PROCEEDINGS OF THE 14th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

Tuesday, 12th & Wednesday, 13th July, 2016

Theme: The Role of Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs) in Sustainable Development

Held at African Union Conference Centre, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Editor: **Prof. Olugbemiro Jegede.**

Are Organisational Characteristics Antecedents of Employee Commitment? Evidence using Academic Staff in Private Universities in Uganda by Wilson Mugizi, Fred E. K. Bakkabulindi and Ronald Bisaso

Makerere University, Uganda

Abstract

The study sought to find out whether organisational structure, leadership, relationships and support were antecedents of the employee commitment (EC) of the academic staff. The correlational study involved 173 respondents from three private universities in Uganda. Data were collected using a questionnaire whose validity and reliability were tested using Factor Analysis and Cronbach Alpha. Means were used for descriptive analysis, while multiple regression helped to test the hypotheses. Results showed that organisational leadership and support were significant positive antecedents of EC, while organisational structure and employee relationships were not. This led to the conclusion that the two positive antecedents were most likely essential requirements for the EC of the academic staff in private universities to their jobs, while organisational structure and employee relationships may not be. Hence the recommendation those stakeholders such as the directorates of human resource in the respective universities, promote good organisational leadership and support in order to enhance the EC of the academic staff.

Keywords: Academic staff, employee commitment, organisational characteristics, private university, regression, Uganda.

Introduction

Employee commitment (EC) which refers to the bond between an employee to an organisation, or loyalty to, and identification with the organisation (Johnson, 2015), may manifest itself in different ways. EC may be seen in the desire of an employee to remain in the organisation (affective commitment), the need to remain in the organisation (continuance commitment) or the mind-set of an obligation to remain in the organisation (normative commitment) (Mercurio, 2015). EC is an important factor of organisational outcomes and performance. Committed employees are more likely to engage in productive behaviours (Islam, Ahmad, Ali, Ahmed & Bowra, 2013) because they are less likely to be tardy, absent and will have higher in-role performance (Arshadia, 2011) putting more effort to their work (van den Hooff & De Ridder, 2004). Committed employees are also less likely to leave the organisation (Islam et al., 2013) and are willing to share their knowledge because of the trust they have in both management and co-workers and because EC may engender beliefs that the organisation has rights to the information and knowledge one has created or acquired (van den Hooff & De Ridder, 2004).

Committed employees also develop satisfaction with their jobs because EC has a soothing and positive effect on job satisfaction and employees who feel a low level of commitment have job dissatisfactions (Şahin, Akyürek & Yavuz, 2014). Owing to the significance of EC to organisations, various studies (e.g. Al-Qatawneh, 2014; Brunetto, Shriberg et al. 2013; Casper, Harris, Taylor-Bianco & Wayne, 2011; Holagh, Noubar & Bahador, 2014; Tyssen, Wald & Heidenreich, 2014)

have been committed to establishing its antecedents. However, as those studies suggest, there has been a bias of those studies towards the West and Asia, thus excluding the developing world context of Africa. To reduce this gap, this paper reports on a survey on the EC of academic staff in private universities in Uganda linking the EC with the characteristics of the organisation (university), in which a given academic staff served.

Organisational characteristics refer to physical and social factors within the boundaries of the organisation and the interpersonal relations of members and their interactions with each other (Nguyen, 2011).Organisational characteristics originate from the management model adopted by the organisation, through its structure or strategy, and from the company culture embodied in the nature of its membership and relationships (Said, Abdullah & Mohamed, 2014). The theory underpinning the study was the Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) theory. LMX theory holds that constraints on the supervisor's time and resources limit the number of high-quality exchange associations the supervisor can form with subordinates. The supervisor thus identifies a core group of subordinates (Eisenberger et al., 2010) with whom he or she develops close relationships through a series of work-related exchanges. Members in exchange relationships with their leaders are given more freedom, better job assignments, and increased opportunities to work with their leaders. In return, LMX-partners reciprocate with a greater expenditure of time and effort and higher commitment (Leow & Khong, 2009). LMX suggests that when a leader of an organisation such as university provides a favourable organisational structure, leadership, good relationships and support to a core group of subordinates, the subordinates become committed. Therefore, the objective of this study was to find out whether organisational characteristics were antecedents of the EC of the academic staff in private universities in Uganda. The organisational characteristics considered were organisational structure, leadership, employee relationships and organisational support.

Background

Organisational Structure and Employee Commitment.

The term organisational structure (OS) refers to the formal configuration between individuals and groups regarding the allocation of tasks, responsibilities and authority within the organisation (Lunenburg, 2012). OS is the starting point for organising which includes roles and positions, hierarchical levels and spans of accountability, and mechanism for problem solving and integration (Maduenyi, Oke & Fadeyi, 2015). OS comprises elements of formalisation, complexity and centralisation (Shafaee, Rahnama, Alaei & Jasour, 2012). Formalisation indicates the extent to which job tasks are defined by formal regulations and procedures (Al-Qatawneh, 2014). Complexity refers to the inter-organisational separation limits. Complexity is the specialisation, division of labour and the amount of levels in the organisational hierarchy (Kermani, 2013). On the other hand, centralisation or hierarchy of authority, refers to the number of role incumbents who participate in decision making and the number of areas in which they participate (Lunenburg, 2012).

Several studies (e.g. Al-Qatawneh, 2014; Ansari & Valiyan, 2015; Holagh, Noubar & Bahador, 2014) related organisational structure to employee commitment (EC). However, from the above studies some gaps emerge. For example, whereas Al-Qatawneh (2014) and Ansari and Valiyan (2015) established that a positive relationship existed only between formalisation and complexity

(standardisation) and organisational commitment, Holagh et al. (2014) established a relationship with all the dimensions of organisational structure including centralisation. Besides, as the above studies suggest, there are few studies in the African context and in the sector of universities. The gaps in the above studies thus suggested the need for this study in the universities in Uganda to test the hypothesis that:

H1: Organisational structure was an antecedent of EC of the academic staff in private universities.

Leadership and Employee Commitment.

Leadership is the process by which an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Cummings, MacGregor, Davey, Wong, Lo, Muise & Stafford, 2009). The influence of leadership can be categorised into two approaches, namely; people oriented and task oriented. The people or relationship oriented approach focuses on people and relationships to achieve the common goal, and the task oriented approach focuses on the tasks to be accomplished (McCallum & O'Connell, 2008). Cummings et al. (2009) suggest that approaches that focus on people and relationships to achieve the common goal include the transformational leadership, individualised consideration and resonant leadership. On the other hand, task focused (non-relationally focused) leadership approaches are primarily management by exception, laissez-faire, transactional leadership, dissonant leadership styles, and instrumental leadership.

Studies on organisational leadership and employee commitment (e.g. Acar, 2012; Kim and Kim, 2015; Raja & Palanichamy, 2011; Selamat, Nordin & Adnan, 2013; Tyssen, Wald & Heidenreich, 2014) can be cited. However, contextual and empirical gaps emerge from such studies. At the contextual level, the above studies suggest a bias toward Western World (e.g. see Acar, 2012; Tyssen et al., 2014), and the East (e.g. see Raja & Palanichamy, 2011; Selamat et al. 2013). At the empirical level, there are controversies too. For example, whereas the study by Raja and Palanichamy (2011) revealed a significant positive correlation between the transformational leadership and organisational commitment but not transactional leadership, the study by Tyssen et al. (2014) established that both transactional and transformational leadership behaviours significantly positively influenced the followers' commitment. The above gaps indicated the need in the context of private universities in Uganda to test the hypothesis:

H2: Organisational leadership was an antecedent of the EC of academic staff in private universities.

Employee Relationships and Employee Commitment.

Employee relations refer to connection between employees with the organisation and with each other (Sundaray, Sahoo & Tripathy, 2010). Holtzhausen and Fourie (2011) indicate that good relationships exist when there is trust, that is when one party has confidence in the partner's reliability and integrity; control mutuality that is when the organisation and its employees take each other into account; commitment which entails that the parties involved feel that the relationship is worth spending energy on; and level of relationship satisfaction, that is when the parties are happy because of the interactions and reaping benefits from the relationship, and employees feel they are important to the organisation. Quite a number of studies (e.g. Brunetto, Shriberg et al., 2013; Brunetto, Xerri et al., 2013; Morrison, 2004) relate employee relationships to employee commitment. However, the contexts in which the above studies were carried out suggest a bias toward the Western World and to other sectors such as the medical one and not the educational

sector. These gaps therefore made it necessary for this study to seek to ascertain in the context of private universities in Uganda the hypothesis that:

H3: Organisational relationships were antecedents of the EC of academic staff in private universities.

Organisational support and Employee Commitment.
Organisational support concerns discretionary practices which the organisation is not obligated to offer that imply organisational caring and commitment towards the wellbeing of the employees but not made compulsory by company policy, union contract or laws of the country (for example, career development opportunities and work/family support) and organisational recognition for the employee's contribution. This organisational support is interpreted by employees as indicative of commitment to them by the organisation's high level of caring and concern. In return, employees will reciprocate this kind deed by increasing their own commitment to the organisation by being highly involved in the organisation and showing their willingness to work hard to accomplish the organisation's goals (Lew, 2011).

Studies (e.g. Arshadi, 2011; Arshadi & Hayavi, 2013; Casper, Harris, Taylor-Bianco & Wayne, 2011; O'Donnell, Ananda, Jayawardana & Jayakody, 2012) relate organisational support to employee commitment. Gaps still can be found from studies presented above. For example, the studies were skewed in countries outside the developing context of Africa. The studies by Arshadi (2011), Arshadi and Hayavi (2013) and O'Donnell et al. (2012) were carried out in the Asian context. On the other hand the study by Casper et al. (2011) was carried out in the South American context. This gap made it imperative in the context of private universities in Uganda to test the hypothesis that:

H4: Organisational support was an antecedent of EC of academic staff in private universities.

Method

Data Collection Tool.
Using the quantitative paradigm, specifically the survey design, data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) - appended. The SAQ comprised three sections, namely A through C. Section A was on the background characteristics of the respondents with questions on the respondent's university, position on first appointment in the university, current appointment in the university, age group, sex, highest level of education, tenure of service, and position in the hierarchy of the university. Sections B and C were on the dependent and independent variables (DV and IVs) respectively, and were developed basing on instruments already used by other scholars basing on the premise that their validities and reliabilities could be taken for granted initially. Section B on the DV (employee commitment) covered three aspects namely affective, continuance and normative commitment (with seven items for affective at α = 0.87, five items for continuance at α = 0.75 and six items for normative at α = 0.79 all adopted from Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Section C was on the IVs (organisational characteristics) and covered four variables namely; organisational structure (six items, with four items adapted from Schminke, Cropanzano & Rupp, 2002: α = 0.73 and two from Hansen & Hřst, 2012: α = 0.52); organisational leadership (nine items adapted from Kanste, Miettunen & Kyngäs, 2007: α = 0.78 - 0.93); employee relationships (seven items adapted from Dilber, Bayyurt, Zaim & Tarim, 2005: α = 0.8209); and organisational support (seven items adapted from Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986: α = 0.97). The validity of the instruments was also guaranteed basing on the ground that an instrument cannot be valid unless it is reliable (Hee, 2014). However, still after data collection, the respective items were subjected to confirmatory factors analysis and reliability test to reconfirm validity and reliability. The results the results of this analysis are given in appropriate sections of section 4 (Results).

Participants

Data were collected from 173 respondents from three private universities. The sample size was attained using two-stage sampling whereby in the first stage, the universities were clustered according to regions, Central, East, North and West. In stage two, the universities were stratified according to status, selecting only the chartered because they satisfied the conditions of a fully fledged university in Uganda. In the Central Region, Kampala International and Ndejje were selected representing the new and old universities respectively. From the Eastern Region, Islamic University in Uganda (IUIU) the only private chartered one in the region was selected. From the Northern and Western Regions no private university was chosen there from since the two regions by the time of sampling had no private chartered universities.

Data Management

The data analysis was done at two levels, namely univariate and multivariate levels. The data analysis at univariate level was based on percentages and means. Validity and reliability of data on multi-item constructs were ascertained using factor analysis and Cronbach alpha respectively. At the multivariate level, a predictive model was built by regressing the numerical index on the dependent variable (DV) on the numerical indexes of the four respective independent variables (IVs). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) facilitated the data analysis.

Results

Background Characteristics of the Respondents.

The data on background characteristics of the respondents in the study in Table 1 show that a typical respondent was a staff of Islamic University in Uganda, IUIU (45.7%); first appointed in the current university as a Teaching Assistant/ Assistant Lecturer (61.8%) and currently serving as a Lecturer (47.4%). The typical respondent was aged 30 but below 40 years (54.9%); a male (56.5%); holding a masters degree (68.6%) as the highest qualification; married (75.1%); having served between five and 10 years in the current university (43.9%); and strictly an academic staff (79.4%).

Table 1: Respondents Background Characteristics

Item	Categories	Frequency	Percent

Name of the University a respondent worked in	Islamic University in Uganda	79	45.7
	Kampala International University	67	38.7
	Ndejje University	27	15.6
	Total	173	100.0
Position of the respondent on first appointment to the current University	Teaching Assistant/ Assistant Lecturer	107	61.8
	Lecturer	61	35.3
	Senior Lecturer	4	2.3
	Associate Professor	1	0.6
	Total	173	100.0
Current appointment of the respondent in the current University	Teaching Assistant/ Assistant Lecturer	77	44.5
	Lecturer	82	47.4
	Senior Lecturer	13	7.5
	Associate Professor	1	0.6
	Total	173	100.0
Age group of the respondent in years	Up to 30 years	43	24.9
	30 but below 40	95	54.9
	40 and above	35	20.2
	Total	173	100.0
Sex of the respondent	Male	95	56.5
	Female	73	43.5
	Total	168	100.0
Highest level of education attained by the respondent	Bachelor's degree	22	12.8
	Post graduate diploma	9	5.2
	Master's degree	118	68.6
	PhD degree	23	13.4
	Total	172	100.0
Marital status of the respondent	Single never married	36	20.8
	Married	130	75.1

	Widowed	7	4.0
	Total	173	100.0
Tenure in years of employment attained by the respondent in the current University	Up to one	10	5.8
	One but below five	66	38.2
	Five but below 10	76	43.9
	10 and above	21	12.1
	Total	173	100.0
Position of the respondent in the hierarchy of current University	Administrative position (e.g. Principal of a college, Dean of a faculty, Head of institute, Head of dept)	35	20.6
	Strictly academic	135	79.4
	Total	170	100.0

The Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment.

The dependent variable, DV, employee commitment (EC) was broken into three components, namely; affective (AC), continuance (CC) and normative (NC). All the items under each component were scaled using the five-point Likert scale from a minimum of 1 for the worst case scenario (strongly disagree) to a maximum of 5, which is the best case scenario (Strongly agree). Table 2 gives the resultant respective means, factors and Cronbach alphas. Therein it is illustrated that the respondents overall rated themselves highest on the first component of EC, namely AC (overall mean = 3.74 ≈ 4, corresponding to Agree); while they rated themselves averagely on the other two respective components of EC, namely CC and NC (overall means = 3.04 and 3.28 ≈ 3, corresponding to Undecided). Further according to Table 2, Factor Analysis suggested that the items on each of the three components of AC could be reduced to only one factor, with the respective three factors having eigenvalues of 4.642, 3.123 and 2.703 respectively.

The respective three factors explained over 66%, over 62%, and over 45% of the joint variation in the respective items constituting a factor. Considering a factor loading which was at least 0.5 as strong (Beavers, Lounsbury, Richards, Huck, Skolits & Esquivel, 2013), Table 2 suggests that each item loaded highly on the corresponding factor, meaning that all items were valid measures of the corresponding constructs (AC, CC & NC). Finally Table 2 illustrates that the Cronbach alphas of 0.914, 0.839 and 0.749 for the respective components of AC were above the recommended 0.7 (Hee, 2014). This means that each cluster of items was a reliable measure of the corresponding constructs (AC, CC & NC). Finally, an average index of EC from all the items of the three aspects namely, affective (AC), continuance (CC) and normative (NC), had an overall mean = 3.39 meaning that overall the respondents were non-committal about their levels of job commitment.

Table 2: Means, Factors and Cronbach Alphas on Components of Employee Commitment

Constructs	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on AC	Cronbach (α)
a) AC				
AC1	4.03	3.74	0.823	0.914
AC2	3.72		0.779	
AC3	3.47		0.755	
AC4	3.76		0.849	
AC5	3.72		0.793	
AC6	3.73		0.851	
AC7	3.74		0.845	
Eigenvalue			4.642	
% variance			66.310	
b) CC	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on CC	Cronbach (α)
CC1	3.06	3.04	0.763	0.839
CC2	2.92		0.840	
CC3	2.93		0.897	
CC4	2.83		0.872	
CC5	3.46		0.521	
Eigenvalue			3.123	
% variance			62.458	
c) NC	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on NC	Cronbach (α)
NC1	2.97	3.28	0.566	0.749
NC2	3.97		0.670	
NC3	3.10		0.717	
NC4	3.79		0.738	
NC5	2.76		0.602	
NC6	3.13		0.716	
Eigenvalue			2.703	
% variance			45.054	

AC = Continuance Commitment, CC = Continuance Commitment, NC = Continuance Commitment

The independent Variables.

The independent variables (IVs) in the study were four constructs that defined organisational characteristics, namely; organisational structure (OS), leadership (OL), relationships (OR) and support (OSup). All the items under each component were scaled using the five-point Likert scale from a minimum of 1 for the worst case scenario (strongly disagree) to a maximum of 5, which was the best case scenario (Strongly agree). Table 3 gives the resultant respective means, factors and Cronbach alphas. Therein it is illustrated that the respondents overall rated themselves averagely on all the four respective IVs, namely OS, OL, OR and OSup (overall means = 3.39, 3.14, 2.98 and 3.06 ≈ 3, corresponding to undecided). Further according Table 3, Factor Analysis suggested that the items on each of the four IVs could be reduced to only one factor, with the respective four factors having eigenvalues of 3.576, 5.417, 3.936 and 5.002 respectively.

The respective four factors explained almost 60%, over 60%, almost 66% and over 71% of the joint variation in the respective items constituting a factor. Considering a factor loading of at least 0.5 as high (Beavers et al., 2013), Table 2 suggests that each item loaded highly on the corresponding factor, meaning that all items on the four IVs were valid measures of the corresponding construct (OS, OL, OR & OSup). Finally, Table 2 illustrates that the Cronbach alphas of 0.859, 0.927, 0.895 and 0.933 for the respective IVs were above the recommended 0.7 (Hee, 2014). This means that each cluster of items was a reliable measure of the corresponding constructs (OS, OL, OR & OSup).

Table 3: Means, Factors and Cronbach Alphas on the Organisational Characteristics

Constructs	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on OS	Cronbach (α)
a) OS				
OS1	3.64	3.39	0.500	0.859
OS2	3.43		0.863	
OS3	3.68		0.802	
OS4	3.47		0.834	
OS5	2.95		0.807	
OS6	3.14		0.771	
Eigenvalue			3.576	
% variance			59.603	
b) OL	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on OL	Cronbach (α)
OL1	2.78	3.14	0.708	0.927
OL2	3.27		0.828	
OL3	3.15		0.802	
OL4	3.02		0.807	
OL5	3.18		0.849	
OL6	3.20		0.823	
OL7	3.77		0.712	
OL8	3.06		0.813	
OL9	2.81		0.813	
Eigenvalue			5.417	
% variance			60.188	
c) OR	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on OR	Cronbach (α)
OR1	3.05	2.98	0.793	0.895
OR2	3.06		0.822	
OR3	2.88		0.797	
OR4	2.84		0.809	
OR5	3.12		0.791	

OR6		2.96		0.845	
Eigenvalue				3.936	
% variance				65.602	
d)	OSup	Mean	Overall Mean	Factors on OR	Cronbach (α)
OSup1		3.40	3.06	0.863	0.933
OSup2		3.18		0.876	
OSup3		2.90		0.882	
OSup4		2.97		0.841	
OSup5		2.76		0.801	
OSup6		2.79		0.823	
OSup7		3.36		0.827	
Eigenvalue				5.002	
% variance				71.462	

OS = Organisational structure, OL = Organisational leadership, OR = Organisational relationships, OSup = Organisational support.

Regression Model for Predicting Employee Commitment using the Organisational Characteristics.

To establish whether the organisational characteristics predicted the employee commitment (EC) of the respondents, the dependent variable (DV) namely, EC was regressed against the independent variables, IVs (organisational characteristics), and the pertinent results are in Table 4.

Table 4: Regression of Employee Commitment on Organisational Characteristics

Organisational Characteristic	Standardised Coefficient β	Significance p
Organisational Structure	0.062	0.253
Organisational Leadership	0.189	0.018
Employee Relationships	-0.002	0.976
Organisational Support	0.217	0.001
Adjusted R^2 = 0.462		
F = 35.983, p = 0.000		

The results in Table 4 show that, the four organisational characteristics explained 46.2% of the variation in EC (adjusted $R^2 = 0.462$). This means that 53.8% of the variation was accounted for by extraneous variables, that is, other factors not considered in this study. The regression model was very good/ significant ($F = 35.983$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). Of the four organisational characteristics, only two namely organisational leadership and support were positive antecedents of employee commitment ($p < 0.05$) while organisational structure and employee relationships were not ($p > 0.05$). Thus H2 and H4 were upheld, while H1 and H3 were not supported. Of the two significant antecedents, organisational support ($\beta = 0.338$) was more significant than organisational leadership ($\beta = 0.256$).

Discussion

The first hypothesis (H1) proposing that, organisational structure was an antecedent of employee commitment (EC) was not supported. This finding which was inconsistent with the finding by Holagh et al. (2014) was partly consistent with the finding Al-Qatawneh (2014) and Ansari and Valiyan (2015) that found out that the centralisation aspect of organisational structure was not a significant correlate of EC. Therefore, the finding in this study of ours adds to the controversy of whether indeed organisational structure is an antecedent of EC. The second hypothesis (H2) to the effect that organisational leadership was an antecedent of EC was supported. This finding concurred with the findings of other previous scholars such as Acar (2012); Tyssen et al. (2014); Raja and Palanichamy (2011); and Selamat et al. (2013). The finding in our study concretises the assertion that good leadership attracts EC. The third hypothesis (H3) that organisational relationships were antecedents of EC was rejected. This finding was contrary to the findings of previous scholars (e.g. Brunetto, Shriberg et al., 2013; Brunetto, Xerri et al., 2013; Morrison, 2004) who indicated existence of a significant positive relationship. Therefore, our finding adds to the controversy of whether indeed organisational relationships are an antecedent of EC. The fourth hypothesis (H4) that organisational support was an antecedent of EC was accepted. This finding was consistent with Arshadi (2011); Arshadi and Hayavi (2013); Casper et al. (2011); and. Since organisational leadership and support were significant positive antecedents of EC of academic staff in private universities, it is hence recommended that relevant stakeholders such as the directorates of human resource in the respective private universities, promote good organisational leadership and support in order to enhance the EC of the academic staff. And the finding that organisational structure and relationships were not significant antecedents led to the conclusion that stakeholders such as the directorates of human resource in the respective universities do not over stress them.

Conclusion

Employee commitment (EC) is an important factor as far as organisational outcomes and performances are concerned. Committed employees are more likely to engage in productive behaviours, less likely to leave the organisation, are willing to share their knowledge and are satisfied with their jobs. Therefore this study being concluded aiming at finding out factors positively relating to EC was important. This paper has reported on a survey on EC of the academic staff in private universities in Uganda with the purpose linking the EC with four organisational characteristics, namely; organisational structure, leadership, employee relations and support. In this regard the study closed a couple of gaps. For example the study was carried out in

the context of universities in the developing world context of Africa that had generally previously had been ignored by earlier studies. The main findings of the study were that organisational leadership and support were significant positive antecedents of EC, while organisational structure was not and relationships were negative.

The findings of this study have practical significance to human resource managers in private universities in Uganda and other similar institutions of higher learning. Specifically, the findings that organisational leadership and organisational support were significant positive antecedents of employee commitment (EC) suggest that the two variables might be fundamental antecedents of the EC of academic staff. Hence it was recommended that stakeholders such as the directorates of human resource in the respective universities, promote good organisational leadership and support in order to enhance the EC of the academic staff. However, the finding that organisational structure and employee relationships were not significant antecedents led to the conclusion that most likely the variables were not yet fundamental antecedents of the EC of academic staff in private universities. This made it necessary to recommend to stakeholders in the universities such as the directorates of human resource not to over stress them.

Despite its contribution, this study had a number of limitations. For instance, the study considered only four organisational characteristics as independent variables (IVs) yet evidently, there are other variables that could serve as IVs of EC. Future studies should consider more such IVs that were not considered in this study. The study was also based on data collected from academic staff from a few private chartered universities as the respondents. Therefore, the generalisation of the research findings to all universities should be taken with care. Besides, the study being only quantitative may have limited the reliability of the findings which calls for future studies to consider a mixed approach for wider findings about the variables studied.

References

Acar, A. Z. (2012). Organisational culture, leadership styles and organisational commitment in Turkish logistics industry. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences, 58*, 217-226.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organisation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18.

Al-Qatawneh, M. I. (2014). The impact of organisational structure on organisational commitment: A comparison between public and private sector firms in Jordan. *European Journal of Business and Management, 6*(12), 30-37.

Ansari, M. E., & Valiyan, H. (2015). The relationship of organisational structure and organizational commitment in water and wastewater company in Golestan Province. *Jamaican Journal of Science and Technology, 26*, 21-28.

Arshadi, N. (2011). The relationships of perceived organisational support (POS) with organisational commitment, in-role performance, and turnover intention: Mediating role of felt obligation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 30*, 1103 -1108.

Arshadi, N., & Hayavi, G. (2013). The effect of perceived organisational support on affective commitment and job performance: Mediating role of organisation-based self-esteem. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 84,* 739-743.

Beavers, A. S., Lounsbury, J. W., Richards, J. K., Huck, S. W., Skolits, G. J., & Esquivel, S. L. (2013). Practical considerations for using exploratory factor analysis in educational research. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 18*(6), 1-13.

Brunetto, Y., Shriberg, A., Farr-Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The importance of supervisor–nurse relationships, teamwork, wellbeing, affective commitment and retention of North American nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management, 21*(6), 827-837. doi: 10.1111/jonm.12111

Brunetto, Y., Xerri, M., Shriberg, A., Farr-Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The impact of workplace relationships on engagement, well-being, commitment and turnover for nurses in Australia and the USA. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 69*(12), 2786-2799.

Casper, W. J., Harris, C., Taylor-Bianco, A., & Wayne, J. H. (2011). Work–family conflict, perceived supervisor support and organisational commitment among Brazilian professionals. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 79*(3), 640-652.

Cummings, G. G., MacGregor, T., Davey, M., Wong, C. A., Lo, E., Muise, M., & Stafford, E. (2009). Leadership styles and outcome patterns for the nursing workforce and work environment: A systematic review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 47*(3), 363-385. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.08.006

Dilber, M., Bayyurt, N., Zaim, S., & Tarim, M. (2005). Critical factors of total quality management and its effect on performance in health care industry: A Turkish experience. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *4*(1), 220-234.

Eisenberger, R., Hungtington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Karagonlar, G., Stinglhamber, F., Neves, P., Becker, T. E., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., & Steiger-Mueller, M. (2010). Leader–member exchange and affective organizational commitment: The contribution of supervisor's organisational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(6), 1085-1103: doi: 10.1037/a0020858

Hee, O. C. (2014). Validity and reliability of the customer-oriented behaviour scale in the health tourism hospitals in Malaysia. *International Journal of Caring Sciences, 7*(3), 771-775.

Holagh, S. R., Noubar, H. B. K., & Bahador, B. V. (2014). The effect of organisational structure on organisational creativity and commitment within the Iranian Municipalities. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 156*, 213-215.

Holtzhausen, L., & Fourie, L. (2011). Employees' perceptions of institutional values and employer-employee relationships at the North-West University. *Journal of Public Affairs, 11*(4), 243-254. doi: 10.1002/pa.417

Islam, T., Ahmad, U. N. B. U., Ali, G., Ahmed, I., & Bowra, Z. A. (2013). Turnover intentions: The influence of perceived organisational support and organisational commitment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences, 103*, 1238-1242.

Johnson, R. R. (2015). Police organisational commitment: The Influence of supervisor feedback and support. *Crime & Delinquency, 61*(9), 1155-1180. doi: 10.1177/0011128 712466887

Kanste, O., Miettunen, J., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). Psychometric properties of the multifactor leadership questionnaire among nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *57*(2), 201-212. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.04100.x

Kermani, P. R. (2013). Survey of the relation between organisational structure and informational overload in Payame Noor University. *Research Journal of Recent Sciences,* 2(6), 52-57.

Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2015). A cross-level study of transformational leadership and organisational affective commitment in the Korean local governments: Mediating role of procedural justice and moderating role of culture types based on competing values framework. *Leadership, 11*(2), 158-185.

Leow, K. L., & Khong, K.W. (2009). Organisational commitment: The study of organiSational justice and leader-member exchange (LMX) among auditors in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Information, 4*(2), 161-198.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2012). Organisational structure: Mintzberg's framework. *International Journal of Scholarly, Academic, Intellectual Diversity, 14*(1), 1-8.

Maduenyi, S., Oke, A. O., Fadeyi, O., & Ajagbe, A. M. (2015). Impact of organisational structure on organisational performance. *International Conference on African Development Issues (CU—ICADI)*, 254-358.

McCallum, S. & O'Connell, D. (2009). Social capital and leadership development. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal, 30*(2), 152-166. doi: 10.1108/ 014377309109 35756

Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment as a core essence of organisational commitment: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review, 14*(4), 389-414. doi: 10.1177/1534484315603612

Morrison, R. (2004). Informal relationships in the workplace: Associations job satisfaction, organisational. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 33*(3),114-127.

Morton, N. A., & Hu, Q. (2008). Implications of the fit between organisational structure and ERP: A structural contingency theory perspective. *International Journal of Information Management, 28*, 391–402.

Nguyen, L. D. (2011). Organisational characteristics and employee overall satisfaction: A comparison of state-owned and non-state – owned enterprises in Vietnam. *The South East Asian Journal Management, 5*(2), 135-153. doi: 10.1177/1742715013514880

O'Donnell, M., Ananda K. L. Jayawardana, A. K. L., & Jayakody, J. A. S. K. (2012). Organisational support and employee commitment in Sri Lanka. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review, 23*(1),125-142. doi: 10.1177/103530461202300108.

Raja, A. S., & Palanichamy, P. (2011). Leadership styles and its impact on organisational commitment. *Asia Pacific Business Review, 7*(3), 167-175.

Şahin, İ., Akyürek, C. E., & Yavuz, Ş. (2014). Assessment of Effect of Leadership Behaviour Perceptions and Organizational Commitment of Hospital Employees on Job Satisfaction with Structural Equation Modelling. *Journal of Health Management, 16*(2), 161-182. doi: 10.1177/0972063414526111

Said, A. R., Abdullah, H., Uli, J., & Mohamed, Z. A. (2014). Relationship between organizational characteristics and information security knowledge management implementation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 123*, 433-443.

Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R., & Rupp, D. E. (2002). Organisation structure and fairness perceptions: The moderating effects of organisational level. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, *89*(1), 881-905.

Selamat, N., Nordin, N., & Adnan, A. A. (2013). Rekindle teacher's organisational commitment: The effect of transformational leadership behaviour. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 90*, 566-574.

Shafaee, J., Rahnama, A., Alaei, A., & Jasour, J. (2012). Evaluation of the impact of organisational structure and job characteristics on organisational identification and organisational commitment in Islamic Azad University, Parsabad Branch. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 2*(3), 2329-2335.

Sundaray, B. K., Sahoo, C. K., & Tripathy, S. K. (2010, December). *Employee relations initiatives and quality of work life: A study in power sector units.* In 52nd Annual Conference of the Indian Society of Labour Economics, Karnataka University, Dharwad.

Sundaray, B. K., Sahoo, C. K., & Tripathy, S. K. (2010, December). *Employee relations initiatives and quality of work life: A study in power sector units.* In 52nd Annual Conference of the Indian Society of Labour Economics, Karnataka University, Dharwad.

Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A., & Heidenreich, S. (2014). Leadership in the context of temporary organisations: A study on the effects of transactional and transformational leadership on followers' commitment in projects. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies, 21*(4), 376-393. doi: 10.1177/1548051813502086

van den Hooff, B., & de Ridder, J. A. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: The influence of organisational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 8*(6), 117-130. doi: 0.1108/13673270410567675