



## **Institutional Climate and Management Administrative Commitment as Correlates of Productivity of University Lecturers in Delta State Nigeria**

JOSEPH EFE ANHO

Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

**Abstract.** The purpose of this research is to investigate institution climate and management administrative commitment as correlates of university lecturers' productivity in Delta State Nigeria. The study specifically looked at relationship institution climate and management commitment has on university lecturers' productivity. The population of the study comprised all the 2190 academic staff of universities in Delta State. The research used the stratified sampling technique to sample one federal, one state and one private university each this gives 1808 as the sampled population. To further reduce the sample size to manageable size, the study used the random sampling technique to sample the 19% of the lecturers in Federal University of Petroelum Resources (FUPRE) i.e. 140 out of 722, 17% i.e. 150 from 976 of Delta State University Abraka (DELSU) and 18% i.e. 21 from Novena University, Amai. This gives 311 as the total sample figure made up of only senior lecturers and above who are considered by law to be capable of holding or may have held management position. The instrument for data collection was a self-constructed questionnaire. The instrument was validated by colleagues in the department of Educational Management and Foundations and that of counselling psychology who are specialist in measurement and evaluation. Thus,

the face content and construe validity were ensured. For the content and construct validity the study used 30, i.e. 10 lecturers each selected from the three universities of study who are not part of the sampled respondents for the main study. The Pearson product Moment Correlation ( $r$ ) was used to obtain a reliability coefficient 'r' of 0.79 and 0.77 respectively for the two subscales using the test retest method. The research used the frequency and mean score, and standard deviation to answer the research questions and for the test of hypothesis, the hierarchical present and multiple regressions were used. The results were analyzed and presented on tables. Four research questions were raised as guide and four hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. Among the findings, there was a significance relationship between institutions climate and management administrative commitment, there was significant relationship between institution climate and university lecturers productivity. The research therefore recommended among others that heads of institutions should endeavour to create workable, likeable, stress free, educational conducive, emotional and intellectually safe environment through the promotion of institution-community, emotional and intellectually safe environment through the promotion of institution-community

relationship, provision of current, state of the art instructional materials, team work and the use of feedback mechanism.

**Keywords:** Administration, Institutional Climate, Management Administrative Commitment, Productivity

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background to the Study

Organizational climate has been viewed from many perspective and defined differently in various ways by different people. Heuriegel and Sloutum (1974: 256) sees organizational climate as “a set of attributes that can be perceived about an organization and or it units described by the practices, processes, and ways of dealing with members of the unit and its environment”. More relatedly to this topic is the definition of Hodgetts and Altman (1979:344) as “a set of property of the work environment perceived by individuals who work there and which serve as a major force in influencing their job behaviour”. Peretomode (2014 P 624) summarized these definitions and others and highlighted that organizational climate

- is the perception by members of an organization or school (and sometimes by visitors) which distinguish one from another
- influences the employees (and students) work behaviour and performance in the school
- is a product of formal and informal group characteristics and other factors in the work environment, a product of the interaction between students, teachers and administrators in a school.
- is subjective because it is based on perception.

Greenberg, Weissberg, Uthe O’Brien, Zins, Fredricks, Rezruik and Elias (2003), write on positive school climate as a school environment that allows for the production of students who are culturally literate, intellectually reflective and committed to lifelong learning and high quality education that teaches young people to interact in socially skilled and respectful ways,

to practice positive, safe and healthy behaviours, to contribute ethically and responsibly to their peer groups, family, school and community; and to possess basic competencies, work habits, and values as a foundation for meaningful employment and engage citizenship.

Researches of Cohen, McCabe, Micheki and Pickeral, (2009) show

that positive school climate is a critical dimension of effective risk production, health promotion efforts and learning, interpersonal relationship and the school environment. Similarly, Peretomode (2014: 624) asserts that “organizational climate is directly related to the leadership and management style of the leader, based on the values, attributes, skills, and actions as well as the priorities of the leader”.

### 1.2 The Importance of Organizational / School Climate

The concept of organizational/school climate is important to educational managers and administrators. This is so because according to Peretomode (2014) there is evidence that managers or administrators can influence the climates of their organizations/institutions that some climates are likely to yield better results for specific tasks than others. Therefore an educational administrator will have a difficult time exercising his educational leadership roles without a sufficient supportive climate within which to work. Consequently, improving an organizational/institutional climate can lead to improvement in personal and group relations within the organization. That is the reason Sergioamni and Sturrant, (1979) stress giving importance to organizational climate so as not to limit the total amount of leadership style available in the school.

**Types of school climate:** There are different types of school climates, according to Halpin (1966:174-180) that exist in schools as “open, autonomous, controller, familiar, paternalistic and closed climate”.

**Open climate:** Refers to the openness and authenticity of interaction that exists among the school leadership, students and parents. Hoy and Sabo (1998) describes open climate as reflecting the school leadership and teachers/lecturers

cooperative supportive and receptive attitudes to each other's ideas and then commitment to work. There is high supportiveness, low directive, low hindrance, low disengagement, high collegial relations, and high commitment.

**Autonomous climate:** Portrays an atmosphere where teachers are given a good measure to operate in the school. The leadership models enthusiasm and diligence, no external threat or influence, teachers/lecturers have great desire to work. The relationship among the leadership, teachers/lecturers, student and parents is cordial with staff and students highly motivated to work.

**Controlled climate:** Headship is over emphasized, although workers are committed to work, the leadership often employs direct approach and keeps distance from the seeking students and parents so as to avoid familiarity.

**Familiar climate:** The leadership is mostly concern about maintaining friendly atmosphere at the expense of task accomplishment making the parents, teachers and students not to be committed to the school objective.

**Paternal climate:** This situation when there is a degree of closeness between the principal and teacher, the school head is energetic, considerate but benevolently autocratic.

**Closed climate:** There is lack of commitment and unproductiveness, no emphasis on task accomplishment, the leadership stresses routine, initiate and unnecessary work, the leadership is rigid and controlling, considerate, unsupportive and un-responsible leading to frustration, intolerance and in effectiveness of staff.

### 1.3 Factors that influence the Climate of Organization / School

There are numerous factors that influence the climate of organization such as educational institutions. These can be summarized from the works of Peretomode (2014) likert and likert (1976) Dubrin (1974) Halpin and Crafts (1963) and Forehand (1968).

**Organizational Policy:** Organizational policy whether written or implied create impressions and perception in the organization over a period of time, that is the reason Litwin and Stringer (1968) sees climate as the perceived subjective

effects of the formal system, the attributes, beliefs, values and motivation of people who work in a particular organization.

#### **The size and structure of the organizations**

The size and structure of an organization or an institution determines the climate that prevails. A large institution with many units will certainly have a strict hierarchy divisions which most times is characterized by rigidly, traditionalism and bureaucratic tenderness as against a smaller and less mechanize hierarchy which will be innovative and flexible.

#### **Decision-making practices**

The institutions/organization decision-making practices and process determine its climate. An organization/institution where there is shared or collaborative decision making, creative relationship, commitment of all concerned, there is acceptance of decisions, improved quality of decisions and integration of divergent views. All these reflect positively on the climate of the school. However, some participation or collaboration decision making processes or practices may also negatively affect the climate of the organization according to James (1982) cited in Peretomode (2014) resulting in "group-think" making the staff member develop on illusion of invulnerability, rationality, morality, developing stereotype views, self-censorship from any demiation so as to minimize doubts and counter arguments and have perception of a shared illusion of unanimity concerning judgements to the majority view.

**Values:** The value system in the organization positively or negatively affects the organizational climate, Gibson, et al (1977) noted that an organization which places high value on the welfare of its employees will develop much warmer, friendly climate.

#### **Economic Condition of the Organization**

The economic conditions of an organization reflect its climate. When the economy is good, employees have confidence and are relaxed than when the economy is light, this reflect the non-permanency of organization/institution climate, and an organization/institution climate may reverse to close climate when budget is reduced and the economy worsen.

#### **Technological availability and adequacy**

When technology is available and adequate, teaching is current, available and adequate

making employees work hard, feel satisfied as a result of the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards which reflects on the climate of the organization. The reverse may be the case when technologies are not current, not available or adequate.

**Management Administrative Commitment and Productivity**

Commitment in general refers to ones level of involvement in the organization – it is the outcome in which one agrees with decision or request and makes a great effort to carry out that decision or request. However in relation to the education/school setting, commitment is the administrative effectiveness, dedication and loyalty to leadership responsibility of the institution in achieving its sets of objective through cordial, interpersonal relationship, institutional safety and conducive teaching and learning environment.

Therefore, management administrative commitment calls for taking care of the staff which accordingly increase productivity, improvement in the quality of work; skills, knowledge, understanding and attitudes; enhancement of the use of tools and machine, reduction of waste, accidents, turnover, lateness to work, absenteeism and other overhead costs, elimination of obsolete in skills, technologies, methods, products and capital management. Commenting on benefits of managing academic staff of universities, Igwe and Oragu (2013) noted that it bring incumbents to that level of performance needed for the job; enhance the implementation of new policies and regulations; reposition people for achievement, improve man power development and ensures survival and growth.

Management commitment to staff promotes higher and quality performance through motivating the staff to greater participation in making decision and being part of the implementation of such policies and attainment of institutional objectives. Therefore commitment is related not only to behaviour but also to performance and productivity.

There are various factors which affect organizational/institutional commitment of employees. From the works and researches of Baren and Greenberg (1990), Kanderiberghe, 1996, Benkhof, 1997, and Meyer and Allen 1997, the effects of organizational institutional

commitment of employees can be summarized below:

- The higher the level of responsibility and authority an employee is given, the higher the level of commitment. Job role and promotion opportunities can also enhance or reduce commitment. Age, years of service and gender are employees characteristics that are corollates of commitment. While lack of employment opportunities reduces the level of commitment.
- Positive work environment and organizational structure affect commitment. These include location, physical structure, safety; work practices, management style, less bureaucratic barriers and flexible administrative structure.
- Management administrative commitment can have both negative and positive effect on the institutional climate and productivity of lecturers. This include the strength of an individual involvement in the organization, teachers motivation to work, attitude, including belief and behaviour, and intention towards work. Cohen (2003) states that organizations whose members have higher level of commitment show higher performance and productivity and lower level of absenteeism and tardiness, as it releases their creativity and contributes toward organization development initiative. Researchers such as: Daar, (2010) Perminc, Leaudbeater and Blatt, (2011) Manning and Saddlemine (1996) abound that institutional climate is important to the overall production of teachers and the success of any school.
- Management administrative commitment influence institution climate because according to Babayemi (2006), management (school heads) have the responsibilities of ensuring that facilities are in good shape, even with the meagre resources at their disposal, management have the responsibility of providing teachers'/lecturers and other instructional staff with necessary

resources for effective teaching. Curriculum leadership (2007) noted that great schools (2014) providing meaningful opportunity for professional development commitment of teachers, and using different forms of commitment to build a strong link to school-community- relations, making school a welcoming place for all staff, student and their families.

Dean (2014) supports this by advocating collaboration with staff and school community in decision making and that all stakeholders have opinions and input to provide which should be respected and valued. Therefore, collaboration creates an open, productive, climate which leads to increase in productivity and results.

Consequently, according to Baron and Greenberg (1990), management administrative commitment provide promotional opportunities to enhance/diminish organization commitment low level of responsibility and autonomy of teachers commitment to educational institution decrease teachers belief and acceptance of the goods and values of institution.

#### **1.4 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to investigate the administrative institutional climate and management administrative commitment as correlates of university lecturers productivity in Delta State Nigeria. The study specifically looked at relationship institution climate and management commitment, have on university lecturers productivity.

#### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

The findings of this research will benefit university administrators specifically tertiary institution management and administrators; vice chancellors, provost and rectors as well as secondary and primary school heads. This will make them improve their institutions/colleges/schools' climate for enhanced productivity.

Furthermore, the findings will tremendously help policy makers – Ministry of Education

official on the need to enhance school climate for committed work force. This research would also provide data for future researchers on this and other related areas.

## **2. Methodology**

The population of the study comprised all the 2190 academic staff of universities in Delta State. The research used the stratified sampling technique to sample one federal, one state and one private university each this gives 1808 as the total sampled population. To further reduce the sample size to manageable size, the study used the simple random sampling technique to sample 19% of the lecturers in Federal University of Petroleum Resources Ugbomro - Effurun (FUPRE) i.e. 140 out of 722, 17% i.e. 150 from 976 of Delta State University Abraka (DELSU) and 18% i.e. 21 from Novena University, Amai. This gives 311 as the total sample figure made up of only senior lecturers and above who are considered by law to be capable of holding or to have held management positions.

The instrument for data collection was a self-constructed questionnaire on institution climate, management administrative commitment and productivity of university lecturers in Delta State. The questions contain four (4) sections. Section A is on demographic data such as name of university, status of lecturers, age, experience and highest educational qualification. Section B is on institution climate, section C is on management administrative commitment and section D is on university lecturers productivity. The instrument contains items/statements which respondents reacted to in an adapted 4-point likert type scale. The instrument was validated by colleagues in the department of Educational Administration and that of counselling psychology who are specialist in measurement and evaluation. Thus, the face, content and construct validity were ensured. For the content and construct validity the study used 30, i.e. 10 lecturers each selected from the three universities of study who are not part of the sampled respondents for the main study. The Pearson product Moment Correlation ( $r$ ) was

used to obtain a reliability coefficient ‘r’ of 0.79 and 0.77 respectively for the two subscales using the test re-test method. The questionnaire was administered and collected immediately with the help of two research assistants. Thus, 100% return rate was ensured. The research used the frequency and mean score, and standard deviation to answer the research questions and for the test of hypothesis, the hierarchical preset and multiple regressions were used. The results were analyzed and presented on tables.

**3. Research Questions**

- What is the relationship between institution climate and management administrative commitment of university lecturers
- What is the relationship between institution climate and university lecturers productivity
- What is the relationship between management administrative

commitment and university lecturers productivity

- What is the relationship between institution climate, management administrative commitment and university lecturers productivity

**4. Hypothesis**

**Ho1:** There is no significant relationship between institution climate and management administrative commitment.

**Ho2:** There is no significant relationship between institution climate and university lecturers’ productivity

**Ho3:** There is no significant relationship between management administrative commitment and university lecturers’ productivity

**Ho4:** There is no significant relationship between institution climate, management administrative commitment and university lecturers’ productivity.

**5. Presentation of Data**

**Research Question 1:** What is the relationship between institution climate and management administrative commitment

**Ho1:** There is no significant relationship between institution climate and management administrative commitment of university lecturer.

**Table I:** Descriptive and regression analysis of institution climate and management administrative commitment of university lecturers

Sources of variance	n	r	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	SS	Df	Ms	F	Sig
Regression	311	.761	.579	.577	22025.292	1	22025.292	424.268	.000
Residual					16041.306	309	51.914	-424.268	P<.05
Total					38066.590	310			

	Unstandardized coefficients	Unstandardized coefficient			
Model	B	Std	Beta	t	Sig
1. (Constant)	6.410	1.971		3.253	.001
Institution Climate	1.756	.085	.761	20.598	.000

Predictors (Constant): Institution climate

Dependent Variable: Management Administrative Commitment

From the table above, institution climate highly correlated with management administrative commitment with  $r = .761$  while  $R^2 = .579$  was found significant at  $F(1,309) = 424, 268 P < .05$ . The adjusted R-square of .557 indicates that institutional climate contributed 57.7% variance to management administrative commitment. The standardized beta coefficient of .761 also showed that institution climate contributed significantly to management administrative commitment. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This inferred that there was a significant relationship between institution climate and management administrative commitment of university lecturers.

**Research Question 2:** What is the relationship between institution climate and productivity of university lecturers?

**Ho2:** There is no significant relationship between institution climate and university lecturers productivity

**Table II:** Descriptive and regression analysis of institution climate and productivity of university lecturers

Sources of variance	of	n	r	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	SS	Df	Ms	F	Sig
Regression		311	.424	.180	.177	6835.207				
Residual						31231.391	1	6835.207	67.627	.000
Total						38066.590	309	101.072		P<.05

	Unstandardized coefficients		Unstandardized coefficient		
Model	B	Std	Beta	t	Sig
1. (Constant)	26.879	2.408		11.162	.000
Institution Climate	.412	.050	.424	8.224	.000

Predictors (Constant): Institution climate

Dependent Variable: University lecturers' productivity

The result from table 2 above, shows  $r = .434$ . The  $R^2$  of .180 was significant at  $F(1,309) = 67.627$   $P < .05$ . The adjusted  $R^2$  of .177 indicates institution climate contributed 17.7% to the variance of lecturers productivity. The standard beta value of .424 shows that institution climate contributed significantly to university lecturers' productivity. It therefore means that institution climate is significantly and highly correlated to university lecturers' productivity. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

**Research Question 3:** What is the relationship between management administrative commitment and university lecturers' productivity?

**Ho3:** There is no significant relationship between management administrative commitment and university lecturers' productivity

**Table III:** Descriptive regression analysis of the relationship between management administrative commitment and university lecturers' productivity

Sources of variance	of	n	r	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	SS	Df	Ms	F	Sig
Regression		311	.069	.005	.002	182.144				
Residual						37884.454	1	182.144		
Total						38066.590	309	122.603	1.486	.224
							310			P < .05

	Unstandardized coefficients		Unstandardized coefficient		
Model	B	Std	Beta	t	Sig
1. (Constant)	45.778	.688		66.533	.000
Management Administrative Commitment	2.051	1.683	.069	1.219	.224

Predictors (Constant): Management Administrative Commitment

Dependent Variable: University Lecturers Productivity

The result in table 3 shows that management administrative commitment  $r = 0.69$ , while  $R^2$  of .005 at  $F(1,309) = 1.486$   $P < .05$  was not significant. With the adjusted  $r^2$  of .002 indicates that management administrative commitment contributed only .2% to the variance of university lecturers productivity this shows that there is a relationship which was not significant, therefore the null hypothesis of no significance was therefore accepted.

**Table IV:** Descriptive and regression analysis of the relationship between institution climate management administrative commitment and university lecturers productivity

Sources of variance	n	r	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	SS	Df	Ms	F	Sig
Regression	311	.791 <sup>a</sup>	.625	.623	23809.607	2	11904.803	257.185	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual					14256.991	308	46.289		
Total					38066.598	310			

**Regression Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Unstandardized coefficient		
	B	Std	Beta	t	Sig
1. (Constant)	.493	2.168		-.227	.820
Institution Climate	1.608	.084	.696	19.150	.000
Management Administrative Commitment	.220	.035	.226	6.209	.000

Predictors (Constant): Institution Administrative Management Administrative Commitment  
 Dependent Variable: University Lecturers Productivity

The result in table iv shows that institution climate and management administrative commitment are highly related to university lecturers productivity with  $r = .791$ , while  $R^2$  of .625 is significant at  $F(2,308) = 257.185$ ,  $P < .05$  the adjusted  $R^2$  of .623 also indicates that the two (2) independent variables i.e. institution climate, and management administrative variables accounted for 62% variance in university lecturers productivity. This indicates that there existed a very high significant relationship. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

**6. Discussion of Results**

The first finding arose from the test of hypothesis one and provides answer to research question one; that there is a high correlation between institution climate and management administrative commitment of university lecturers. This agrees with Moorhead and Griffin (2001) who contends that school climate can be manipulated to positively affect the behaviour of people connected with the school. In the same vein, from Allen (2003) and Cotton (2004), organizational climate is said to be a meaningful construct with significant implications for understanding human behaviour, as climate can

potentially influence an individual’s behaviour in the organization/institution. Such human behaviour can be said to be management administrative commitment. This finding is also supportive of Peretomode (2014) when he emphasized that management administrative commitment reflects the persisting school climate which is also described as the institutional heads dedication and administrative effectiveness in promoting school peace and safety, collaborative interpersonal relationship, collective decision making, and conducive teaching and learning environment.

When school institution climate is conducive, and healthy, when there is fairness and equality, sense of belonging and motivation, staff potentials will be maximized and utilized for productive outcome.

The second finding indicates that there is a significant relationship between institution climate and university lecturers productivity. This supports the works of Allen (1997 and 2003), Greenberg, Weissberg, Utter O’Brien, Zins Fredricks, Rezenth and Elias (2003) and Peretomode (2014) that organizational institutional climate is directly related to the leadership and management style and commitment. This is seen in the improvement in

the quality of work, skills, knowledge, attitude, understanding, reduction of waste, turnover and overhead cost. Positive institution climate foster teamwork according to Cohen (2003) team work serves better in teaching, and learning and creates effectiveness and efficiency in the classroom. Team spirit arising from institution climate increases the school head and lecturers competency in job, as a result of the prevailing friendly, aesthetic physical environment, cordial and collegial relationship.

The third finding indicates that there is a relationship which was not significant between management administrative commitment and university lecturers' productivity. Management administrative commitment contributes only 2% to the variance of university lecturers' productivity. This finding supports the research of Ayeni (2012) which noted that management administrative commitment of school is not the major factor which affects staff productivity but other principal variables such as poor condition of infrastructure, inadequate instructional materials, poor financial support and low commitment of parents to their children's education and low number of teachers engaged in research to improve curriculum delivery affects productivity.

Management administrative commitment of school heads, which emphasizes production according to Itlpin (1966:151) make them to be rigid. However, Silver (1983:183) asserted that production emphasis ranges from "very strong to no emphasis". Therefore, any school management administrator who emphasizes production very strongly believes that people work best under tension and pressure which is not healthy for school climate.

Similarly, Holpin (1966), Hoy and Tarher (1997) found out low supportive, high directive and low engaged (school head) principal behaviour shows low commitment which is an attribute of closed and unhealthy organizational/institution climate which reflects on the output of such organization or institution.

The fourth finding reveals that there is significant relationship between institution

climate, management administrative commitment and university lecturers' productivity. The two variables: institution climate and management administrative commitment accounted for 62% variance in university lecturers' productivity. Therefore, education institution climate is significantly related to management administrative commitments as seen from the writings of Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991) which reveals that there are two dimensions of management administrative commitment such as school heads leadership aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration and these lead to teachers/lecturers poor dimensional behaviour – disengagement hindrance, esprit and intimacy, therefore climate of the school and the productivity of staff. While low level of crimes, less fear, less behaviour problem, cooperation, commitment, respect, trust, tolerance, better atmosphere, leads to achievement, efficiency, effectiveness and productivity.

## 7. Conclusion

This research revealed among some others that there is positive significant relationship between positive institutional climate, management administrative commitment and university lecturers productivity.

This research has also shown that school heads/administrators could promote institution/school climate or destroy it through their administrative endeavour, style, disposition or indisposition seen in some challenges such as division and non-cooperative stance, tension, unresponsiveness, assault, intimidation, rigidity, disorderliness, lack of trust, disrespect, higher behaviour problems, inefficiency, in-effectiveness and eventually less productiveness.

Therefore, institution climate needs good management administrative commitment so as to be productive arising from provision of sufficient instructional supervision, quality infrastructure, equipment and facilities, welcoming and conducive school culture and relationship which makes the output of such institution productive.

## 8. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were offered:

Heads of institutions should endeavour to create a workable, likeable, stress free, educational conducive, emotional and intellectually safe environment. This can also be done through promotion of institution – community relationship, provision of current state of the art instructional materials, team work, staff and student centered development plans, taking care of staff needs and interest, collective decision making and the use of feedback mechanism. These have been known to be a two way traffic i.e. creating a positive climate promotes good management administrative commitment which in turn produce, positive climate with the overall effect of high productivity while negative climate creates the opposites.

## References

- Allen, D.K. (2003). Organizational Climate and Strategic Change in Higher Education: Organizational Insecurity. *Higher Education*. 46(1).
- Ayeni, A.J. (2012). The Heart of Leadership. *Educational Administration*, 58(4).
- Babayemi, A. (2006). Principals in J.B. Babalola, a. O. Ayeni, S.O. Adedeji, A.A. Suleiman and M.O. Arikewuyo (eds) *Educational Management: Thoughts and Practice*. Ibadan: Codat Publications. 242-261. *European Journal of Educational Studies* 2(3), 2010 192.
- Babayemi, B.A. (2006). *Principals in J.B. Babalola A.O., O.S. Ayeni, S.O. Adedeji, A. A. Suleiman & M.O. Arijewuyo (Eds.). Educational Management: Thoughts and Practice*. Codat Publishers, Ibadan.
- Baron, R.A., & Greenberg J. (1990). Behaviour in organization (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). London: ally and Bacon.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997). Ignoring commitment is costly: New approaches to establish the missing link between commitment and performance. *Human Relations*, 26(2). 701-72.
- Cohen, A. (2003). Multiple Commitment in the Work Place: An Integration Approach. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Cohen, J. McCabe, E.M. Michelli, N.M. & Pickeral T. (2009). School Climate Research Policy Teacher Education and Practice, *Teachers College Record*, 111 (1), 180-213. Retrieved from <http://www.tere.cord.org/content.asp?contentid=15220>.
- Cohen, P.S. (2003). Value Leadership: The 7 Principles that drive corporate value in any economy. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Cotton, K. (1996). *School size, school climate and student performance* (school improvement research series, close-up No. 20) Portland or: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Cotton, P. (2004). Developing an optimal organization climate. Paper presented at Towards Australia's Safest Workplaces, Australia.
- Daar, S.E. (2010). School, Climate Teacher Satisfaction and Receptivity to Change. Luiz Carvalho, Indiana.
- Dean, (2004, January 3). Quality of a good principal teaching and learning Edubabbling for the Masses. Retrieved from [www.edubabbling.com/qualities-of-a-good-principal/](http://www.edubabbling.com/qualities-of-a-good-principal/)
- Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional learning communities at work: best practices for enhancing student's achievement. National Educational Service: Indiana.
- Greenberg, M.T. Weissberg, R.P. Utne O'Brien, M. Zins, J.E., Frederick, L., Resnik, H., Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional and academic learning. *American Psychologist*, 58(6/7): 466-474. Doi: 10.1037/0003-066x:58.6-7.466.
- Halpin A. & Croft, D. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

- Halpin, A.W. (1966). *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: Macmillian.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slotum, J.W. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies. *Academic Management Journal*, 17(2).
- Hoy, W.K. & Sabo, D.J. (1998). *Quality Middle School: Open and Healthy Climate* California Corwin Press Inc.
- Hoy, W.K. & Tarter, C.J. (1997). *The road to open and healthy schools. A Handbook for Change, Middle and Secondary School Edition*. California: Corwin Press Inc.
- Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J. & Kottkamp, R.B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: measuring organizational climate*. London: Sage Publication.
- Kottkamp, R.B., Mulhern, J.A. & Hoy, W.K. (1987). Secondary School Climate: A Revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 23(3).
- Litwin, G.H. & Stringer, R.A. Jr. (1968). *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Manning, M.L. & Saddlemire, R. (1996). Developing a sense of community in Secondary Schools. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*. (NASSP) Bulletin, 80 (58) 41-48.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1984). Testing the side best theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and applications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Moorhead, G. & Griffin R.W. (2001). *Organizational behaviour: Managing people and organizations*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Peretomode V.F. (2014). *Theories of Management: Implications for Educational Administration*. University Printing Press, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.
- Sackney, L. (2007). *Enhancing School Learning Climate: Theory, Research and Practice*. Retrieved on September 27, 2007, from [http://saskschoolboard.ca/research/school\\_improvement/180.htm](http://saskschoolboard.ca/research/school_improvement/180.htm).
- Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climates: An essay. *Personnel Psychology*. 28.
- Vandenberghe, C. (1996). Assessing organizational commitment in a Belgian Context: Evidence for the three – dimensional model. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 45, 371-386.
- Zaffane, R. (1994). Patterns of organizational commitment and perceived management style: A comparison of public and privates sectors employees: *Human Relations*, 47, 977-1010.