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Introduction

Higher Education Institutions (HEI) are focusing towards motivating and retaining committed lecturers in their system. In recent decades, organizational commitment especially in education, health and management fields, has grown in importance due to the fact that it is regarded as the main determinants of organizational existence (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Globally, governments are making efforts to provide citizens with quality tertiary education, but this would not be achievable without the commitment of lecturers who are the main drivers of the learning process in all the institution to achieve meaningful development (Malefe, 2010).

The success or failure of any educational process is always attributed to the critical roles lecturers play in the human resource development initiative of a nation to help it achieve competitive economic standing, superior labor quality, and technological advancement (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006; Idris, Dollard, Coward, & Dormann, 2012). Human resource in the educational system are teachers, instructors, facilitators, and lecturers who form the main assets as well as the essential drivers in any educational system and its development (Anyebe, 2014). This is because, College effectiveness and performance are measured irrevocably by the efficiency and quality output of its lecturers, and how successfully they created and developed learning processes and learning experiences that are relevant to the demands of the society, job market needs, and their students’ wholesome development (Baba gana, 2014).

Organizational commitment is often referred to as the connection of an employee has with his organization, to the extent that he/she works, and can identify, with the values of the organization (Ball & Cohen, 1996). According to Allen & Meyer (1990) organizational commitment is the psychological attachment that links the employee to his employer. Powell & Meyer (2004) postulated on three dimensions of organizational commitment; affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to employees’ emotional attachment to be identified with, enjoying affiliation and involvement in the organization. Continuance commitment refers to employees’ perception of costs associated with employee’s intension to exit from the organization. Normative commitment refers to employees’ feelings of responsibility to continue with the organization due to obligations.

A critical overview of organizational commitment literature shows that their exist a gap between the practice and theoretical considerations in human resource practice, and need to be authenticated and further confirmed through thorough linkage among the components of industry, process and outcome. This will only be possible when researchers of nowadays continue to develop interest on
the determinants of organizational existence (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Moreover, unintentionally empirical justification related to organizational commitment in higher institutions of developing nations Nigeria inclusive is neglected (Nazari, Ramli, & Idris, 2012).

In Nigeria, the Federal and State Government highlighted the role of Higher Education Institutions in the area of human capital development of the nation towards achieving the objective of producing the needed skilled manpower for managerial and technocratic advancement in economic, social and political sectors (National Policy on Education, 2004). The key goals as specified in the National Policy on Education of Federal Republic of Nigeria include; the provision of educational skills and training relevant to national demands of working life, carry out research activities that yield fruits for the development and promotion of a knowledge-based economy, technological advancement as well as to ensure social integration, at local, regional development and global well-being, and stress the strong and unequivocal role and relationship existing between higher education and development (Ifenkwe, 2013).

However, achieving the stipulated goals of higher education system in Nigeria is today characterized by some challenges and setbacks comprises of inability to meet lecturers needs, as a result of shifting culture from work setting to market oriented focusing on accountability. Similarly, unattractive condition of service and job in-security which results to incessant strike actions and a host of other problems that are impediment towards actualizing the key goals of NPE. Thus, the direct effect and consequences are on the lecturers commitment towards their functions (Othman, Mohammed, & DSilva, 2012). Available records reveal that from a span of decades (2003 to 2013), more than 35 per cent academic staff transfer or even withdraw their service from colleges of education or polytechnics to the university or any other lucrative perceived sector as a result of acquiring PhD (NCCE, 2014), Therefore, lecturer’s level of commitment in polytechnics and colleges is very low when compared to universities (Nkoro, Ibrahim, & Ogirima, 2013).

Statement of Problem
Higher education system in Nigeria has suffered and it is still suffering from poor commitment of academic staff, inadequate of infrastructure and production of low quality graduates; this is attributed to psychological empowerment practices, motivational strategies, work environment and the organizational culture of institutions as perceived by the academic staff (Aluede, Idogho, & Imonikhe, 2012; Ekundayo, 2010). This scenario is worrisome, due to the fact that, the socio-economic development of the country lies holistically on the intellectual capacity and ability of teachers, who in turn facilitate production of other stakeholders at all levels for nation building (Aluede et al., 2012; Egwu, 2009; Ogbogu, 2013). Research conducted on organizational commitment in separate national cultures revealed on the diverse meaning of commitment and different predictors and determinants emerge (Pearson & Chong, 1997; Lincoln & Kallenberg, 1985; Meyer et al, 1998; Knoop, 1994). Therefore it is very significant to investigate the determinants of organizational commitment in the Nigerian context, which earlier studies have not
undertaken. The majority of commitment studies have been conducted in Western countries; models of commitment have been developed and tested in the same countries. Therefore, there is need for more systematic research to determine the Nigerian context in view of the perceived brain drain from these intermediary or middle class manpower production institutions (Colleges and polytechnics) to universities and other sectors of the economy which is practically reducing the ability of such units to prosper in totality (Pitsoe & Machaisa, 2012; Adeniji, 2011a; Nakpodia, 2011).

Objectives of the Study
1. To determine the level of lecturers organizational commitment in HEIs.
2. To determine the influence of organizational and personal factors on lecturers organizational commitment.

Research Question
What is the level of lecturers organizational commitment in HEIs?
What is the influence of organizational and personal factors on lecturers organizational commitment?

Literature Review
Conceptual Clarification

Organizational commitment
Studying the concept of commitment is complex overtime due to difference among scholars in relation to its conceptualization and measurement (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 2013). The simplest and explicit definition given by (Koslowsky, 2009) is that organizational commitment is referred to as emotional and functional level of attachment an employee offered to his/her employers. Consequently, numerous meanings have been advanced for the commitment concept. O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell (1991) defines organizational commitment as when “an individual’s psychological bond to the organization, in addition to a sense of job involvement, loyalty and belief in the norms and values of the organization. From this perspective, organizational commitment is characterized by employee’s recognition or acceptance of organizational goals and their willingness to exert substantial effort in achieving the objectives set out by the organization.

According to Powell and Meyer (2004) organizational commitment refers to the extent to which employees identify with their organization and the managerial goals of the organization, including process and procedures defining the work, and subsequently showing a willingness to devote effort, participate in decision making process and assume organizational values. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) organizational commitment connotes a binding force that is witnessed and
experience as a mindset or a psychological state that leads an individual towards a precise sequence of action. Meanwhile Carver and Candela (2008), maintain that employees who are committed to an organization demonstrate it by a willingness to continue their relationship with the organization, and a willingness to exert considerable effort to achieve the goals of the organization. According to Cohen (2003) commitment is a presence of a force binding an individual to a sequence or course of action of applicability to one or more objectives. Organizational commitment has been defined in both ways as a one-dimensional and a multidimensional construct (Allen and Meyer, 1996; Cohen, 2007; Krishna, 2008).

Meyer & Allen (1991) expanded on the traditional model of commitment proposed by Mowday et al. (1982) which was known to focus primarily on value and goal congruence. Instead, Meyer & Allen suggested that commitment is more accurately depicted through understanding an individual’s desire, need, and obligation to remain with the organization. Meyer & Allen (1991) stated that the psychological linkage between employees and their organization can take three quite distinct forms, each of which can be given a distinguishable label. Affective commitment refers to “identify with, involvement in and emotional attachment to the organization. Employees with strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so. Continuance commitment refers to “an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Normative commitment reflects “a sense of feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high normative commitment remain because they ought to” (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer et al., (2002) considered affective, continuance, and normative commitment to be components and not different types of commitment. These three components reflect varying degrees of an employee’s relationship with an organization. Meyer & Allen (1997) described that a “committed employee is one who stays with the organization through thick and thin, attend work regularly, put in a full day, protect organizational assets, and share organization goals”.

Grounding in the analysis of various definitions of commitment, it does appear that there are some common agreements that commitment is a force that binds an individual to the organization (Cohen, 2007; Malik et al., 2010; Bakan et al., 2011). It is an individual’s psychological attachment to an organization or a psychological bond that connects an individual to his/her organization (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Cohen, 2007). From the foregoing definitions, and for the purpose of this paper, organizational commitment refers to a psychological connection individuals have in respect to their organization, described by a strong affiliation and identification with the organization and aspiration to contribute towards the organizational goals.
Organizational climate and culture

Various research and educational studies have defined Organizational Climate in so many ways, but there seems to be agreement that the concept basically deals with human perceptions of their working environment (Hoy & Forsyth 1986). Hoy & Forsyth (1986), cited by Raza, (2010) describe climate as a relative term and an enduring quality that is witnessed and experienced by lecturers, which in turn influence their behavior, and is itself shaped by group perceptions. Organizational climate is referred to a study of individual’s perceptions on various units or aspect of the work environments in the organization.

Forehand & Von Haller (1964) cited by Torres (2013), defined organizational climate as referring to the set of characteristics that describe an organization that (a) distinguish the organization from other organizations, (b) are relatively enduring over time, and (c) influence the behavior of people in the organization. Tagiuri, Litwin, & Barnes (1968) define organizational climate as “the relatively enduring quality of the inner environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization”. Another, more elaborate, definition of organizational climate is given by Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki (2006) who acknowledged that organizational climate is a shared perception of what the organization is like in terms of practices, policies, procedures, routines, and rewards- what is important and what behaviors are expected and rewarded- and is based on shared perceptions among employees within formal organizational units.

Organizational climate have been proven to influence employee’s behavior such as participation, absenteeism, level of stress and work commitment (Gupta & Singh, 2014). Organizational climate also influence workers’ motivation, productivity, and job satisfaction (Katz & Kahn, 2004). The climate of organization may be roughly conceived as the “personality” of the organization, that is, climate is to an organization as personality is to an individual (Halpin & Croft, 1963). A HEIs organizational climate is a set of lasting internal psychological features which can distinguish one university from another (Pan & Song, 2014). According to Randhawa & Kaur (2014), organizational climate is a consequence of the interaction between individuals in an organization and their external environment.

Furthermore, another important organizational factor is organizational culture. Organizational culture in the organization explains employees’ behaviors and attitudes as well as specific strategies they adopt which are related to the components of work life (Schein, 2011). Organizational culture is considered to be an important driver of employee attitudes, organizational effectiveness and performance (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004). In other words, organizational culture has a great influence on individual attitudes, behavior and perception (Awal, Klingler, Rongione, & Stumpf, 2006). Organizational culture is viewed as one of the dominant features that shapes the
norms and values of organizations’ environment, as well as an important factor for productivity and effectiveness of workplace.

Burke & Litwin (1992) defined culture as a beliefs and values within the organization. Culture can also be perceived as a set of attitudes, values and beliefs that guide organizational behavior but what really separates culture is what the attitudes, values and beliefs are about (Thomas, 2008). Culture is seen as the way things are accepted and completed. Aina, Adeyeye, & Ige (2012) investigated the relationship between organizational culture and employees’ commitment in public tertiary institutions in Lagos State, Nigeria. Findings indicated a significant relationship existed between organizational culture and employees’ commitment in public tertiary institutions in Lagos State.

Organizational climate and organizational culture are closely related, but are certainly not the same (Denison, 1996; Hofstede, 2010; Schneider, 2012). Both deal with how individuals try to make sense of their environments, and are learned through interaction among persons belonging to a certain group (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). However, fundamental differences between these two phenomena exist. After an extensive research on both climate and culture literatures, Denison (1996) identified several differences between organizational climate and culture. According to him, organizational culture refers to the underlying structure of an organization, embedded in the values, beliefs, and assumptions of organizational members. Organizational climate, on the other hand, is reflected in practices and procedures that are observable at the surface of the organization. Organizational climate is emphasized to be temporary, subject to direct control, and limited to aspects that are consciously perceived by members of an organization. In literature, organizational climate is conceptualized across different levels of analysis: individual, work, and organization. Each organization has its own specific organizational climate and organizational outcomes.

From a management perspective, organizational climate can be influenced relatively easily, and changes in organizational climate can be observed on a short time span. Organizational climate is composed of contingencies that help the organization adapt to changes, satisfy employees’ needs and raise the effectiveness of operation. Indeed, the climate is considered by Likert (1967) as linkage between structural attributes of an organization and its effectiveness.

**Empowerment**

First and foremost, the term empowerment in an organization refers to deliberate and purposeful allocation or delegation of supervisor’s responsibility for effective discharge of duties aimed at achieving organizational goals (Pelit, Öztürk, & Arslantürk, 2011). This definition of empowerment is articulated in the hierarchy of power whereby power is devolved from the manager to the subordinate. Employees’ empowerment has received much attention from researchers who study its relationships with organizational outcomes. Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, & Wilk (2003) maintained that organizational empowerment of employee towards
achieving a collective vision basically provide them with ideas and learning opportunities, which further influences their work, attitudes, and behaviors. Laschinger, Gilbert, Smith, & Leslie (2010) concluded that employees who work in organizations that empower them (employees) are more committed to their organizations. Conger & Kanungo (1988) view on employee’s empowerment as a process of enhancing the feelings of self-efficacy among organizational members through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness, and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing effective information.

Thomas & Velthouse, (1990) defined empowerment as increased task motivation manifested in four cognitions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Their four cognitions model was based upon employees’ perception and feeling about their work roles, and the effect of the work place on the employee’s personal disposition, attitudes and behaviors. The four psychological states are defined by Thomas & Velthouse, (1990) as follows:

- **Meaning** reflects the degree to which an individual believes in and cares about work goals or purposes. **Meaningfulness** is judged in relation to an individual’s own ideals or standards of need. **Competence** refers to self-efficacy specific to work and is rooted in an individual’s belief in his or her knowledge and capability to perform task activities with skill and success. Feelings of competence are analogous to effort-performance expectancy, personal mastery, and agency beliefs (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1989). **Self-determination** represents the degree to which an individual feels causal responsibility for work-related actions, in the sense of having choice in initiating and regulating actions (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989; Spreitzer, 1995). **Impact** is the degree to which behavior is seen as making a difference in terms of achieving the purpose of the task and influencing strategic, administrative or operating outcomes at work.

Based on the work of Thomas and Velthouse (1990), Spreitzer (1995) developed a theory of psychological empowerment geared towards corporate organizations context. Spreitzer used Thomas and Velthouse’s model, but refined it to suit the business context. Spreitzer retained the measures of psychological empowerment whereby employees’ empowerment is demonstrated through their intrinsic task motivation that are in turn, driven by a set of four cognitions (meaning, competence, self-determination and impact). This cognition reflects the individual’s orientation towards his or her work role.

Moreover, Trickett, (1994) is of the opinion that empowerment requires an understanding of individuals in context, particularly with respect to cultural diversity. That is, differences may exist both within and between groups, and as we try to develop models of empowerment, we must consider the cultural factors that may impact an individual’s experience. This dynamic form of empowerment can also be illustrated by mapping the influence of cultural factors, environment, organizational context and history on the organization. Employees who are psychologically empowered demonstrate higher levels of job-satisfaction and are said to be extra committed towards the goals of the organization, hence better outcomes (De Klerk, 2013).
Lecturers Organizational Commitment Determinants

According to Steers (1977) organizational commitment antecedents are categorized into three main classes: (a) personal characteristics, (b) job characteristics, and (c) work experiences. In addition (Lee, Ashford, Walsh, & Mowday, 1992) suggested another component to the above mentioned category, (d) role-related characteristics as another antecedent of organizational commitment. (Meyer & Allen, 1991), recognized and agreed with these classifications, nevertheless, harmonized job-related characteristics with work experience (Bakan, Büyükbeşe, & Erşahan, 2011; Malik, Nawab, Naeem, & Danish, 2010). However, it is evident from the literature on antecedents of organizational commitment during the previous four decades, that there is a dearth of understanding of how organizational factors may behave as antecedents that influence commitment. The literature of commitment has almost totally neglected that organizational commitment is contextual (Cohen, 2007). Organizational context is shaped among others, by its structure, mission, administration practice, work policies, staffing, leadership, climate and culture (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2014). According to Cohen (2007) the development of organizational commitment must take into account both individual and organizational level forces. Therefore, in accordance to this observation made by Cohen (2007) this paper resolved to examine organizational climate and culture as the organizational level antecedents to organizational commitment, while psychological empowerment as personal factor between organizational climate and culture with organizational commitment.
Methodology

The used of reliably validated questionnaire was employed to survey Lecturers of Higher institutions in Borno State. The questionnaires was personally administered to the respondents with the permission of their managements. Multi-stage cluster random sampling was used to select the sample respondent proportionately from the accessible population determined from the respective HEIs. Thus, the unit of analysis in this study consist of both male and female lecturers from all HEIs in Borno State. Based on population size a sample size established according to Cochran (2007) laid down procedures.

Expected Outcome

At the end of the study, the researchers expected to determine the level of lecturers organizational commitment and the influence of organizational and personal factors on lecturers organizational commitment in HEIs in Borno state, Nigeria.
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