organizational climate as being autonomous, 55 perceive a controlled climate, 47 perceive a familiar climate, 36 perceive
their climate as being paternal, and 52 perceive their academic organizational climate as closed.

2. After collapsing the six climates into two major climates, open and closed, 117 lecturers appear to perceive the academic organizational climate as open (open, autonomous, or controlled) and 135 lecturers appear to perceive the academic organizational climate to be closed (familiar, paternal, or closed), although the difference is not statistically significant.

**EWCS Survey Instrument Data Findings**

1. The data on all six factors of the EWCS reveal a similarity in the mean scores of lecturers regardless of how they perceive the academic organizational climate.

2. The highest mean scores achieved by lecturers are for EWCS Factors 1, potential for personal challenge and development, and 6, surround concern. Next highest are the scores for Factors 2, competitiveness desirability and reward of success, and 3, tolerance for work pressure. The lecturers scored lowest on Factors 4, conservative security, and 5, willingness to seek reward in spite of uncertainty versus avoidance of uncertainty.

3. In determining relationships between the work motivational factors and lecturers' perceptions of academic organizational climate, no statistically significant differences appear for the following five motivation to work
factors among the responses of lecturers who are classified according to their perceptions of academic organizational climates.

**EWCS Factor 1.**--The desirability of a job that provides opportunity for creativity and responsibility and that stresses individual ability.

**EWCS Factor 2.**--Whether an individual seeks job situations where the salary is determined by merit, the competition is strong, and accomplishment is emphasized.

**EWCS Factor 3.**--Attitudes toward job situations in which work loads may be extreme or excessive.

**EWCS Factor 4.**--A desire for security that includes well-defined guidelines for promotions and job routines.

**EWCS Factor 5.**--A willingness to perform interesting work despite the fact that the job might be a temporary one.

4. Considering the direction and magnitude of the difference between groups, a statistically significant relationship exists between EWCS Factor 6, the individual's concern with physical surroundings and the general aspects of the job, and the lecturers' perceptions of academic organizational climate.

Conclusions

From the analyses of the data, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.
1. Based upon responses from this study, it is difficult to determine a discernible pattern in the academic organizational climate of Nigerian universities.

2. The way in which respondents view their academic organizational climate (open or closed) appears to be unaffected by intrinsic work motivation factors (opportunities for creativity, responsibility, competition, and accomplishment; excessive or temporary work loads).

3. The way in which respondents view their academic organizational climate (open or closed) appears to be affected by extrinsic work motivation factors (physical surroundings and working conditions).

4. It appears that the organizational climate of Nigerian universities is not conducive to rewarding the individual meritorious accomplishments of their lecturers.

Implications

The following implications may be drawn from the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. A closed organizational climate that does not recognize or reward individual meritorious contributions can be responsible for the absence of individual work motivation. When intrinsic rewards are withheld as a result of a rigid organizational structure (wherein, possibly, promotion and salary increases are based on
seniority or political influence), the factors that motivate one to excel are diminished.

2. The results of this study, which indicate that lecturers' perceptions of their academic organizational climates tend toward the closed end of the organizational climate continuum, suggest average institutional morale. To reinforce optimal job performance, good morale must be cultivated and rewarded in academic organizations, as it is in other group enterprises. The key persons in the initiation of morale-building in academic organizations are heads of departments. They not only must understand the desires of their faculty members, they must also recognize the factors that bear on their morale and motivate them to work.

3. Department heads might be encouraged to attend management seminars and workshops in order to familiarize themselves with the latest personnel management techniques. In an open, healthy organizational climate, when a sound new method of employee relations is introduced, it is possible for openness to correlate with effective job performance. Healthy, open organizational dynamics make a contributing impact because they facilitate the processes of the organization, not necessarily its products. Although openness as such may not make a poor program effective, department heads of academic organizations should be cognizant of these research findings.
4. Attractive salaries and physical working conditions as well as adequate work facilities could be significant factors in a job change situation for Nigerian lecturers.

5. The review of the literature for this study indicates that other researchers conclude that an open organizational climate is more desirable than a closed one. Their arguments are corroborated by the findings of numerous investigators on educational and organizational climate as well as teacher job satisfaction. The results of this study suggest that efforts should be made by Nigerian university authorities to give adequate consideration to improving motivation to work through the establishment of a more open organizational climate.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon the findings, conclusions, and implications of this research, the following recommendations for future study are proposed.

1. Since this study found that a significant relationship exists between concern with physical surroundings and lecturers' perceptions of the academic organizational climate, a follow-up of this study should be conducted utilizing a different statistical analysis to determine the precise relationship of the individual's concern with
the general aspects of a job to perceptions of academic organizational climate.

2. Further investigations should be made regarding whether lecturers' levels of motivation to work will be higher or lower in academic organizations that have tendencies toward both open and closed climates.

3. In view of the increasing number of newly-established universities in Nigeria, organizational climate studies should be extended to other universities. This will result in a national comparison of lecturers' motivations to work and their perceptions of academic organizational climate and unrestricted generalizations of findings to other universities in Nigeria.

4. Additional research should be conducted using demographic data such as sex, age, professional rank, years of experience, and nationality as variables to determine their effect on both lecturers' motivation to work and their perceptions of organizational climate.
APPENDIX A

LOCATION OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES UNDER STUDY
The places named in black type are the seats of the university institutions numbered above.

* The name is now Bayero University, Kano.
DESCRIPTION OF THE EIGHT SUBTESTS OF THE
OCDQ AS USED IN THIS STUDY*

1. Behavior of Lecturers

A. **Disengagement** refers to the lecturers' tendency to be "not with it." This dimension describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand. This subtest focuses upon the lecturers' behavior in a task-oriented situation.

B. **Mandrance** refers to the lecturers' feeling that the department head burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the lecturers construe as unnecessary busy work. The lecturers perceive that the department head is hindering rather than facilitating their work.

C. **Esprit** refers to "morale." The lecturers feel that their social needs are being satisfied and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.

D. **Intimacy** refers to the lecturers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other. This dimension describes a social needs satisfaction which is not necessarily associated with task accomplishment.

2. Behavior of Department Head

E. **Aloofness** refers to behavior by the department head which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than deal with the lecturers in an informal, face-to-face situation. His behavior, in brief, is universalistic rather than particularistic, nomothetic rather than idiosyncratic. To maintain this style, he keeps himself— at least "emotionally"— at a distance from his staff.

F. **Production emphasis** refers to behavior by the department head which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and plays the role of a "stew boss." His communication tends to go in only one direction, and he is not sensitive to feedback from the staff.

G. **Thrust** refers to behavior by the department head which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization." "Thrust"
behavior is marked not by close supervision but by the department head's attempt to motivate the lecturers through the example which he professionally sets. Apparently, because he does not ask the lecturers to give of themselves any more than he willingly gives of himself, his behavior, although starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the lecturers.

H. Consideration refers to behavior by the department head which is characterized by an inclination to treat the lecturers "humanly," to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms.
APPENDIX C

THE SIX CATEGORIES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
DESCRIPTION OF SIX CATEGORIES OF
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE*

1. **Open climate**—High esprit; group works well together; not burdened by busy work; leader facilitates task accomplishments. Group friendly to each other but not intimate. Considerable job satisfaction and pride in organization. Leader viewed as genuine; works hard himself and is considerate of others. Personal flexibility and integrity, not aloof, low emphasis on production but work gets done.

2. **Autonomous climate**—Almost complete freedom given to group to provide their own structures. High esprit and intimacy, work well together, and achieve goals. Not hindered by leader but leader remains aloof, little production emphasis, and only moderately considerate. Leader provides thrust and is flexible but mainly allows the group to run the show.

3. **Controlled climate**—Marked by a press for achievement at the expense of social needs satisfaction. Group works hard, engaged in tasks, and follows the prescribed

routine. They have much to do and do not have much social involvement with others. Social isolation is common. The leader is dominating and directive, somewhat aloof and dogmatic. Overall esprit is not bad as all members have a sense of pride in getting things done.

4. **Familiar climate**—Conspicuously friendly manner of group and leader. Social needs satisfaction is extremely high with little being done toward goal achievement. Everyone is viewed as a big happy family with being nice as the only criterion of success. The leader is concerned with making things easy for everybody.

5. **Paternal climate**—Group does not work well together; leader does most of the work himself. Group does not enjoy friendly relationships with each other and members really do not care. The leader is the opposite of aloof, being involved with everything and taking on all responsibilities. He works hard but does not motivate the group to do likewise. The feeling is that "Daddy Knows Best." It appears that his consideration for others is a form of over-solicitousness to serve his own social needs rather than the group's.

6. **Closed climate**—Group members obtain little satisfaction in respect to task achievement or social needs. The group does not work well together, yet they are fairly friendly towards each other. The leader is detached from
the group and directs what is to happen. He is viewed as low in consideration and emphasizes production by expecting others to work hard without giving them the freedom to accomplish the task.
APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE WITH VICE-CHANCELLORS
OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES
March 11, 1981

The Head
Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos
Akoka, Yaba
Lagos, Nigeria

Dear Sir:

RE: Application for Field Trip to Nigeria

I am a member of the academic staff of the University of Lagos (Faculty of Business Administration) currently on training leave in the above-named university. Recently I successfully completed my comprehensive examinations, a major requirement for my PhD programme, leaving me with research examination requirements.

North Texas State University has a policy that encourages its international students to undertake research projects, particularly a trainee of my status, in their home countries. The members of my academic programme committee have also advised that I choose a research topic relevant to Nigerian situation. In view of these facts, I am humbly requesting your permission to come home as soon as possible for my study.

I have had prior formal discussions in writing with both you and the Dean of my Faculty concerning the above subject matter. Consequently, the Dean of my Faculty, Professor U. G. Damachi, requested that I forward the following:

1. A detailed statement of my research proposal, including research instrument (i.e., questionnaires, etc.); and

2. A letter from my supervisor to justify the trip.

These requirements have been fulfilled.

For ease of reference, kindly note the proposed research topic over-leaf.

Research Topic

"A Study of Lecturers' Attitudes Concerning Factors of Motivation to Work in Terms of Their Perceptions of Academic Organizational Climate in Three Selected Universities in Nigeria"
I wish to express with great concern that at this point in time, I cannot proceed further with my research proposal beyond its present stage until approval for my field trip to Nigeria is secured.

Respectively submitted and anxiously waiting to hear from you.

Yours sincerely,

Michael A. Aluko
Lecturer I/Doctoral Candidate in Organization and Management Theory
PO Box 12757 NT Station
Denton, Texas 76203
United States

enclosures

cc: The Dean, Faculty of Business Administration
The Vice-Chancellor, University of Lagos

APPROVED:

Head, Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos

Dean, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Lagos

Vice-Chancellor, University of Lagos
The Vice-Chancellor
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria, Kaduna State
Nigeria WA

Dear Sir:

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A
CAMPUS STUDY

I am a Nigerian faculty member of the Department of
Business Administration, University of Lagos, Lagos-Nigeria
and a doctoral candidate pursuing an interdisciplinary program
of study that involves Business Administration, Higher Education
Administration, and related areas at North Texas State University.

My dissertation study concerns factors that appear to
influence the performance of lecturers in universities in
Nigeria.

I am requesting permission to administer a research
questionnaire to faculty members, excluding department heads,
randomly selected from nine academic faculties in your university.
The total study will be conducted in three randomly selected
universities in Nigeria.

The resulting data from the questionnaire will be used
for this study and will be kept confidential. No individual
or university will be identified.

My field trip to Nigeria is scheduled for early October. Therefore, an early favourable response to my request is necessary.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Aluko
Lecturer Grade I/Doctoral Candidate

Endorsed by:

Dwane Kingery, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Director of the Center
for Higher Education
J.C. Matthews Chair
of Higher Education

C.L. Littlefield
Distinguished Professor of
Business Administration
The Vice-Chancellor  
University of Ife  
Ile-Ife, Oyo State  
Nigeria WA

Dear Sir:

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A CAMPUS STUDY

I am a Nigerian faculty member of the Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Lagos-Nigeria and a doctoral candidate pursuing an interdisciplinary program of study that involves Business Administration, Higher Education Administration, and related areas at North Texas State University.

My dissertation study concerns factors that appear to influence the performance of lecturers in universities in Nigeria.

I am requesting permission to administer a research questionnaire to faculty members, excluding department heads, randomly selected from nine academic faculties in your university. The total study will be conducted in three randomly selected universities in Nigeria.

The resulting data from the questionnaire will be used for this study and will be kept confidential. No individual or university will be identified.

My field trip to Nigeria is scheduled for early October. Therefore, an early favourable response to my request is necessary.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Aluko  
Lecturer Grade I/Doctoral Candidate

Endorsed by:

Dwane Kingery  
Professor of Education  
Director of the Center for Higher Education  
J.C. Matthews Chair of Higher Education

C.L. Littlefield  
Distinguished Professor of Business Administration
APPENDIX E

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY
Dear Mr. Aluko,

Field Trip to Nigeria

Thank you for your letter of 28th October, 1980 on the above subject matter. Although you claimed to have sent some information on your application, we have not been able to trace such. You may therefore wish to send us:

(a) a detailed statement of your research proposal including any research instruments i.e. questionnaires, etc.;

(b) a letter from your supervisor to justify the trip.

It should be noted, however, that this request does not indicate an approval in principle.

The University is becoming increasingly reluctant and unable to finance field trips for members of staff on training leave abroad. The feeling is that if a field trip is so necessary, members of staff should be encouraged to do their studies at home where the information they need is available.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

(U. G. DAMACHI)
Dean
Dear Mr. Aluko,

FIELD TRIP TO NIGERIA

Please refer to your letter dated 11th March, 1981 on the subject mentioned above.

In view of the good support from your Supervisor in U.S. and the support of our Dean of Business Administration, I have pleasure in informing you that the Vice Chancellor has approved a return Air Ticket (Denton-Lagos-Denton) for you to enable you undertake the Field Trip to Nigeria.

I am by a copy of this letter informing the Bursar of this approval and requesting him to send to you a return Air Ticket as approved above.

(I. O. AJIJOLA)
Ag. Registrar.
THE VICECHANCELLOR HAS GRANTED YOUR REQUEST TO CONDUCT A CAMPUSS STUDY IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR PhD PROGRAMME
PAGES ACTING REGISTRAR LAGOS UNIVERSITY

PO BOX 12757, TX 76263
Mr. Michael Aluko,
Lecturer in Management,
P.O. Box 12757,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76203,
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Aluko,

Request for Permission to Conduct a Study

The Registrar has referred your letter to the Vice-Chancellor on the above to this office. You will be permitted to conduct the survey indicated in your letter when you call at the University Campus. Please report to this office on your arrival so that necessary notice can be given to staff to facilitate your work.

Sincere regards,

Professor Omolade Adejuyigbe,
Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences.

cc. Registrar
Mr. Michael A. Aluko,
Lecturer in Management,
P. O. Box 12757,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76203,
U. S. A.

Dear Mr. Aluko,

Request for Permission to Conduct a Campus Survey

Further to our letter to you Reference No. RC.141/Vol.VII/29 of 26th October, 1981 on the above subject, I am pleased to inform you that both our Faculties of Administration and Social Sciences have confirmed their willingness to permit you to carry out the study you envisaged.

A copy of a direct communication dated 13th November, 1981 addressed to you from the Dean of our Faculty of Social Sciences conveying this approval is attached hereto for your use.

With best wishes for Christmas and the New Year.

Yours sincerely,

W. A. Ladipo (Mrs.),
Senior Assistant Registrar,
Registrar's Office.
31st December, 1981

Mr. Michael A. Aluko,
Lecturer in Management,
P. O. Box 12757,
North Texas State University,
Denton, Texas 76203,
U. S. A.

Dear Mr. Aluko,

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT A CAMPUS STUDY

Thank you for your letter dated 23rd November, 1981 on the above subject.

I am pleased to inform you that both our Faculties of Administration and Social Sciences have confirmed their willingness to permit you to carry out the study you envisaged. This information had earlier on been communicated to you in letters dated 13th November, 1981 from the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and another dated 23rd December, 1981 from this Office. I trust you must have received the letters by now.

I return herewith the two documents attached to your letter as requested.

With best wishes for a prosperous New Year.

Yours sincerely,

W. A. Ladipo (Mrs.),
Senior Assistant Registrar,
Registrar's Office.
Mr. Michael A. Aluko,
C/o Dr. Alisha C. Aluko,
Department of Industrial Design,
A.B.U. Zaria.

Dear Mr. Aluko,

Request for Permission to Conduct a Campus Study

Please refer to your letter of 9th September 1981. I wish to inform you that you have the Vice-Chancellor's permission to conduct a Campus study of A.B.U. in connection with your Ph.D. programme. We would like a copy of your study to be deposited in this office.

Yours sincerely,

Musa B. Gaizama
for Vice-Chancellor

cc: Ag. Registrar
Mr. Michael A. Aluko,
(Senior Lecturer in Management,)
North Texas State University,
P. O. Box 12757,
Denton,
Texas 76203,
U. S. A.

Dear Mr. Aluko,

Request for Permission to Conduct a Campus Study
at the University of Ife

Thank you for your letter dated 22nd February, 1982
which has just been received. Incidentally, Mrs W. A. Ladipo
has been redeployed out of the Registrar's Office and I am at
present covering her schedule.

I would like to say that we were very pleased to have
contributed our little quota to the success of your programme
while on your visit to this University.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

M. O. Akinbowo
for Senior Assistant Registrar.
APPENDIX F

REQUESTS FOR PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Gentlemen:

I am interested in obtaining permission to use The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - HE by Dr. Serge Andrew Borovik, as appears in the Eric Reports, Document ED 070 427 and HE 003 759 dated September 1972.

I am currently involved in research on a doctoral dissertation at the above named University. I would like to use the scale - OCDQ-HE - to measure the perception of the type of current organizational climate in which my research subjects work. This document is Dr. Borovik's Dissertation which was sponsored by your Education Department in 1972.

Your prompt attention to my humble request will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Michael A. Aluko

The cited document may be reproduced without restrictions, since it was federally funded. See attached guidelines.

Frank Bryars
Technical Informantio Specialist
National Institute of Eduvation
Washington, DC 20208
Documents are placed in ERIC at one of three different levels depending upon the restriction to which the document is subject. If there is no restriction (i.e., if the document may be placed in the public domain) the document is entered in ERIC at level I. Such documents are available in both microfiche and paper copies. These are usually, but not always, documents which are generated with Federal funds. Anyone may duplicate these documents.

It is possible, but not usual, for a level I document to be copyrighted. That occurs when the author (or the publisher) is entitled to have copyright but is still willing to permit ERIC input at level I. These documents are usually, but not always, generated at private (i.e., non-Federal) expense. These documents may be duplicated only in accordance with the scope of permission which is printed on the document or, if none is on the document, by the specific permission of the author (or publisher). Sometimes the legend printed on the document will permit duplication by components of the ERIC system and by ERIC "users." It is not absolutely clear who would be encompassed by ERIC "users." I assume it would include almost anyone who is duplicating a limited number of copies for a non-profit purpose.

Level II documents are available only in microfiche. Almost all of them would be copyrighted. The same permission rules would apply here as do for copyrighted level I documents.

Level III documents are cited and abstracted in Resources in Education but are not available from ERIC. They are almost always copyrighted and one would have to obtain copies from the source.

A copyrighted document published prior to January 1, 1978 must bear a copyright notice (e.g., copyright ©, 1976 by John Doe). One published on or after that date may not carry a copyright notice. However, unless it does bear a copyright notice or else a permission legend it can be assumed to be in the public domain.

Source: Letter 6/2/79
Bachrach
Dr. Berge Andrew Borrevik, Jr.
School of Health, Physical Education
and Recreation
Oregon University
Eugene, Oregon

Dear Dr. Borrevik:

I am a member of the academic staff of the University of Lagos, Nigeria currently a doctoral candidate in the above University. Right now I am involved in a research on my doctoral dissertation. The topic of the dissertation concerns work motivation and perceptions of academic organizational climate in Nigeria.

The survey instrument I proposed to use in this study is the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - HE which you constructed in 1972.

I wish to obtain your written permission to use the OCDQ-HE instrument to measure the perceptions of the type of current organizational climate in which my research subjects (Nigerian University Lecturers) work.

I should be grateful if you would kindly respond promptly to this my humble requests.

Yours sincerely,

Michael A. Aliuko
Dr. Berge A. Borrevik, Jr.
N. 10727 Elma Drive
Spokane, WA 99213

Dear Dr. Borrevik:

For several months, I have engaged in an extensive search to locate your current address. Not until three days ago I succeeded in my venture. Thanks to the Chairman of your former Department of Physical Education and Recreation at Eugene who, at last, put me through.

I am an academic staff member of the University of Lagos in Nigeria currently attending North Texas State University to earn a doctoral degree in College Teaching with concentration in Management and Organizational Theory.

I am interested in obtaining a written permission to use the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-HE which you constructed in 1972. This scale is required to measure the organizational climate perceptions of my research subjects in Nigeria. Currently I am involved in a doctoral dissertation with the topic, "Work Motivation and Perception of Organizational Climate: A Nigerian Study."

Your prompt attention to my request will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Michael A. Ajala
Lecturer I/Doctoral Candidate in Mgmt. & Organizational Theory

Encl.
Dr. Berge A. Borrevik, Jr.
New York Life Insurance Company
And Annuity Corporation
West 818 Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201

Dear Dr. Borrevik:

It was recently I knew your current address as shown above. I have written some letters to you pertaining to the use of your instrument, Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-HE which you developed in 1972.

Kindly find the enclosed letters written for the same purpose in the months of September and October 1981.

I should be grateful if you would respond to the letters at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Michael A. Aluko
Dr. Cecil Miskel
The University of Kansas
225 Strong Hall
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Dear Dr. Miskel:

You can hardly imagine how badly I felt after exhaustively searching for your mailing address without any hope of success. Recently, however, with persistent efforts to succeed in my search, I luckily came across the above address.

I am an academic staff member of the Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Nigeria, and currently a doctoral candidate in the above named University. I am involved in research on my doctoral dissertation, the topic of which concerns Work Motivation and Perceptions of Academic Organizational Climate in Nigeria. My study, apparently a pioneering project, attempts to replicate research in academic organizational environment, an exercise similar to the type which is primarily conducted in industrial and manufacturing organizations.

I would like to use, with your written permission, the Educational Work Outcome Study (EWS) to measure what my research subjects, Nigerian University Lecturers might consider to be their desired factors of motivation to work.

In view of inevitable time pressure on me to return to my work in Nigeria, I would greatly appreciate your prompt attention to my request.

Sincerely yours,

Michael A. Aluko
Lecturer I/Doctoral Candidate in
Organization and Management Theory
APPENDIX G

PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
Mr. Michael A. Aluko  
P.O. Box 12757  
North Texas State University  
Denton, TX 76203  

Dear Mr. Aluko:  

Thank you for your letter of September 7, 1982. Concerning your using the Educational Work Components Study, you can use the test in any way, providing you do not change or adapt it without contacting the author.  

I hope this information is helpful. Do not hesitate to contact the Test Collection if we can assist you further.  

Sincerely,  

Mary Ann Kirkendoll  
Test Collection Assistant  
Test Collection  

/mak
October 1, 1982

Mr. Michael A. Aluko
Lecturer I and Doctoral Candidate
Organization and Management
PO Box 12757
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203

Dear Mr. Aluko:

By means of this letter, I hereby give permission for you to use the Educational Work Components Study (EWCS) in your research study.

Sincerely,

Cecil G. Miskel
Professor and Chair

CGM:jg
October 4, 1982

Michael A. Aluko
P.O. Box 12757
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203

Dear Michael:

I welcome the use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-HE.

I wish you my best in your use of the OCDQ-HE.

With warm regards,

Berge A. Borrevik

BAB/iah
enc.
APPENDIX H

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
EDUCATIONAL WORK COMPONENTS STUDY (EWCS)

THE JOB

Instructions: Given below are a series of questions on things people want in jobs. However, people differ greatly in the things they want in a job, and jobs differ greatly, even within the same university. This form is designed to gather information about things you consider desirable in a job in the university environment. Respond to each of the items as follows:

How desirable would you consider each of the following items in a job for you? A job in which......

desirable, would favor the job undesirable, would favor the job greatly

Write on the line preceding each statement the number that best describes your attitudes. For example, if you think the job would be extremely undesirable, you would write '1' on the short line preceding the statement, but if you think the job would be desirable, you would put a '4' in front of it. Give an answer to every item if even you have to guess.

A JOB IN WHICH...

1. I could get fired easily, but the work would be very interesting.
2. Salary increases would be strictly a matter of how much I accomplished for the university.
3. The lighting and the air conditioning would be good.
4. There would be opportunity for undertaking research projects.
5. The community would have good recreational facilities.
6. I would be involved in managing a small group of students undertaking routine field studies.
1. The faculty departments would be involved in heavy professional competition.

2. I could stay on the bar of my salary scale for several years.

3. There would be opportunity for creative work.

4. The university community would be controlled by external forceful rules and regulations.

5. I would take a sizeable raise in pay to get me retained on the present job.

6. The climate would be pleasant.

7. The community would be a wonderful place to raise a family.

8. The work might run out, but it would be extremely interesting while it lasted.

9. I would always have a chance to vocalize freely in matters pertaining to national progress.

10. The physical working conditions would be attractive.

11. I could get fired easily.

12. The work might build up pressures on me.

13. The ventilation would be modern.

14. I could stay on the job for more than three years before my appointment could be confirmed.

15. There would be emphasis on individual ability.

16. The department would encourage further specialized work.

17. Promotions would come automatically.

18. Competition would be open and encouraged.

19. I would have a chance to further my formal education.

20. I could get fired easily, but the reward would be high.

21. The work might not attract high income, but highly respected in the community.

22. I would always have a chance to learn something new by way of attending periodic learned conferences.

23. The job would be insecure by governmental regulations pertaining to the practice of my profession outside the university campus.
30. I would take up a job that permits publish or perish.
31. The work might come in big pushes sometimes.
32. There would be emphasis on the actual production record.
33. I might be on call when there is pressure to get jobs done.
34. Salary increases would be a matter of how much effort you put in.
35. Rewards might be high, but if one loses one's job it would be very difficult to get another one.
36. There would be emphasis on originality.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Instructions: Following are 50 statements descriptive of academic departments in colleges and universities. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes or occurs in your department by circling the letter which represents the appropriate response at the left of each statement.

Key:  
A - Almost always occurs  
B - Frequently occurs  
C - Approximately equal in occurrence and non-occurrence  
D - Infrequently occurs  
E - Almost never occurs

Circle the response.

1. The Department Head puts the department's welfare above the welfare of any faculty member in it.

2. Academic departments communicate with one another.

3. Supplies for lecture aids are readily available for use of faculty members in lecture rooms.

4. Faculty start projects without trying to decide in advance how they will develop or where they may end.

5. There is a recognized group of student leaders within the department.

6. If a faculty member is not productive, he is not encouraged to remain.

7. There are funds available for faculty members research projects.

8. The Department Head has faculty members share in making decisions.

9. The Department Head displays tacts and humor.

10. Faculty members express concern about the "deadwood" in this department.
11. Available funds for research projects are easily obtainable.

12. The Department Head regards what faculty members do outside of the group as no concern to him.

13. Faculty members have access to publication outlets.

14. There is a great deal of borrowing and sharing among the faculty.

15. The Department Head has everything going according to schedule.

16. The Department Head engages in friendly jokes and comments during department meetings.

17. The Department Head encourages the use of certain uniform procedures.

18. Faculty members talk about leaving the University.

19. Faculty members socialize together in small select groups.

20. Faculty members are afraid to express extreme or unpopular view points on campus.

21. Faculty members seem to thrive on difficulty—the tougher things get, the harder they work.

22. Articles published by faculty members in local Journals are usually acceptable for promotions.

23. Tensions emanating from governmental rules and regulations interfere with departmental activities.

24. Close friendships are found among the department faculty.

25. The Department Head is friendly and approachable.

26. The Department Head finds time to listen to faculty members.

27. The Department Head accepts change in departmental policy.

28. The university accepts faculty members' recommendations in matters affecting their conditions of service.
29. Receptions, teas, or formal dances are well attended by faculty members.

30. The morale of the faculty members is high.

31. The department works as a committee of the whole.

32. There are periodic informal social gatherings.

33. There are opportunities within the department for faculty members to get together in extra-curricular activities.

34. The Department Head changes his approach to meet new situations.

35. The important people in the university community expect others to show respect for them.

36. Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices.

37. Older faculty control the development of departmental policy.

38. Faculty members express the same kind of attitudes, opinions and beliefs about things that affect their work.

39. The Department Head maintains definite standards of performance.

40. Actions are unanimous among faculty members on matters affecting their social welfare.

41. When students do not like an administrative decision, they really work to get it changed.

42. The Department Head uses constructive criticism.

43. The Department Head delegates the responsibility for departmental functions among the faculty.

44. New jokes and gags get around the department in a hurry.

45. Faculty members approach their problems scientifically and objectively.

46. Faculty members talk to each other about their personal lives.

47. The faculty uses parliamentary procedures in their meetings.
48. The Department Head treats all faculty members as equal.

49. The Department is thought of as being friendly.

50. Faculty members in this department use mannerisms which are annoying.
SEX:  
___ Male  
___ Female  

AGE:  
___ 20 years or under  
___ 21-30 years  
___ 31-40 years  
___ 41-50 years  
___ 51-60 years  
___ 60 and over  

FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION  
___ Business Administration  
   (all branches)  
___ Environmental Design  
   (all branches)  
___ Engineering (all branches)  
___ Education (all branches)  
___ Social Sciences  
   (all branches)  
___ Arts and Sciences  
___ Law (all branches)  
___ Other (specify)  

HIGHEST QUALIFICATION  
___ Bachelor degree  
___ Master degree  
___ Doctoral degree  
___ Other (specify)  

PROFESSIONAL RANK  
___ Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow  
___ Lecturer I/Research Fellow I  
___ Lecturer II/Research Fellow II  
___ Assistant Lecturer/Research Assistant  
___ Other (specify)  

WHERE HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED  
___ Nigeria  
___ Africa (specify)  
___ United States  
___ Western Europe  
___ Other (specify)  

NATIONALITY  
___ Nigerian  
___ Non-Nigerian  

TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN THIS UNIVERSITY  
___ 1 year or less  
___ 2-5 years  
___ 6-10 years  
___ 11 years and over  

APPOINTMENT CONFIRMED:  
___ Yes  
___ No
APPENDIX I

COVERING LETTERS FOR SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
Dear Faculty Member:

I am an academic staff member of the Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, and currently a doctoral candidate in the above-named university. My area of interest focuses on work motivation and perception of academic organisational climate in Nigeria. My study is also an attempt to replicate research in organizational environment which has, in the past, been conducted primarily in industrial and manufacturing organisations.

In Nigeria, there is evidence of continued exodus of highly qualified lecturers from the academic environment to industrial organizations because they are progressively becoming disillusioned with academic organizations. It is proper to assume that the highest motivation to work is present when the job characteristics one desires and the perceived organizational climate match each other. In order to retain these threatened lecturers and make them more productive, it appears that they need to be highly motivated.

You and 299 other randomly-selected Nigerian university lecturers are being asked to participate in this study. The attached questionnaire is intended to obtain information regarding what you consider to be your desired factors of motivation to work.

Please answer the questions as truthfully as possible. Be assured that your responses to the questions will remain absolutely confidential.

In order to complete this study on schedule, it is desirable that you return the completed questionnaire to your Faculty Officer as soon as possible, but prior to January 20, 1982. Please use the enclosed self-addressed envelope for your reply.

Thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to answer this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Ako, AIA, M, AMN, ANN
Doctoral Candidate/Lecturer in Management

Enc.

P.S.
Dear Faculty Member:

I am an academic staff member of the Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, and currently a doctoral candidate in the above-named university. My area of interest focuses on work motivation and perception of academic organizational climate in Nigeria. My study is also an attempt to replicate research in organizational environment which has, in the past, been conducted primarily in industrial and manufacturing organizations.

In Nigeria, there is evidence of continued exodus of highly qualified lecturers from the academic environment to industrial organizations because they are progressively becoming disillusioned with academic organizations. It is proper to assume that the highest motivation to work is present when the job characteristics one desires and the perceived organizational climate match each other. In order to retain these threatened lecturers and make them more productive, it appears that they need to be highly motivated.

You and 299 other randomly-selected Nigerian university lecturers are being asked to participate in this study. The attached questionnaire is intended to obtain information regarding your current perception of the type of organizational climate in which you work.

Please answer the questions as truthfully as possible. Be assured that your responses to the questions will remain absolutely confidential.

In order to complete this study on schedule, it is desirable that you return the completed questionnaire to your Faculty Officer as soon as possible, but prior to January 30, 1982. Please use the enclosed self-addressed envelope for your reply.

Thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to answer this questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Aluko, AMA, AM, AMRA, AMN
Doctoral Candidate/Lecturer in Management
APPENDIX J

EXPLANATIONS OF DATA TECHNIQUES USED
WITH SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
PROCEDURES FOR COLLAPSING CLIMATES*

If fewer than thirty respondents are classified in any climate category, the following combinations will be used in order to secure a minimum of thirty respondents.

A. Three major categories
   1. Composed of the first two (Open and Autonomous) relatively open climates.
   2. Composed of the third and fourth climates (Controlled and Familiar), each of which stresses only one of the two major organizational requirements (group maintenance or task accomplishment).
   3. Composed of the fifth and sixth climates (Paternal and Closed), both of which are closed.

or

B. Two major categories
   1. Composed of the first three climates (Open, Autonomous, and Controlled), which tend toward being open.
   2. Composed of the last three climates (Familiar, Paternal, and Closed), which tend toward being closed.

### Prototypic Climates of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCDQ Subtests</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C**</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = open climate, A = autonomous climate, C** = controlled climate, F = familiar climate, P = paternal climate, C = closed climate.
ITEMS COMPOSING THE SIX SUBSCALES OF THE EWCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPCD</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>TWP</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>WSP</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEMS COMPOSING THE EIGHT SUBTESTS
OF THE OCDQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scored inversely.
APPENDIX K

SALARY GRADE LEVEL SYSTEMS
ADJUSTED SALARY SCALE (1979)

Following the decision of the Federal Military Government on the abolition of vehicle basic allowances in both the Public and Private Sectors, the following salary scales have been approved with effect from 1st April, 1979 for the Public Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
<th>Step 6</th>
<th>Step 7</th>
<th>Incremental Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>+ 24/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>+ 36/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>+ 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>+ 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>2526</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>+ 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>2832</td>
<td>2952</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>3312</td>
<td>3432</td>
<td>3552</td>
<td>+ 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>3564</td>
<td>3714</td>
<td>3864</td>
<td>4014</td>
<td>4164</td>
<td>4314</td>
<td>4464</td>
<td>+ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>4668</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>4992</td>
<td>5154</td>
<td>5316</td>
<td>5478</td>
<td>5640</td>
<td>+ 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5760</td>
<td>5922</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>6246</td>
<td>6408</td>
<td>6570</td>
<td>6732</td>
<td>+ 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6764</td>
<td>6924</td>
<td>7084</td>
<td>7244</td>
<td>7404</td>
<td>7564</td>
<td>7724</td>
<td>+ 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7404</td>
<td>7620</td>
<td>7836</td>
<td>8052</td>
<td>8268</td>
<td>8484</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>+ 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8064</td>
<td>8384</td>
<td>8704</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td>9344</td>
<td>9664</td>
<td>9984</td>
<td>+ 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9168</td>
<td>9488</td>
<td>9808</td>
<td>10128</td>
<td>10448</td>
<td>10768</td>
<td>11088</td>
<td>+ 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10296</td>
<td>10512</td>
<td>10812</td>
<td>11112</td>
<td>11412</td>
<td>11712</td>
<td>12012</td>
<td>+ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11568</td>
<td>11814</td>
<td>12064</td>
<td>12314</td>
<td>12564</td>
<td>12814</td>
<td>13064</td>
<td>+ 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12996</td>
<td>13332</td>
<td>13672</td>
<td>13912</td>
<td>14152</td>
<td>14392</td>
<td>14632</td>
<td>+ 360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**

Professor: Grade Level 16 (₦ 11,568 x 576 - ₦ 12,720)
Reader: Grade Level 15 (₦ 10,296 x 516 - ₦ 11,328)
Senior Lecturer: Grade Level 13 (₦ 8,064 x 320 - ₦ 9,024)
Lecturer Grade I: Grade Level 12 (₦ 7,404 x 216 - ₦ 8,052)
Lecturer Grade II: Grade Level 10 (₦ 5,760 x 162 - ₦ 6,732)
Assistant Lecturer: Grade Level 09 (₦ 4,668 x 162 - ₦ 5,640)
Graduate Assistant: Grade Level 08 (₦ 3,564 x 150 - ₦ 4,464)
### Figure 11

**Commission's Alternative C — and Some Adjusted Limits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Incremental Rate</th>
<th>Adjusted Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,776*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,908*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>2,424*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>3,084*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>3,912*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>4,848</td>
<td>5,016</td>
<td>5,016*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>5,496</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>6,216*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,346</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>6,912</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>7,296</td>
<td>7,488*</td>
<td>7,488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>7,632</td>
<td>7,832</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>8,252</td>
<td>8,464</td>
<td>8,688</td>
<td>8,688*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,148</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>8,628</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>9,114</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>9,612</td>
<td>9,612*</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>10,444</td>
<td>10,812</td>
<td>11,188</td>
<td>11,188*</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10,002</td>
<td>10,248</td>
<td>10,496</td>
<td>10,748</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,264</td>
<td>11,528</td>
<td>11,528*</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,364</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>11,664</td>
<td>11,816</td>
<td>12,072</td>
<td>12,328</td>
<td>12,584</td>
<td>12,584*</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,732</td>
<td>13,392</td>
<td>14,052</td>
<td>14,712</td>
<td>15,372</td>
<td>16,032</td>
<td>16,692</td>
<td>16,692*</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14,280</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,720</td>
<td>16,440</td>
<td>17,160</td>
<td>17,880</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>18,600*</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

Professor
Associate Professor
Senior Lecturer
Lecturer I/Research Fellow I
Lecturer II/Research Fellow II
Assistant Lecturer
Graduate Assistant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USS 15</th>
<th>(N 14,280 — N 15,720)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USS 14</td>
<td>(N 12,732 — N 13,572)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS 13(a)</td>
<td>(N 11,364 — N 14,820)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS 11</td>
<td>(N 9,000 — N 10,080)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS 09</td>
<td>(N 7,550 — N 8,040)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS 08</td>
<td>(N 6,336 — N 7,488)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USS 07</td>
<td>(N 6,336 — N 6,216)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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