

AN ANALYSIS OF JOB COMMITMENT AND INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES IN RELATION TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. S. I. Anumnu

Abstract

It is known that the development of any nation depends considerably on the quality of the products of its educational system. Similarly, it is acknowledged that the quality of these educational products depends on truly inspired and committed staff. This paper explores the job commitment and involvement of academic staff of Nigerian universities toward national development especially at a period when these category of staff are predisposed to being wary of mistreatment by their employers. Survey methodology was used to gather data by means of a questionnaire that measures academic staff extent of commitment and involvement in their jobs. Using a stratified random sampling technique, 303 academic staff from four Nigerian universities formed the sample for the study. A 25-item instrument titled; Employee Job Attitude Questionnaire (EJAQ) was used for data collection. The data were analysed using mean, standard deviation and analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical tools. The results indicated that academic staff in Nigerian universities did not differ in their levels of job commitment and involvement irrespective of differences in their age, gender and marital status. The study also reveals that job commitment of academic staff seemed to be related to their job status. Recommendation as to how to develop and maintain the teachers' job commitment and involvement towards national development were proffered.

Introduction

The Nigerian University education system sprang up out of the need for the development of high-level manpower to take over the challenge of nation building after independence. Being a citadel of knowledge, education and human resources development, the people hoped that the university education should produce the right types of manpower in sufficient quality for the transformation of the nation's structures and superstructures.

Flannery, Hofrichter and Plattern (1996) acknowledge that institutions or organizations (whatever their business strategy) are quickly coming to the realization that it is the performance of their "human assets" that make the difference between success and failure. The people who know a job best are those who do it and those people want to do good work if the institution allows them (Foy, 1997). According to Foy, most of these people spend at least eight hours a day more than their waking hours at work. He further states that these workers deserve the chance to do good work and organizations that want success simply find ways to let them. Goldthrope, Lockwood, Bechhofer and Platt (1970) agreed that the way workers define and give meaning to their work largely accounts for their attitudes and behaviours. Similarly, Drucker (1984) insists that the people in organization, their work orientation, feeling and behaviours have a lot to do with how well the institutions achieve their set goals.

There is no doubt that Nigeria needs literate and productive manpower to develop her tremendous natural resources. It is through sound education delivered by the teachers that such manpower would be developed. To fulfill all these, there is need to develop and maintain these teachers' job commitment and involvement on the job.

The Role of University Education Towards National Development

Acknowledging the enormous roles of university education in nation building, Aminu (as cited in Ejiogu, 1994) posit that the universities are places where profound research studies are conducted. It is the main pillar of modern society and load-bearing members of the main structures. Every citizen in developed, industrialized, urbanized societies depends on the performance of this

type of educational institution. Furthermore, university being the highest centre of learning all over the world is saddled with multifarious roles to be accomplished through teaching, research and development, information discovery and dissemination of knowledge and community services.

As the nation articulates it in her National Policy on Education (NPE), (1998: 32), the university is among the tertiary education whose goals are:

- Contribution to national development through high level relevant manpower training.
- Develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of the individual and society.
- Teaching, research dissemination of information and professional training.
- Acquire both physical and intellectual skills which will enable individuals to be self-reliant and useful members of the society, and
- Forge and cement national unity.

If one appreciates the fact that the university is to educate the society and also the fact that teachers in this type of institution constitute the foundation in any viable manpower development for other sectors of the economy, then one would be better placed to appreciate the role of academic staff in nation building. They are the ones that inculcate useful skills to students needed for the country's economic productivity. They hold the trust, for implementing curriculum of university education and are therefore at the centre of the educative process.

The fundamental role of university education in nation building therefore relies very heavily upon, satisfied, committed and involved academic staff among others. No matter how much machinery and equipment the university has, these things cannot be put into use until they are released and guided by employees who have the right attitudes and work behaviours. Developing a person's human potential is indeed very tasking and according to Ejiogu (1999), those who engage in this process of developing the human potential must be a rare species of homo-sapiens, entrusted with tasks of continuing the work of human creation, yet, most times these employees find themselves under the influence of social pressures from within and outside the world of work. Most of these pressures can be controlled while some others cannot. Whichever way, individual actions, reactions and even inaction have the potential of either facilitating or inhibiting organizational activities.

Perspectives on Commitment and Involvement

Current literature on commitment., (Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974; Steers, 1977; Meyer and Allen, 1997) view commitment largely as an employee attitude or, more specifically, a set of behavioural intentions, such as a desire to remain with the organization, an intention to exert high levels of effort on behalf of the organization, and an identification with the organization's goals. The antecedents of these intentions are basically positive work experiences, personal characteristics, and job characteristics. The outcomes of these intentions are increased performance, reduced absenteeism, and reduced turnover (Steers, 1977). As a positive outcome of the quality of work experience, the concept can be regarded as a factor contributing to subjective well being at work (Cook and Wall, 1970).

Marrow (1993) in her review, identifies five major targets of commitment: work itself, career, job, organization and union. Buchanan (1974) distinguishes three components of commitment:

Identification, Involvement and Loyalty. Identification is the pride in the organization; the internalization of the organization's goals and values; Involvement is the psychological absorption in the activities of one's role; Loyalty is affection for and attachment to the organization; a sense of belonging manifesting as 'a wish to stay'. To Stayer (1990), commitment reflects the extent to which an individual identifies with his or her organization. A committed person stays with the organization through thick and thin, puts in a full day and more, protects company assets, shares company's beliefs and goals (Meyer and Allen, 1997), is a happy employee and invests freely in achieving the desired outcome (Salancik, 1977). Consequently, teachers in the university possess positive or negative attitudes to the institutions, which in turn impact on their job performance.

Job Involvement

Job involvement is a measure of how much the employee identifies with or gives to the job. Lodahl and Kejner (1965), Kanungo (1982) define it as the extent to which an individual identifies with

his or her job. In other words, job involvement was treated as a component of the individual's self-image. Driscoll (1978) identified that a basic level of trust of the company and its motives to be an essential part of genuine involvement. Its operation takes the form of a "hygiene factor" in that its absence will prevent employee involvement and that a minimum level is required to enable involvement. Highly involved employees would consider their job a large part of their identity (Lawler 1986). Job involvement seems to be heightened by perceived support. An employee's belief that the organization values his or her work may encourage him/her to identify strongly with the workplace. Stayer (1990) stresses the importance of job involvement to improve results. According to him, employees would lack involvement because they have no stake in the organization and no power to take decisions or control their own work. A study by Cotton (1993) identified a major cause for employee involvement schemes to fail. According to Cotton, it was a lack of trust of the company. The extent of convergence between the goals of the worker and the goals of the organization has also been identified as a significant contributory factor to successful employee involvement (Tabb and Goldfarb, 1970; Vroom and Jago, 1988).

In respect of the above, one can rightly say that the academic staff of Nigerian universities have not been shown to possess a level of trust sufficient enough to support commitment and involvement. If the universities want improvement, academic staff job commitment and involvement should be increased. This is particularly important for the continued operation of the university system.

Relationship Between Commitment and Involvement

The relationship between commitment and involvement has two dimensions; one exists within the employee, while the other exists between the employer and employee. Within the employee, involvement is the natural action that stems from their commitment to particular ideals or corporation goals. The two coexist and appear to be actually supportive. They also share a common characteristic. Both are only given willingly. Employee involvement is a response to the organization's commitment to the same ideals and goals that employees are being asked to adopt. This employee involvement is a direct and possibly proportional, response to this commitment. Involvement is the active manifestation of commitment (Buchanan, 1972). In implementation terms, the commitment of the organization also has a major influence upon the commitment and involvement of the workforce. Involvement of the workforce is begot by the genuine commitment of the management; employee and involvement is a direct response to this commitment.

The crux of involvement has been shown to be decision-making (Pateman, 1970 and Lawler, 1986). Involvement is founded upon the employee's ability to participate in decision-making concerning their own actions in this instance, their work. Similarly, Blanner (1994), Patemen (1970) Lawler (1986) identified employee characteristics that are conducive to involvement, commitment, participation and empowerment. These are: a desire to participate, a need for independence, a desire to make decisions, a semi-authoritative attitude, goal convergence between worker and organization; and a basic trust of the organization and its motives.

The major factor underlying all these characteristics is the obvious one that employees must have a basic desire to be involved. Academic staff of Nigerian universities differ from workers in other organization or institutions in terms of their desire to participate (Mohammed, 1995). The desire to make decisions is a direct manifestation of their desire to be involved in their work. The need for independence among lecturers is a positive one, it has been identified by many writers to be an essential personal characteristic for involvement (Vroom, 1960). Vroom in particular showed that workers who possess a need for independence were favourably affected by opportunities to participate in making decisions in their jobs; exactly the characteristics sought for workers with a high need for independence. In the context of university education, involvement requires the academic staff to participate in decision-making concerning the achievement of stated goals. To achieve the goals, their participation in decision-making must be genuine. Genuineness of involvement is the key factor in the success or failure of university set goals. Genuineness of participation in decision-making is the acid test of involvement, a test the academic staff of Nigerian universities need regularly and periodically in their teaching towards national development.

Lecturers whose commitment and involvement are high are what university education will seek and be assured for their enormous role of nation building. Trust, specifically mutual has a

significant role in the success of both commitment and involvement, consequently it must be a prime issue for consideration and be part of the teachers if the university education is to uplift the nation economically, socially and technologically high.

Statement of the Problem

These days the Nigerian educational institutions have been blamed for being instrumental in the country's low level of development when compared to some "third world" countries (Oseni, 1997). It is further alleged that the institutions especially the universities seemed to be failing in producing the type of human resources needed for social, economic, political and technological development of the country.

Before now, Ejiogu (2000: 28) contends that teachers attitudes to work are characterized by: lateness to school, truancy or absenteeism, loafing and moonlighting when one should be seriously involved in teaching-learning activities. All these are germane to this study.

Purpose of the Study

Since it is the general belief that the greatest asset in the achievement level of any organization is the people (Drucker, 1984; Ejiogu, 1994), it is the intention of this study to empirically investigate factors associated with academic staff job commitment and involvement in relation to the achievement of universal education goals.

Theoretical Framework

Two models are particularly useful to this study of employee commitment and involvement. Gibson, Ivancercich and Donnelly (1997) suggest that an employee behaviour is affected by diverse environmental factors and many individual factors and events. Such environmental factors as organizational structures, job design leadership, reward and sanctions, resources and non work factors as family, economies, leisure and hobbies, individual factors such as ability, skill, personality, perception, experience, age, sex, family background and attitudes. Gibson et al model supports Lewin's (Owens, 1982) original proposal Lewin conceptualizes human behaviours mathematically as, $B = F(I, E)$ which means employee behaviours (B) is a function of individual (I) and environment (E). These characteristics representing a complex combination of physical, mental, social and organizational environment, representing such things as corporate values, culture, reward, system policies, procedures, rules, technology and leadership styles are central to individuals' pattern of attitudes and behaviour. Similarly, Winfield, Bishop and Porter (2000) proposed factors, which influence attitudes towards, work as; orientation, motivation, ability, work itself and location of the work. Based on these models, this study concludes that employee job attitudes and behaviours are the functions of job situations and employee demographic factors.

Significance of the Study

The general issue of manpower development is of primary concern and interest to every nation of the world. But for a developing country such as Nigeria, the issue of human resource development and management through university education becomes critically central to any form of socio-economic and techno-scientific advancement yet, the issue of teacher commitment and involvement seem to have been an unresolved national problem that has rocked the university educational system.

It is therefore expected that this study will provide some concrete data or information that would be used in initiating policies that would empower educational institutions towards better university employee self-fulfillment, and high performance. It is also hoped that findings will be of practical and immediate use to policy makers, employers of labour and management of organizations especially in the area of personnel function (such as administrative training programmes) in- the educational enterprise.

Research Questions

- Two research questions were raised for the study:
- What factors are associated with academic staff of Nigerian universities' job commitment and involvement?
- To what extent can socio-demographic factors (such as gender, age and marital status)

account for academics job commitment and involvement?

Hypotheses

1. Job commitment and involvement of academic staff of Nigerian universities will not differ due to differences in their gender, age and marital status.
2. Job status, experience and academic qualifications of academic staff will not significantly impact on their job commitment and involvement.

Methodology

Design

This is a descriptive survey research, which sets out to explore academic staff of Nigerian universities' job commitment and involvement.

Population

The entire federal universities in Nigeria formed the population for the study.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The universities were zoned based on regional and ecological factors into north and south. Using stratified random sampling, a sample size of 303 academic staff were drawn from four Federal Universities, namely; University of Lagos (UNILAG), Ahmadu Bello University (ABU) Zaria, University of Abuja and Federal University of Technology, Owerri (FUTO)

The main instrument was a question consisting of two sections and 25 items. Section A had eight items designed to elicit information on the respondents' personal characteristics such as gender, age and marital status, educational qualification, job status, experience, ethnicity and institution location. Section B comprised 25 items designed to find out how conditions in the respondents' institution affect their job commitment and involvement. The items were rated on a five point Likert Scale (strongly agree-strongly disagree) for ease of analysis and interpretation.

For the validation and reliability of instrument, some experts in institutional management, research methodology and statisticians scrutinized the instrument. After all the necessary corrections were effected, the instrument was considered appropriate. A pilot study using test-retest procedure was conducted to ascertain the consistency of the instrument and Pearson's product moment correlation co-efficient (r) of 0.74 and 0.78 were obtained respectively.

Data Collection Procedure and Analysis

The questionnaires were distributed with the assistance of three-trained research assistants. These research assistants distributed the questionnaires to academic staff of the four universities used for the study. In all 303 academics responded to the questionnaire, 239 male and 62 female. The .data gathered were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA),

Result

Hypothesis One States that job commitment and involvement of academic staff of Nigerian universities will not significantly differ due to differences in their gender, age and marital status. To test this hypothesis, a 2, \ 2 x 4 univariate analysis of variance was performed. The independent factors were gender, age and marital status while each job attitude factor (job commitment and involvement) was entered as dependent variable. The results are presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3.

Table 1: Descriptive Data of Academics on Job Attitudes Due to Gender, Age and Marital Status

			Job Commitment			Job Involvement	
Gender	Age	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev

Male	21-30yrs.	Single	28	51.82	6.09	3.25	1.40
		Married	30	52.50	.708	3.00	.00
		Total		51.87	5.88	3.23	1.36
	31-40 yrs.	Single	32	48.53	7.30	3.59	1.32
		Married	63	48.63	7.13	3.74	1.32
Total		95	48.60	7.15	3.69	1.31	
41-50 yrs.	Married	75	49.96	7.00	3.71	1.28	
	Total	75	49.96	7.00	3.71	1.28	
Above 50 yrs.	Single	2	47.50	9.19	4.00	1.41	
	Married	38	49.61	5.21	3.42	1.11	
	Total	40	49.50	5.30	3.45	1.11	
Total	Single	62	49.98	6.91	3.45	1.35	
	Married	178	49.44	6.67	3.65	1.25	
	Total	240	49.58	6.72	3.60	1.28	
Female	21-30 yrs.	Single	7	51.57	4.65	4.29	1.11
		Married	10	51.33	4.62	3.00	2.00
		Total		51.50	4.38	3.90	1.45
	31-40 yrs.	Single	4	49.75	6.13	2.50	1.29
		Married	18	50.44	5.46	3.61	1.46
Total		22	50.32	5.44	3.41	1.47	
41-50 yrs.	Single		45.00		3.00		
	Married	1	50.68	4.46	4.21	1.03	
	Total	19	50.40	4.52	4.15	1.04	
Above 50 yrs.	Married	11	50.09	3.05	4.09	1.22	
	Total	11	50.09	3.05	4.09	1.22	
Total	Single	12	50.42	5.07	3.58	1.38	
	Married	51	50.51	4.48	3.90	1.30	
	Total	63	50.49	4.56	3.84	1.31	
Total	21-30 yrs.	Single	35	51.77	5.77	3.46	1.40
		Married	40	51.80	3.35	3.00	1.41
		Total		51.78	5.49	3.40	1.39
	31-40 yrs.	Single	36	48.67	7.12	3.47	1.34
		Married	81	49.04	6.80	3.71	1.34
Total		117	48.92	6.87	3.64	1.34	
41-50 yrs.	Single	1	45.00		3.00		
	Married	94	50.11	6.56	3.81	1.25	
	Total	95	50.05	6.54	3.80	1.24	
Above 50 yrs.	Single	2	47.50	9.19	4.00	1.41	
	Married	49	49.71	4.78	3.57	1.15	
	Total	51	49.63	4.88	3.59	1.15	
Total	Single	74	50.05	6.62	3.47	1.35	
	Married	229	49.68	6.25	3.70	1.27	
	Total	303	49.77	6.34	3.65	1.29	

Table 1 shows that Nigerian academics are very similar in their job commitment and job involvement irrespective of their gender, age and marital status as evident from the descriptive data. The males obtained a mean score of 49.58 and standard deviation of 6.72 as against a mean of 50.49 and standard deviation of 4.56 by their female counterparts on job commitment. On job involvement, their mean scores were 3.60 for male and 3.84 for female with standard deviation of 1.28 and 1.31

respectively. Similar results were obtained in respect of age and marital status on job commitment and job involvement, as the mean differences between the various categories of each demographic variable were generally low and negligible.

To test if the above differences are statistically significant, analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was performed and the results are summarised in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: ANOVA Data of the Effects Gender, Age and Marital Status on the Job of Commitment and Involvement of Academics

Source	Job Commitment					Job Involvement				
	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean	F	Sig.
Model	750970.772 ^a	14	53640.769	1317.515	.000	4047.577 ^b	14	289.113	176250	.000
Gender	36.694	1	36.694	.901	.343	3.763	1	3.763	2.294	.131
Age	246.213	3	82.071	2.016	.112	2.641	3	.880	.537	.657
Marital status	6.845	1	6.845	.168	.682	.426	1	.426	.260	.611
Gender * Age	21.243	3	7.081	.174	.914	11.429	3	3.810	2.322	.075
Age* marital status	29.867	3	9.956	.245	.665	6.408	3	2.136	1.302	.274
Marital status	1.665	1	1.665	.041	.840	2.927	9 _A	2.927	1.784	.183
Error	11766.228	289	40.714			472.423	288	1.640		
Total	762737.000	303				4520.000	302			

Table 2 shows that each of the computed F-values for effects of gender, age and marital status and their interaction effects were not statistically significant at 0.05 probability level for job commitment and job involvement. From these findings, it is concluded that:

- 1, Academics in Nigerian Universities exhibited similar levels of job commitment and job involvement irrespective of differences in their age, gender and marital status.

Hypothesis Two: This hypothesis states that job status; experience and academic qualification of academic staff will not significantly impact on their job commitment and involvement. A 5 x 6 x 3 univariate analysis of variance was performed to test the effects of the independent variables on job attitudes factors. The findings are presented on Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Descriptive Data of Academics on Job Commitments and Involvement Due Experience, Job Status and Academic Qualification

Experience	Job Status	Education Qua.	N	Job Commitment		Job Involvement	
				Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
0-5 years	Asst lecturer	Bachelors	15	51.00	4.77	3.40	1.45
		Masters	38	51.61	5.52	3.34	1.32
		Others	1	54.00		3.00	
		Total	54	51.48	5.24	3.35	1.33
	Lecturer II	Bachelors	3	57.33	5.86	4.67	.58
		Masters	17	48.59	6.76	3.71	1.49
		Doctorate	4	55.25	4.03	3.50	1.29
		Total	24	50.79	7.03	3.79	1.38
	Lecturer I	Bachelors	2	46.00	2.83	4.00	
		Masters	4	49.50	1.91	4.00	2.00
		Others	1	50.00		3.00	
		Doctorate	4	49.50	4.80	3.75	.96
		Total	11	48.91	3.30	3.80	1.32
	Snr lecturer	Others		46.00		2.00	
		Doctorate	12	48.50	.71	5.00	.00
Total		3	47.67	1.53	4.00	1.73	
Total	Bachelors	20	51.45	5.43	3.63	1.38	
	Masters	59	50.59	5.85	3.49	1.41	
	Others	3	50.00	4.00	2.67	.58	
	Doctorate	10	51.60	4.81	3.90	1.10	
	Total	92	50.87	5.55	3.54	1.35	
6- 10 years	Asst lecturer	Bachelors	38	47.33	1.15	3.67	1.53
		Masters		47.25	4.20	4.25	1.04
		Total	11	47.27	3.55	4.09	1.14
	Lecturer II	Bachelors	1	53.00		3.00	
		Masters	17	47.71	7.87	4.12	1.36
		Others	1	52.00		5.00	
		Doctorate	1	44.00		4.00	
		Total	20	48.00	7.43	4.10	1.29
	Lecturer I	Bachelors	2	56.00	2.83	2.00	1.41
		Masters	13	46.62	6.44	3.92	1.19
		Doctorate	6	46.50	8.19	4.00	1.26
		Total	21	47.48	7.08	3.76	1.30
	Snr lecturer	Masters	6	50.00	2.45	2.17	1.47
		Doctorate	13	52.00	6.25	3.69	1.25
		Total	19	51.37	5.35	3.21	1.47
Total	Bachelors	6	51.17	4.58	3.00	1.41	
	Masters	44	47.61	6.27	3.82	1.40	
	Others	1	52.00		5.00		
	Doctorate	20	49.95	7.13	3.80	1.20	
	Total	71	48.63	6.43	3.76	1.35	
				Job Commitment		Job Involvement	
Experience	Job Status	Education Qua.	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
11-20 years	Asst lecturer	Masters	1	50.00		5.00	
		Total	1	50.00		5.00	
	Lecturer II	Masters	1	44.00		4.00	
Doctorate		4	50.75	6.65	3.50	1.00	
Total		5	49.40	6.50	3.60	.89	

	Lecturer I	Bachelors	2	10	60.50	2.12	4.00	.00
		Masters	5	17	47.10	10.68	3.60	1.58
		Doctorate			40.00	12.98	4.20	1.10
		-Total			46.59	12.02	3.52	1.33
	Snr. Lecturer	Bachelors	1		52.00		1.00	
		Masters	17		49.71	7.36	3.41	1.46
		Doctorate	25		50.16	4.09	3.68	1.44
	Total	43		50.02	5.51	3.51	1.47	
Ass Prof.	Masters	7	4	52.57	6.29	3.57	.98	
	Doctorate	11		52.25	3.86	3.50	1.00	
	Total			52.45	5.32	3.55	.93	
Professors	Doctorate	4		44.75	2.63	3.00	.00	
	Total	4		44.75	2.63	3.00	-.00"	
Associate Led.	Masters	2		50.00		4.00	.58'	
	Doctorate	1		40.00	11.31	3.00		
	Total	3		46.67		3.67		
Total	Bachelors	3		57.67	5.13	3.00	1.73	
	Masters	38		49.42	5.08	3.58	1.33	
	Doctorate	43		48.49	6.74	3.63	-1.23	
	Total	84		49.24	7.46	3.58	1.28	
21-30 years	Asst. lecturer	Bachelors	2		55.00	7.07	5.00	.00
		Total	2		55.00	7.07	5.00	.00"
	Lecturer 1	Bachelors			47.00		4.00	
		Masters	1	1	38.00		4.00	
		Doctorate	1		51.00		3.00	
		Total	3		45.33	6.66	3.67	.58
	Snr lecturer	Masters	8	5	50.13	1.73	3.25	.71
		Doctorate	13		49.80	4.60	3.60	1.50
		Total			50.00	2.97	3.38	1.04
	Ass Prof.	Bachelors	1		67.00		4.00	
	Masters	2		46.50	2.12	4.50	.71	
	Doctorate	4		51.00	10.80	4.25	1.50	
	Total	7		52.00	10.36	4.29	1.11	
Professors	Masters	1		49.00		5.00		
	Doctorate	11		49.27	4.86	3.55	1.21	
	Total	12		49.25	4.63	3.67	1.23	
Associate lect.	Masters	2		54.00	8.49	3.00	1.41	
	Total	2		54.00	8.49	3.00	1.41	
Total	Bachelors	4		56.00	9.20	4.50	.58	
	Masters	14		49.21	4.73	3.57	.94	
	Doctorate	21		49.81	5.84	3.67	1.28	
	Total	39		50.23	6.02	3.72	1.12	

				Job Commitment		Job Involvement	
Experience	Job Status	Education Qua.	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
1-20 years	Asst lecturer	Masters Total	1	50.00		5.00	
	Lecturer II	Masters	1	44.00		4.00	
		Doctorate Total	4	50.75	6.65	3.50	1.00
	Lecturer I	Bachelors	2	60.50	2.12	4.00	.00
		Masters	5	47.10	10.68	3.60	1.58
		Doctorate -Total	17	40.00	12.98	4.20	1.0
	Snr. Lecturer	Bachelors	1	52.00		1.00	
		Masters	17	49.71	7.36	3.41	1.46
		Doctorate Total	25	50.16	4.09	3.68	1.44
Ass Prof.	Masters	7	52.57	6.29	3.57	.98	
	Doctorate Total	11	52.25	3.86	3.50	1.00	
Professors	Doctorate	4	44.75	2.63	3.00	.00	
	Total	4	44.75	2.63	3.00	-.00"	
Associate Led.	Masters	2	50.00		4.00	.58'	
	Doctorate Total	3	40.00	11.31	3.00		
Total!	Bachelors	3	57.67	5.13	3.00	1.73	
	Masters	43	49.42	8.08	3.58	1.33	
	Doctorate	84	48.49	6.74	3.63	-1.23	
	Total		49.24	7.46	3.58	1.28	
21-30 years	Asst. lecturer	Bachelors Total	2	55.00	7.07	5.00	.00
	Lecturer I	Bachelors		47.00		4.00	
		Masters	1	38.00		4.00	
		Doctorate Total	1	51.00		3.00	
	Snr lecturer	Doctorate	1	45.33	6.66	3.67	.58
		Total	3	45.33	6.66	3.67	.58
	Ass Prof.	Masters	8	50.13	1.73	3.25	.71
		Doctorate	5	49.80	4.60	3.60	1.50
Total		13	50.00	2.97	3.38	1.04	
Ass Prof.	Bachelors	1	67.00		4.00		
	Masters	1	46.50	2.12	4.50	.71	
	Doctorate Total	2	51.00	10.80	4.25	1.50	
Professors	Total	7	52.00	10.36	4.29	1.11	
	Masters	1	49.00		5.00		
	Doctorate Total	1	49.27	486	3.55	1.21	
Associate lect.	Total	12	49.25	4.63	3.67	1.23	
	Masters	2	54.00	8.49	3.00	1.41	
Total	Total	2	54.00	8.49	3.00	1.41	
	Bachelors	4	56.00	9.20	4.50	.58	
	Masters	21	49.21	4.73	3.57	.94	
	Doctorate Total	39	49.81	5.84	3.67	1.28	
			50.23	6.02	3.72	1.12	

				Job Commitment		Job Involvement	
Experience	Job Status	Education Qua.	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
Above 30 yrs.	Snr lecturer	Doctorate Total	1	51.00		5.00	
		Total	1	51.00		5.00	
	Ass Prof.	Doctorate Total	2	51.00	.00	3.00	.00
		Total	2	51.00	.00	3.00	.00

	Professor	Doctorate	10	49.10	3.48	4.40	.52
		Total	10	49.10	3.48	4.40	.52
	Total	Doctorate	13	49.54	3.13	4.23	.73
		Total	13	49.54	3.13	4.23	.73
Total	Asst lecturer	Bachelors	20	50.85	4.83	3.60	1.42
		Masters	47	50.83	5.47	3.53	1.32
		Others	1 68	54.00	5.23	3.00	1.33
		Total		50.88		3.54	
	Lecturer II	Bachelors	4 35	56.25	5.25	4.25	.96
		Masters	1 9	48.03	7.16	3.91	1.40
		Others	49	52.00	6.06	5.00	1.01
		Doctorate		52.00	7.13	3.56	1.29
		Total		49.51		3.90	
	Lecturer I	Bachelors	7 28	53.14	6.89	3.33	1.21
		Masters	1 16	46.89	7.80	3.82	1.39
		Others	52	50.00	9.42	3.00	1.06
		Doctorate		45.50	8.35	3.94	1.25
		Total		47.37		3.78	
Snr lecturer	Bachelors		52.00		1.00		
	Masters		49.87		3.13		
	Others	1 31	46.00	5.54	2.00	1.36	
	Doctorate	1 4	50.59	4.71	3.76	1.35	
	Total	79	50.27	5.00	3.46	1.40	
Ass Prof.	Bachelors		67.00		4.00		
	Masters	1 9	51.22	6.12	3.78	.97	
	Doctorate	10	51.50	6.65	3.70	1.16	
	Total	20	52.15	7.00	3.75	1.02	
Professors	Masters		49.00		5.00		
	Doctorate	1 25	48.48	4.24	3.80	1.00	
	Total	26	48.50	4.16	3.85	1.01	
Associate lect.	Masters	4	52.00		3.50		
	Doctorate	1 5	40.00	8.49	3.00	1.00	
	Total		49.60		3.40		
Total	Bachelors	33	52.52	5.95	3.56	1.37	
	Masters	155 4	49.34	6.55	3.61	1.35	
	Others	107	50.50	3.42	3.25	1.26	
	Doctorate	299	49.44	6.12	3.77	1.17	
	Total		49.74	6.36	3.66	1.28	

Table 3 presents the mean and standard deviation scores of the academic staff job commitment and involvement in relation to their job experience, job status and academic qualification.

On the job commitment, the mean scores of the lecturers with varying years of teaching experience did not seem to differ markedly as shown in their respective mean scores ranging from 50.87 for those with 0-5 years experience to 48.63 for those with 6-10 years experience. As regards the effect of job status in job commitment associate professors recorded the higher level of job commitment ($\bar{x} = 52.15$, $Sd = 7.00$), followed by Assistant lecturers ($\bar{x} = 50.88$, $Sd = 5.23$) while those in lecturer I position were least with a mean of 47.37 ($Sd = 8.35$). In terms of educational qualification, the job commitment score of the various categories of staff ranged between 52.52 for Bachelor degree holders to 49.44 for Doctorate degree holders.

On job involvement, the various categories of experienced job status and educational qualification seemed to be homogenous as evident from their respective mean score. Generally, the mean differences between various pairs were very low and negligible.

Table 4: ANOVA Data of Effects of Experience, Job Status and Academic Qualification on Academic Staff Job Attitudes.

Source	Job commitment					Job involvement				
	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Type III sum	df	Mean square	F	Sig. j
Model	742453.103 ^a	52	144277.944	379.010	.000	4065.895 ^a	52	78.190	46.902	.000

Experience	150.094	4	37.523	.996	.410	8.836	4	2.209	1.325	.261
Job status	621.632	6	103.605	2.750	.013	10.675	6	1.779	1.167	.383
Qualification	249.831	3	83.277	2.211	.087	5.235	3	1.745	1.047	.373
Experience* job status	336.238	13	25.864	.687	.776	22.754	13	1.750	1.050	.404
Experience* qualification	337.604		56.267	1.494	.181	10.609	6	1.768	1.061	.387
Job status* Qualification	545.355	11	49.578	1.316	.216	15.752	11	1.432	.859	.581
Experience* job status* qualification	350.013	7	50.002	1.327	.238	5.457	7	.780	.468	.858
Error	9304.897	247				410.105	246	1.667		
Total	751758.000	299				4476.000	298			

Table 4 shows each of the computed F-values for the effects of experience, job status and academic qualification on job commitment, job involvement. As can be seen from Table 4, only the job status of the academics showed statistically significant effect ($F = 2.750$, $P < 0.05$) on their job commitment. As highlighted in Table 4, all other computed F-values were low and statistically not significant.

Based on the above results, the following conclusions were drawn in respect of this hypothesis:

- The job commitment of academic staff of Nigerian universities seemed to be related to their job status.
- Associate professors significantly differed from the professors and those on lecturer I position in their job commitment.

The, job experience and academic qualification of academic staff have no significant effect on their job commitment, involvement.

Discussion of the Result

The study investigated the extent to which demographic factors can impact on job commitment and involvement of academic staff of Nigerian universities. The study results revealed that the academics exhibited similar levels of job commitment and involvement irrespective of differences in their age, gender and marital status as shown in Table 1 and that the analysis of variance result shows effects of gender, age and marital status were not statistically significant at 0.05 probability level for job commitment and involvement as shown in Table 2. This finding corroborates with the findings of Ubangha (1997) and Agbakwu (1997) who found out that teachers' intentions to stay in their institutions were independent of their gender, age and marital status. Similarly, Winfield, Bishop and Porter (2000) Commission founded research showed that people aged 18-30 years have attitudes to work which requires reciprocal behaviour by employers.

On the effect of job status, experience and educational qualification on job commitment and involvement, the result as shown in Tables 3 and 4 revealed that the job commitment of academic staff of Nigerian universities seemed to be related to their job status. Associate Professors significantly differed from the Professors and those on Lecturer I position in their job commitment. The analysis of variance result shows that the job experience and academic qualification of academic staff have no significant effect on their commitment and involvement. This result is logical because the Associate Professors being on the verge of reaching the pinnacle of their career (self-actualization) would seem more committed and involved in their jobs than any other academic staff. While the high mean score of 50.87 for those academics with 0-5 years of experience was expected. As the staff under this category are relatively new in the organization, it is expected that they would exhibit high loyalty and identification with the university. These results also support Gallic and White's (1993) findings. Gallic et al, assessed attitudes of 3,885 people regarding a wide range concerned with work on the employment in Britain survey. The result revealed that job commitment is stronger:

- (1) The more qualification the person has;

- (2) The greater their feelings of having been successful in their career;
- (3) The higher they value 'hard work';
- (4) The more they feel they have personal control over their destiny; and
- (5) The higher their attachment to their current organization. In addition the survey revealed that employment commitment was highest among people in their early 20s and declined with age.

The strongest correlation of personal characteristics with commitment types have been found between perceived competence and affective commitment attachment to, identification with and involvement with the organization (Matthew & Zajac, 1990). This suggests that employees who have a strong confidence in their abilities and achievements tend to develop a stronger sense of affective commitment than those who are less confident. Other research within this perspective also revealed that level of education is negatively related (Steers, 1977).

Relevant to this present discussion is Hall's (1968) seminal work. Implicit in Hall's model is the notion that professionals be free to exercise autonomous judgement and decision making in their work, attitudes, which by definition would be incompatible with a hierarchical, bureaucratic organizational structure. Hall found that educators generally perceived their organization as highly bureaucratic, while his research also revealed that teachers were one of the most "strongly professionalized" occupational groups. It is precisely this combination of attributes that could potentially result in a conflict between professional and organizational interests, making the nature of commitment among educators an important topic for empirical investigation.

Recommendations and Conclusions

The results of the present study suggests that administrators of Nigerian universities should take the time to discover the organizational resources that individual teachers value and take measures to provide such resources where possible. The decision for- independence and to make decisions in relation to their work is a key requirement for academic staff of Nigerian universities. Participation in decision making is a highly desirable trait in a workforce; it could be argued an essential trait for continuous improvement initiatives and such like. Thus, supporting Meyer et al's (1997) findings that job challenge, degree of autonomy, variety of skills used, role ambiguity, role conflict, participation in decision-making, fairness in policies and treatment, personal fulfillment, employee-manager relationship, personal importance and personal competence play an important role in development of job commitment. In line with this is the productivity and efficiency theory which postulates that when organizations allow employees to participate in deciding how they will do their jobs, these workers become ego-involved- a feeling conducive to higher productivity (Ejiogu, 1983).

To develop and maintain employee involvement and commitment, universities must have a functional personnel development properly designed. Personnel development not only enhances the professional development of the teachers, it also promotes the development and achievement of the university education towards goal attainment.

In this presentation, Drucker's (1988) submission becomes very relevant. Drucker, stating why service institutions like the university do not succeed in the goals, posits that what these service institutions need is not "belter people" but people who do the job systematically and who focus themselves purposefully on performance and results. They need efficiency, that is, control of cost. But above all the universities need to be effective, that is emphasis on the right results.

Research indicates that employers can make an impact on how the employees feel by taking positive steps to create a work environment that indicates, by action, that the employee is valued (Lynch, Eiscnberger and Armeli, 1999). According to them, pay is only one important 'part. Employers must address fairness, quality of supervision and support from employee life style. The following, Lynch, et al, (1999) posit can also influence an employee's positive feelings: sufficiency of pay, benefits and reward, family oriented policies and experiences, promotions, clearly stated guidelines, defining appropriate work behaviour and job demands and participation in goal setting.

To achieve effective results from the teachers the management should increase factors that increase commitment and involvement in high level of responsibility, autonomy, motivation of the staff, granting request for study and sabbatical leave, and attendance at conferences both locally and international (this is to enable them keep abreast with the information explosion and technological quest). While factors that affect

these concepts like role ambiguity, job tension, denial of promotional opportunities should be reduced to the barest minimum. The university education should be adequately funded to cushion the effect of poor remuneration and other "hygiene or maintenance factors" that trigger off dissatisfaction in the workplace. The absence of enabling environment for purposeful research activities should be given adequate and quick attention. Sufficient promotional activities on the job should be made available. Research, which is basic to higher education as a whole and to Universities in particular, should be adequately funded.

To promote technological and scientific advancement through effective teaching-learning process, there is need for adequate provision of equipment for laboratories, library books, current journals.

The conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing are that people have a significant influence on the successful implementation of organizational goals. In this presentation, the characteristics conducive for academic staff job commitment and involvement have been clearly stated. Job commitment and involvement on the part of teachers are necessary, if not essential part of educational system. These concepts provide the basis for human resource management necessary for socio-economic political and technological development of the nation.

References

- Agbakwu, S. N. (1999). Determinants of Brain Drain in Nigerian University: Implication for Personal Policy Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis University of Lagos.
- Blanner, R. (1970). Freedom and Alienation. In Paterman (Eds.), *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19 533-546,
- Cook, J.; and Wall, T. (1980). New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Need Non-Fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 53, 39-52.
- Cotton, J. (1993). *Employee Involvement: Methods for Improving Performance and Work Attitudes.*, Newbury Park CA: Sage Publication.
- Driscollj J. (1978). Trust and Participation in Organizational Decision-Making as Predictors of Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2, 145-156
- Drucker, F. P. (1984). *People and Performance, the Best of Peter Drucker on Management*, London: Heinemann.
- Drucker, F. P. (1988). *Management, Task, Responsibilities Practices*. New Delhi: Butterworth.
- Ejiogu, A. M. (1983). Participative Management in a Developing Economy: Poison or Placebo? *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* 19 (3) 239-247.
- Ejiogu, A. M. (1994). *Issues in the Management of Public Service Institutions*.
- Ejiogu, A. M. (1999). *Teachers' Reward in Heaven. A Misplaced Euphemism*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press.
- Ejiogu, A. M. (2000). Nigerian Teachers' Job Attitudes and Their Effects on Educational System. In A. M. Ejiogu and R. A. Alani (Eds.) *Emergent Issues in Nigerian Education* 3.278-285.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1998). *National Policy on Education*. Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Flannery, T. P.; Hofrichler D. A.; Plattern P. E. (1996). *People, Performance and Pay*. New York: Free Press.

- Foy, N. (1997). *Empowering People at Work*. England: Gower Publishing Limited.
- Gallic, D.; and Whiter, M. (1993). *Employee Commitment and the Skills Revolution*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Goldthrope, John, li.; Lockwood, D.; Bechhfer F. Platt, J. (1970). *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, H. R. (1968). Professionalization and Burcaurcatization. *American Sociological Review* H (1) 92-104.
- Kanugo, R. (1982). Measurement of Job and Work Involvement *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67, 3,341-349.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High Involvement Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lodahl, T; and Kejner, M. (1965). The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 24-33.
- Lynch, P. D.; Eisenberger, R.; and Armeli, S. (1999). Perceived Organizational Support: Versus Superior Performance by Wary Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 467-483.
- March. J. G.; and Simon, H, A. (1958). *Organization*. New York: Wiley.
- Marrow, P. C. (1993). *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*, Greenwich: JAI Press, Inc.
- Meyer, J. P.; and Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in Workplace: Theory Research and Application*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Mohammed, A. N. (1997). Government and the University Brain Drain Problem. In A. Ejiogu and K. Ajayi (Eds.) *Emergent Issues in Nigerian Education 2*.
- Mowday, R. J.; Steers R. M.; and Porter, L. W. (1979). The Measurement of Organization Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* 14. 224-247.
- Oseni, A. O. (October 22, 1997). Comments on Utomi's Sermons. *The Guardian*. Paterman, C. (1970). *Participations and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the Control of Organizational Behaviour and Belief. In: Staw, B. M. Salancik, G. R., (Eds.) *New Directions in Organizational Behaviour*. Chicago: St. Clair Press, P. 1-53.
- Stayer, R. (1990). November-December). Let My Workers Lead. *Harvard Business Review*. 66-83.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and Outcomes of Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 22, 46-56.
- Tabb, J.; and Goldfarb, A. (1970). *Workers Participation in Management: Expectation and Experience*. London: Pergamon.
- Ubangha, M. B. (1997). Assessment and Treatment of Teacher Burnout Syndrome in Cross River State. Unpublished Thesis University of Lagos.
- Vroom, V. (1960). *Some Personality Determinants of the Participations*. Englewood Cliffs; New Jersey

Prentice Hall.

Vroom, V.; andJago, A. (1988). *The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organization*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall 4.

