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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between the university’s organisational culture and lecturers’ commitment to the university. A correlational research was carried out using randomly selected academic staff of the University of Cape Coast. The study involved 237 respondents who responded to a self-administered questionnaire. The Cronbach’s alpha was used to test for the reliability of the instrument. The reliability coefficient was 0.80. The statistical tools used in the data analysis were; descriptive statistics such as mean, median, standard deviation. Inferential statistics such as correlation, independent sample t-test, Point-Biserial Correlation, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression were also used.

The best predictor of lecturers’ commitment to the university was support subculture. It was recommended that the university management should do more to ensure that support subculture is sustained, so as to elicit the utmost commitment of the lecturers. The conclusion is that organisational culture has a significant effect on the organisational commitment of lecturers in the university.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Culture at the workplace, is a very potent force which is willfully and by design cultivated and is passed on to the arriving employees. It is the very fiber that holds an organisation in concert. The weight of organisational culture is emphasised by Peters and Waterman (1999), who state that without exception, the pre-eminence and steadiness of culture proved to be an indispensable quality of the first-rate organisation, universities inclusive. Moreover the stronger the culture, the more it was directed to the organisation, the less need there was for policy manuals, organisational charts, and detailed rules. In these organisations, subordinates know what they are supposed to do in most situations because the handful of guiding values is crystal clear.

Organisational culture is the set of beliefs, values, work styles and relationships that distinguish one organisation from another (Hofstede, 2001). Alvesonn (as cited in Nakamya, 2012) deconstructs work styles in organisational culture into power- oriented culture which is characterised by strong emphasis on the hierarchy and an orientation towards the person and role oriented culture which symbolises the typical bureaucracy a tall organisation narrow at the top and wide at the base where roles and tasks are clearly defined and coordinated from the top.

Internal organisational policies and practices influenced by the organisational culture, lecturers commitment in terms of lecturers beliefs in
the goals and values of the organisation, their willingness to exert effort impacts on service quality among students and it affects whether or not students are satisfied and willing to return to the university for post-graduate degrees (Bolton & Thompson, 2000).

Job satisfaction has been an essential topic over the years (Afkopure, Ikhifa, Imide & Okokoyo, 2006). The connection between man and work has always attracted the interest of philosophers. A major part of man’s life is spent at work. Work is social reality and social expectation to which men seem to corroborate.

Employees are among the most central determinants and leading factors that determine the success of an organisation in a competitive environment. Besides that, if managed properly employee commitment can lead to advantageous consequences such as increased effectiveness, performance, and productivity, and decreased turnover and absenteeism at both the individual and organisational levels (Fiorita, Bozeman, Young & Meurs, 2007). An employee who is satisfied with his job would execute his duties well and be committed to his job, and consequently to his organisation. Thus, it is of paramount importance for employers to know the factors that can affect their employees’ job satisfaction level since it would affect the performance of the organisation as well (Awang, Ahmad & Zin, 2010).

Through personnel, organisations can garner a competitive advantage. Committed employees take pride in organisational membership, believe in the goals and values of the organisation, and therefore demonstrate higher levels of performance and productivity (Steinhaus & Perry, 1996). In the eyes of workers they believe that they have done a lot for their organisation and they
also have touching involvement in their organisation. However, their management has very little participation in their growth and development of employees. Many managers have little understanding of how to satisfy their employees and how these employees’ satisfaction levels influence their intention to leave their positions (Feinstein, 2002). In fact, because of this limited understanding, managers’ efforts toward employee satisfaction can sometimes create more conflict than cohesion between employees and management, leading to decreased performance and unwarranted employee turnover (Locke, 1976).

However, it is also sometimes hard to find appropriate people for certain positions. So once an ideal candidate is chosen, organisations will like to make a great effort to keep those employees. Therefore, in order to meet the changing needs and demands of public and private organisations in the global world; it is obligatory to develop an organisational climate and culture to satisfy the employees. So, it is important to increase job satisfaction and to put organisational commitment into practice. According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction can be generally defined as the employee’s feelings toward his or her job. It is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job and as an attitudinal variable that can be a diagnostic indicator for degree to which people like their job.

According to Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky (2002), job satisfaction is a determinative of organisational commitment. The main dissimilarity between organisational commitment and job satisfaction is that while organisational commitment can be defined as the emotional responses which an employee has towards any job. It is considered that these two
variables are highly interrelated. In other words, while an employee has positive feeling towards the organisation, its values and objectives, it is possible for him to be unsatisfied with the job he has in the organisation.

Organisational culture influences the organisation in different angles but this study only focused on lecturers’ commitment aspect of the organisational culture. In this era of rivalry, organisations need such culture that increases employee commitment (Keren, Langlands, Stroh, Northcraft & Neale, 2002). Employee’s commitment comes from the personnel that show the level of attachment with the organisation and these levels of commitment affect the organisation.

The fundamental determinant of organisation’s success is a strong culture. Organisational culture came into being with the communication of employees with each other. The culture of an organisation is diverse from the other on various bases. The culture creation in the organisation involved various factors such as workforce, leadership, owner, size and background. Organisational culture gives the authority to the manager and workforce for the usage of resources. The culture of an organisation drives the workforce, which affects the performance of organisation. Researchers have divided the culture into weak and strong culture. An organisation that consists of the clear and comprehensive shared value and belief lead to the strong organisational culture. Strong culture increases the workforce output by energising with good working environment and coordination among employee behaviour (Andre, 2008).

The culture of an organisation can be build with the help of four main factors (personal and professional characteristics of people within
organisation, organisational ethics, property rights that the organisation gives to employees, and structure of organisation). Each organisation developed its own culture with the interaction of these four factors and may vary with time. The development of organisational culture is based on the people who establish the organisation. The people's shared value within organisation becomes more similar with the organisational values, which lead to best possible performance. The cultural value depends on top management, which also establishes ethics for staff to deal with each other. The moral values and ethic values are part of culture that shapes the values. The establishment body of ethic values influences the organisational culture (Schein, 2010).

The concept of organisational culture has been noteworthy in the study of organisational behaviour because it is a vital lever in enhancing organisations’ key capabilities and how they function, and therefore is a popular topic in both academic research and the business press (Chen, 2004; Nazir, 2005; Silverthorne, 2004).

There is a thin line between organisational culture and organisational climate. Organisational culture defines a set of expected behaviour patterns that are generally exhibited within the organisation. These norms have a great impact on the behaviour of the employees. Organisational climate on the other hand is a measure of whether the employees’ expectations about working in the organisation are being met (Schein, 1984). Schein (1984) defined organisational culture as the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration. These “valid” behaviours are
therefore taught to new members as the “correct way” to perceive, think and feel in relation to problems, issues and decisions.

Schein (1984) maintains that culture exists at both the cognitive and emotional level, and he viewed behaviour as a manifestation of culture. For researchers to understand the culture of the organisations they need to assess the broader cultural paradigm of the society within which the organisation operates as this influences the manner in which the organisation operates. Organisational culture is deeply rooted within the organisational system, as it is a process, which evolves over a long time. An organisation’s culture determines the way the organisation conducts its business, and as a result also influences its processes.

Because of its deep-rooted nature, the culture of the organisation is difficult to change, as there is often resistance against giving up something, which is valued and has worked well in the past.

Some researchers (Desatinic, 1986; Schneider, 1990; Balkaran, 1995; Al–Shammari, 1992; Van der Post, De Coning & Smith, 1997) referred to culture as the “personality” of the organisation, while Gutknecht and Miller (1990) described it as the organisation’s soul, purpose and foundation. According to Schneider and Reicher (1983) it is viewed as the organisation’s value systems and assumptions which guide the way the organisation runs its business. Schein (1984) on the other hand, referred to it as “glue” which serves as a source for identity and strength, while Gutknecht and Miller (1990) viewed it as “oil” for lubrication of organisational processes. New employees have to go through a socialisation process to adapt to the organisation culture.
Organisational culture and climate are however interdependent and reciprocal in nature since climate is to a certain extent the manifestation of organisational culture. Organisational climate is the way employees view the organisational “personality”, that is, its processes (Toulson & Smith, 1994), and it provides a “snapshot” or a summary of how employees view the organisation (Desatinic, 1986). Organisational culture is concerned with the expectations that employees may have on the organisation, while climate measures whether those expectations are being met (Hutcheson, 1996).

Organisational culture is a significant factor used to determine how well a worker fits into their organisational environment, and it has been asserted that a good fit between the member of staff and their organisation is important (Nazir, 2005; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Silverthorne, 2004). In addition, Nazir (2005) and Silverthorne (2004) opine that organisational culture also affects the commitment of workers within an organisation and that the strength of organisational commitment is associated with the strength of organisational culture. It is usually understood that a strong culture is tantamount with consistency, because the beliefs and values of the organisation are shared consistently throughout the organisation, and therefore, the management of culture can be treated as the management of commitment (Nazir, 2005). If the culture is very strong, then workers know the organisation’s goals and they are working for those goals, which augment the commitment of staff (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Individuals may be attracted to organisations that have values that are seen as akin to their own; therefore they will be more committed to their work (Smith, 2003). Nazir (2005) states that having an organisational culture, more
particularly a set of values that is commonly shared by the organisations human resources, may be helpful to organisations operating in the service sector. This would also be the case for the university, which operates in the public service sector.

Organisations today are facing challenges and opportunities due to the constantly changing world of business. Academic institutions are not immune to this wind of change and opportunities. The changes include technological advances and changing economic trends in the global market. Werner (2007, p. 11) states that “social, cultural, political, technological and global forces challenge organisations to redefine their strategies”. The implication of these constant changes for Ghanaian organisations that are now part of the global market is that they are expected to compete and survive in a dynamic world of work. These changes also affect other aspects of the functioning of the organisation, such as organisational culture and organisational commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997, p.114) state that “the biggest challenge for commitment researchers will be to determine how commitment is affected by the many changes such as increased global competition, reengineering and downsizing that are occurring in the world of work”.

The literature shows that organisational culture in general can have an influence on the organisational commitment that employees express (O’Reilly, 1989). According to Martins and Martins (2003, p. 380) “global research indicates that organisational cultures create high levels of commitment and performance”.

The role of organisational culture is critical to understanding organisational behaviour. According to Wagner (1995), organisational culture has a strong
influence on employees’ behaviour and attitudes. Organisational culture involves standards and norms lay down on how employees should behave in any given organisation (Martins & Martins, 2003). Authorities and employees do not therefore behave in a value-free vacuum; they are governed, directed and tempered by the organisation’s culture (Brown, 1998). Employees’ behaviour includes their commitment to their particular organisations. Given the dynamics of culture and human behaviour, it is imperative to study how employees commit themselves to their organisation.

Irrespective of whether the organisational culture is strong or weak, it has also been asserted that it influences the whole organisation and affects every person throughout that organisation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Organisational culture also has an effect on the performance of the organisation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Smith, 2003). Kotter and Heskett (1992) studied the relationship between organisational culture and organisational performance and their research came to four significant conclusions: (1) Organisational culture is able to impact expansively on an organisation’s long term economic performance; (2) Organisational culture’s importance as a factor in determining organisational success or failure will increase in the next ten years; (3) It is common and easy to develop organisational cultures that shrink an organisation’s long term financial performance; and (4) Organisational culture can be altered to be more performance enhancing, even though organisational culture is difficult to change. Given the importance of organisational culture and its power on organisational commitment and performance, it is crucial that University of Cape Coast also considers organisational culture’s influence on lecturers’ commitment.
Statement of the Problem

Fundamental to the realisation of university goals and objectives are the academic staff whose roles are critical and their number, quality and their effectiveness make the difference in university education production function and to the wider society (Mwadiani & Akpotu, 2002). Pienaar and Bester (2008) argue that the academic profession is primary to the functioning of any university. Without well qualified and committed academic staff, no academic institution can really ensure sustainability and quality over the long haul. Higher education institutions are therefore more dependent on the intellectual and ingenious abilities and commitment of the academic staff than most other organisations. This therefore makes it critically important to retain this cadre of staff.

According to Zhou and Zhou (2004), the costs of academic staff turnover, such as subsequent recruiting expenses, disruptions of course offerings, discontinuities in departmental and student planning, and loss of student graduate advisors, are borne at individual, departmental and institutional levels and have an impact on quality of services and the image of the institution.

In educational institutions, lecturers have critical roles. They are responsible for providing students with new knowledge, professional consultations, deliver lecturers, and help students to become successful in their studies. In addition, they are expected to help managers, administrators and educational leaders in decision making process in relation to visions, missions and objectives of the education system, to do academic research and to train students as tomorrow’s leaders. They are also responsible to learn new
knowledge, technology and techniques in their field so that they can provide the society with their new findings and publications (Awang, Ahmad & Zin, 2010; Joolideh & Yeshodhara, 2008; Malik, Nawab, Naeem & Danish, 2010).

On the importance of lecturers’ commitment, Awang et al. (2010) also stated that:

“Lecturing is one of the professions that need high commitment; the work-load is heavy, the role is wide and the lecturers are directly responsible in educating and shaping the students. Without commitment, some may even leave the profession. Others who do not quit, but no longer feel committed to their job would probably avoid their daily duties. These definitely make other bad effects, especially to the students” (p. 48).

According to Clugston, Homwell, and Dorfman (2000); Rowe, Mason, Dickel, Mann and Mockler (1994) and Wasti (2003), organisational culture has consequence on organisational commitment, influencing the effectiveness and efficiency of organisations. Therefore, the importance of assessing the organisational culture of the University of Cape Coast comes to the fore. In Ghana it appears university lecturers hardly leave the job for opportunities outside academia. The study therefore looks at the influence of the university’s organisational culture on organisational commitment of lecturers in University of Cape Coast.

**Purpose of the Study**

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the university’s organisational culture and its consequence on organisational commitment of University of Cape Coast Lecturers.
1. The study also sought to find out lecturers perception on the university’s organizational culture.

2. It is again intended to ascertain how the organisational culture of the university relates to lecturers job satisfaction.

3. The study was to examine the difference in gender with regard to lecturers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

4. Furthermore, the study was to identify the relationship between lecturers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment to their marital status.

5. Finally, the study was to find out the relationship between lecturers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment to their age and length of service.

**Research Questions**

This study was designed to address the following research questions.

1. To what extent do lecturers perceive the university’s organisational culture in positive terms?

2. To what extent does the perceived organisational culture of the university relate to the lecturers’ satisfaction with their job in the university?

3. To what extent do lecturers job satisfaction and organisational commitment differ by gender?

4. To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment relate to their marital status?

5. To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment relate to their age and length of service?
Research Hypothesis

H₀: The University’s organisational culture does not directly predict lecturers’ commitment to the institution.

H₁: The University’s organisational culture directly predicts lecturers’ commitment to the institution.

Significance of the Study

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), workers who become less committed to an organisation will use their energies in other directions (e.g. careers, professions, unions, hobbies, volunteer groups). These employees may therefore start to appraise their skills and experiences in terms of their demand outside the organisation rather than utilise them in their current or future jobs in the organisation. Thus, it becomes crucial for organisations to know how to develop the right type of commitment and improve employee satisfaction so as to ensure that only better performing employees are retained.

Highly committed employees tend to be better performers, put forth greater effort on the job resulting in increased job performance, turnover less and show better attendance (Angle & Perry, 1981; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

This study will therefore inform the management of higher education institutions the organisational culture that is desirable for the attainment of their goals.

The study will also inform major stake holders of educational institutions such as the University Councils, Ministry of Education and Ghana Government in formulating policies geared toward addressing low commitment and staff turnover in the University. This will help in reducing
the lecturers’ dissatisfaction and boost their morale to make them more committed to their job.

It is also hoped that this study would encourage more interest in research and pave the way for an in-depth study of the problems on commitment on a wider dimension than has been pursued in this research.

The findings of this research could be used by the University Of Cape Coast as well as other universities in Ghana in particular and the world in general to improve on its effort to retain lecturers.

The findings of this study are expected to enhance our knowledge of the human resource practices and other work-related factors used by university of Cape Coast. Finally, the findings will also increase the stock of theoretical and empirical knowledge especially in the African context and also form the basis for further research in the field of organisational culture, job satisfaction and employee commitment.

**Delimitation of the Study**

The study has been delimited to the influence of organisational culture on the organisational commitment of lecturers. Choosing the sample of the present study from one university is another delimitation of the study which bounds the variety of the sample and generalisability of the findings. The study is finally delimited to only the academic staff of University of Cape Coast. This has become necessary given the fact that it appears the influence of the university’s organisational culture on the organisational commitment among the lecturers has not been explored.
Limitations of the Study

The selection of the sample for the study from only one university out of a number of universities, both private and public in Ghana would affect the generalisability of the results. A sample size of 273 university lecturers’ drawn from only University of Cape Coast is very limited in terms of geographic area representation. Drawing generalisations with this sample in a country with a lot of universities such as Ghana would therefore be awkward.

Secondly, the measurement of items on lecturers’ commitment based on the organisational culture of the university is likely to include some element of bias in their responses to the questionnaires.

Thirdly limitation of this study is that the correlational research as a design can only assesses relationship but not cause and effect.

The last limitation of this study is that the stratified sampling as a sampling strategy did not allow for proportional representation of male and female respondents.

Organisation of the Rest of the Study

Chapter two is the literature review; has to do with the theories, empirical review and conceptual framework on organisational culture and organisational commitment. Chapter three which is the methodology explains the research design, the population, the sample and sampling procedure. It also deals with the instruments, the data collection procedure and the data analysis plan. Chapter four presents the results and discussions of the study. The final Chapter of the work, chapter five contains summary, conclusions and recommendations as well as suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is devoted to the review of conceptual, theoretical and empirical literature on organisational culture and organisational commitment. The chapter begins by discussing the typologies on organisational culture and conceptual framework in which this work was done, theories on organisational commitment followed by the empirical review. Specifically, the typologies encompass Hellriegel et al. organisational culture typology and Harrison and Stokes’s organizational culture typology. The theoretical perspective encompasses social exchange theory, behavioural theory and multi-dimensional theory. The empirical perspective considers organisational culture and job satisfaction, demographic factors and job satisfaction, demographic factors and organisational commitment, job satisfaction and organisational commitment, organisational culture and organisational commitment, and organisational commitment within academic institutions. The conceptual framework consists of a model showing the interplay of organisational culture, job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

Conceptual Review

The Concept of Organisational Culture

There are various definitions of organisational culture making the concept difficult to define (Hellriegel et al., 2004; Hofestede, 1994; Martin, 2001; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Rowe et al., 1994; Schein, 1992). It is, however, significant to have clarity on what is meant by the term organisational culture,
if it is to be analysed and managed (O’Reilly, 1989). According to Hellriegel et al. (2004), organisational culture is the distinctive pattern of shared assumptions, values and norms that shape the socialisation activities, language, symbols, rites and ceremonies of a group of people. This definition by Hellriegel et al. (2004) emphasises a number of chief aspects of organisational culture, such as shared assumption, shared values, shared socialisation and norms, and shared symbols, language, narratives and practices; it also emphasises how organisational culture assists employees in being introduced and socialised into the new organisation, while concomitantly ensuring internal integration. In doing so, organisational culture lets the employees know how to perceive, think and feel when faced with new problems within their new organisational environment.

Rowe et al. (1994) provide a comparable definition to Hellriegel et al. (2004), in which organisational culture is defined as the combination of shared values, attitudes, beliefs, rituals, norms, expectations, and assumptions of the people within the organisation. Rowe et al. (1994) go on to point out that corporate ritual provide a way of showing the beliefs and values of the organisation, and therefore define the organisational culture as the social interaction, priorities, and way in which workers deal with one another. Rowe et al. (1994) also recognise the importance of the socialisation process of new workers into the organisation. This form of socialisation, through organisational rituals, assists staff in understanding and adhering to specific practices and procedures within the organisation (Rowe et al., 1994). Schein (1992; p. 12) defines organisational culture as
“a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.”

With regard to this definition, Schein (1992) has an analogous view to Rowe et al. (1994) that socialisation plays a key role in what is passed on to new generations of workforce. Furthermore, the way in which a new employee learns, and the socialisation process to which they are subjected, may divulge deeper assumptions (Schein, 1992).

O’Reilly et al. (1991) add to the above definitions by stating that organisational culture can be thought of as a set of cognitions that is shared by members of a specific social unit, which includes prerequisites such as fundamental assumptions, values, behavioural norms and expectations. Deal (as cited in Rowe et al., 1994) observed that worker social needs are met by defining relationships, specifying roles and duties and establishing set standards that are to be adhered to. Deal and Kennedy (1982; p. 4) have a related viewpoint to that of O’Reilly et al. (1991) and explain their definition of organisational culture as the “integrated pattern of human behaviour that includes thought, speech, action and artefacts and depends on man’s capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations.” The informal cultural elements of an organisation can be described as the way things are done around the organisation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).
For the purpose of this research, organisational culture will be defined as the unique pattern of shared assumptions, values and norms that shape the socialisation activities, language, symbols, rites and ceremonies of a group of people. This follows the definition given by Hellriegel et al. (2004) because it is the most comprehensive definition, which includes aspects referred to by other authors, such as O’Reilly et al. (1991), Rowe et al. (1994) and Schein (1992).

**Types of Organisational Culture**

A number of typologies have been thought-out with regards to organisational culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Hellriegel et al., 2004; Hofstede, 1993; Rowe et al., 1994; Schein, 1992). Typologies are handy because they provide broad overview of the variations that exist between organisational cultures (Brown, 1995). In order to get a better understanding of different concepts of organisational culture, two typologies will be briefly discussed, with particular emphasis on the Harrison and Stokes (1992) typology.

**Hellriegel et al. Organisational Culture Typology**

Hellriegel et al. (2004) state that cultural elements and their relationships within an organisation create a pattern that is a unique part of that organisation, creating an organisation’s culture. Several types of organisational culture can be described, namely the bureaucratic culture, clan culture, entrepreneurial culture, and market culture (Hellriegel et al., 2004). Each of the four organisational cultural types developed by Hellriegel et al. (2004) will be briefly discussed.
In bureaucratic culture, the organisation puts premium on rules, hierarchy, and procedures; with the long term concerns being efficiency, predictability and stability (Hellriegel et al., 2004). Managers within a bureaucratic organisation are good coordinators, organisers and enforcers of rules and procedures that are clearly defined. The tasks, responsibilities and authority for the entire organisation’s employees are also clearly stated. Hellriegel et al. (2004) assert that most municipalities and government institutions have bureaucratic cultures, which can hinder their effectiveness and efficiency. The focus of attention of this organisation is internal, and the formal control is stable.

Clan culture is characterized by tradition, loyalty, teamwork, personal commitment and self-management. The organisation focuses their attention internally, yet their formal control is flexible. Members of this organisation recognise an obligation that is beyond their job descriptions, with the understanding that their contributions to the organisation may exceed their contractual agreements. Employees identify that their long term commitment to their organisation, in the form of loyalty, is in exchange for the organisation’s long term commitment to the employee, in the form of security. Unity from this culture type is created through a long and thorough socialisation process, where long term clan members serve as mentors and role models for newer members. There is also strong peer pressure to adhere to important norms within the organisation, and an environment is created in which few departments are left completely free from normative pressures, which may generate innovation and risk-taking behaviour (Hellriegel et al., 2004). Success of this type of organisation is assumed to depend on teamwork,
participation, consensus decision making, as well as employee sensitivity to customers and concern for people (Hellriegel et al., 2004).

Entrepreneurial Culture is characterised by high levels of risk-taking, dynamism and creativity (Hellriegel et al., 2004). Employees are committed to experimentation, innovation and being on the leading edge. This organisational culture type reacts quickly to change, as well as creates it due to the fact that individual initiative, flexibility and freedom promoting growth are encouraged and rewarded (Hellriegel et al., 2004). Effectiveness within this organisation means providing new and unique products and rapid growth. The organisation focuses their attention externally and formal control orientation is flexible in order to foster innovation and change.

Market Culture according to Hellriegel et al. (2004) is characterised by the achievement of measurable and demanding goals, especially those that are finance-based and market-based. In this organisation, the relationship between employee and organisation is contractual, where the obligation of each is agreed in advance; therefore the formal control orientation is quite stable. This is because the employee is responsible for an agreed level of performance; with the organisation exchanging this for an agreed level of remuneration and reward in return (Hellriegel et al., 2004). Competitiveness and a profit gaining orientation therefore exist throughout this organisation because increased levels of performance from the employee are rewarded through increased compensation from the organisation (Hellriegel et al., 2004).
Harrison and Stokes’s Organisational Culture Typology

Harrison (1972) developed a typology for understanding organisational culture. This typology suggests four organisational cultural orientations: (1) power orientation; (2) role orientation; (3) task orientation and (4) person orientation (Harrison, 1972). Harrison’s (1972) cultural orientations were adapted by Harrison and Stokes (1992) to create the (1) power orientation, (2) role orientation, (3) achievement orientation and (4) support orientation. Harrison and Stokes’s (1992) organisational culture theory is used in this research to classify the different types of organisational cultures within the university. Harrison and Stokes (1992) believe that every organisation has a combination of the four cultural types, with each type evoking different behaviours each of which is based on different human values.

The Power Orientation type of organisational culture is usually found in small organisations, where everything revolves around the person in charge (Martin, 2005). Harrison and Stokes (1992) explain that an organisation that is power-oriented is based on inequality of access to resources, where a resource can be anything one person controls that another person wants. Within the power culture, people use resources to control other peoples’ behaviour (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Brown (1995) adds that a power culture has a single source of power from which rays of influence, which are connected by functional and specialist strings that ease co-ordination, spread throughout the organisation. Martin (2005) adds by adding that all important decisions are made by that person who has the single source of power, and that person retains absolute authority in all matters. The main features of a power culture in organisational culture include: single mindedness in approach; dominated
by the leader or central person and their personality; with a lack of bureaucracy in operations (Martin, 2001). The greatest strength of the power culture is the ability of the organisation to react quickly, although the success is largely dependent upon the abilities of the leader, or people at the centre of power (Brown, 1995; Martin, 2001).

The Role Orientation type of organisational culture is based on the existence of rules, procedures and job descriptions, as opposed to the sole power of the leaders found in the power culture (Brown, 1995; Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Martin, 2001). The struggle for power is moderated by the rules, and these rules lead to the idea that the role culture is a bureaucracy and the organising principles are rationality, order and dependability (Brown, 1995; Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Van der Post et al., 1997). In the role culture’s bureaucratic working environment, authority and responsibility are delegated downwards, and each level in the organisation has a defined area of authority where work is able to be done continuously without direct supervision from the top management (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). An advantage of the role orientation culture is that staff of an organisation is able to allocate more energy to doing their work than without the rules and structures of the role orientation (Harmse, 2001). However, a weakness of this cultural type is that employees are assumed not to be trusted; and individual autonomy and discretion is not given to lower-level members (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Employees are controlled so much that they may be prevented from making the correct choices and being innovative if it is outside the rules (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Also, traditional role-orientation organisations may have difficulty keeping up with rapidly changing
environments because in the interests of rationality and order, it is difficult to change the rules, and therefore it may take longer to make any necessary changes in order to adapt (Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

The Achievement Orientation type of organisational culture aligns employees with a common vision or purpose (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The achievement orientation type of culture realises the organisation’s common vision or purpose by using the organisation’s mission to attract and release employees’ personal energy in the pursuit of common goals, where the organisation’s mission is used to focus the personal energy of the organisation’s employees (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Systems and structures are necessary in an achievement-oriented organisation, and are in place to serve the organisation’s mission (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). These systems and structures are altered when alterations in the mission occur, and are therefore more flexible than the rules of law of the role orientation (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). An advantage of this type of culture is that employees give more willingly to their organisation because employees make their contributions more freely in response to their commitment to their shared purpose, and as a result, the entire organisation prospers (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). An achievement-orientation organisation also has advantages in the enthusiasm, high energy, and involvement of the employees of the organization, yet these may also become disadvantages to the organisation (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The high energy and involvement of employees within this culture type are often difficult to sustain because employees may be subject to burnout and disillusionment when results are not achieved (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The achievement
orientation also has a disadvantage in the fact that these organisations are often under-organised because employees lack the necessary time for objective planning, and they may rely on the common mission to organise their work (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). When the mission takes on different forms for various parts of the organisation, the organisation may lose unity of effort (Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

The Support Orientation type of organisational culture is based on mutual trust between the employee and the organisation (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Employees working within a support-orientated organisational culture believe that they are valued as human beings, not just as contributors to a task (Harrison, 1993; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). An organisation that has a support culture has a warm and caring atmosphere, where the assumption is that a sense of belonging will create a sense of commitment to the organisation and therefore employees will contribute more within the organisation (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Advantages of the support-orientated culture are that employees make sacrifices for one another, and the effects of team loyalty add to the high performance and morale of organisations (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Motivation and enthusiasm is high, as well as the camaraderie of the employees, which affect productivity, absenteeism and work quality (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The weakness of the support-orientated culture is that these types of organisations tend to be conflict avoiding organisations and difficult issues are often swept under the rug (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). In the interest of equal treatment, differences in employee skills and abilities may be ignored, and decisions may be made “out of kindness”, which impacts
negatively on an organisation’s effectiveness and efficiency (Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

**Concept of Organisational Commitment**

Effective educational leaders stir up a shared vision and stir up members of the organisation to work toward the achievement of that vision (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Organisational commitment has been defined as the extent of allegiance and duty felt toward a shared mission and the level of willingness to apply effort to achieve that mission (Camp, 1994; Chen, Chen & Chen, 2010). Others have defined it as the strength of identification and attachment in a particular organisation (Hulpia, Devos & Rosseel, 2009). Organisational commitment has three dimensions:

The first dimension of organisational commitment is affective commitment, which represents the individual’s emotional attachment to the organisation. According to Meyer and Allen (1997, p.11) affective commitment is “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation”. Organisational members, who are committed to an organisation on an affective basis, maintain working for the organisation because they want to (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Members who are committed on an affective level stay with the organisation because they view their personal employment relationship is congruent to the goals and values of the organisation (Beck & Wilson, 2000). Affective commitment is a work related attitude with positive feeling towards the organisation (Morrow, 1993). Sheldon (1971, p.148) also maintains that this type of attitude is “an orientation towards the organisation, which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organisation”. Affective commitment is the relative strength of
an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organisation (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). The strength of affective organisational commitment is influenced by the extent to which the individual’s needs and expectations about the organisation are in line with their actual experience (Storey, 1995). Tetrick (1995, p.589) also describes affective commitment as “value rationality-based organisational commitment, which refers to the degree of value congruence between an organisational member and an organisation”.

The organisational commitment model of Meyer and Allen (1997) indicates that affective commitment is influenced by factors such as job challenge, role clarity, and goal clarity, and goal difficulty, receptiveness by management, peer cohesion, equality, personal importance, feedback, participation and dependability. Affective commitment development involves identification and internalisation (Beck & Wilson, 2000). Individual’s affective attachment to their organisations is firstly based on identification with the desire to establish a rewarding relationship with an organisation. Secondly, through internalisation, this refers to congruent goals and values held by individuals and the organisation. In general, affective organisational commitment is concerned with the extent to which an individual identifies with the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1990).

The second dimension of organisational commitment is continuance commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997, p.11) define continuance commitment as “awareness of the cost associated with leaving the organisation”. It is calculative in nature because of the individual’s weighing of costs and risks associated with leaving the current organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997).
Meyer and Allen (1991, p.67) further state that “employee’s whose primary link to the organisation is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so”. This indicates the difference between continuance and affective commitment. The latter entails that individual’s stay in the organisation because they want to.

Continuance commitment can be regarded as an active attachment to the organisation, where the individual’s association with the organisation is based on an appraisal of economic benefits gained (Beck & Wilson, 2000). Organisational members develop commitment to an organisation because of the positive extrinsic rewards obtained through the effort-bargain without identifying with the organisation’s goals and values. The strength of continuance commitment, which implies the need to stay, is determined by the apparent costs of leaving the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1984). Best (1994, p.71) indicates that “continuance organisational commitment will therefore be the strongest when availability of alternatives are few and the number of investment are high”. This argument supports the view that when given better alternatives, employees may leave the organisation.

Meyer and Allen (1993, p.715) also maintain that “accrued investment and poor employment alternatives tend to force individuals to maintain their line of action and are responsible for these individuals being committed because they need to”. This implies that individuals stay in the organisation, because they are lured by other accumulated investment which they could lose, such as pension, seniority or organisation specific skills. The need to stay is “profit” associated with continued participation and termination of service is a “cost” associated with leaving. Tetrick (1995, p.590) supports the profit view
by describing the concept continuance organisation commitment as “an exchange framework whereby performance and loyalty are offered in return for material benefits and rewards”. Therefore, in order to keep employees who are continuance committed, the organisation needs to give more attention and recognition to those elements that boost the employee’s morale to be affectively committed.

The last dimension of the organisational commitment is normative commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997, p.11) define normative continue as “a feeling of obligation to continue employment”. Internalised normative beliefs of duty and obligation make individuals obliged to sustain membership in the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1993). According to Meyer and Allen (1991, p.67) “employees with normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organisation”.

In terms of the normative dimension, the employees stay because they should do so or it the proper thing to do. Wiener and Vardi (1980, p.86) describe normative commitment as “the work behaviour of individuals, guided by a sense of duty, obligation and loyalty towards the obligation”. Organisational members are committed to an organisation based on moral reasons (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999). The normatively committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the organisation. The strength of normative organisational commitment is influenced by accepted rules about reciprocal obligation between the organisation and its members (Suliman & Iles, 2000). The reciprocal obligation is based on the social exchange theory, which suggests that a person receiving a benefit is under a strong normative obligation or rule to repay the benefit in some way (McDonald & Makin,
This implies that individuals often feel an obligation to repay the organisation for investing in them, for example through training and development.

Meyer and Allen (1991, p.88) argue that “this moral obligation arises either through the process of socialisation within the society or the organisation”. In either case it is based on a norm of reciprocity. In other words if the employee receives a benefit, it places him or her or the organisation under the moral obligation to respond in kindness.

**Conceptual Framework**
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**Figure 1.** Influence of organisational culture on university lecturers commitment to the University.

Organisational Culture; According to Reichers and Schneider (1990), following Smircich (1983), there have been two distinct approaches to the definition of culture. While the first approach treats organisational culture as
“something an organisation is, the second one accepts culture as something an organisation has” (1990, p.22). Although almost all of the academicians agree upon the second approach including Schein (1992), Killman (1985), and Hofstede (2000), the concept of culture has not yet been clearly defined and accepted.

In the light of functionalist approach, the development of organisational culture is related to the capability of organisations in solving their “external adaptation and internal integration problems,” and the development of culture is “identical to the process of group formation” (Schein, 1992, p. 51). In a similar manner, Hofstede (2000) states, “one can only define culture for a group of people… organisational culture is that which distinguishes the members of one organisation from other people” (p.135).

Job satisfaction refers to the degree to which individuals “like” or are “happy” with their work (Mottaz, 1987). Commitment to university is defined as lecturers’ belief and acceptance of the goals and values of the university, lecturers’ efforts for actualization of those goals and values, and lecturers’ strong desires to keep up membership in the University. This definition is based on the concept of organisational commitment (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982)

The conformity of lecturers with the organisational culture of the University will lead to job satisfaction on their part. The achievement of job satisfaction will then elicit commitment to the university.
Theoretical Review

Social Exchange Theory

The exchange standpoint views the employment relationship as consisting of social or economic exchanges (Aryee, Budhwar & Chen, 2002; Cropanzano, Rupp & Bryne, 2003). Economic exchange relationships involve the exchange of economic remuneration in return for employees’ effort and are often dependent on formal contracts which are lawfully enforceable. On the contrary, social exchanges are ‘voluntary actions’ which may be initiated by an organisation’s handling of its employees, with the expectation that the employees will be obligated to respond the good deeds of the organisation (Blau, 1964; Gould-Williams & Davies, 2005).

The exchange approach view of organisational commitment posits that individuals attach themselves to their organisations in return for certain rewards from the organisations (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Hrebiniaik & Alutto, 1972; March & Simon, 1958; Mowday et al., 1979; Steers, 1977). According to this view, employees enter organisations with specific skills, wishes and goals, and expect to find an environment where they can use their skills, satisfy their wishes and achieve their goals. Perceptions of favourable swap from the employees’ viewpoint are expected to result in increased commitment to the organisation. Likewise, the more copious the perceived rewards in relation to costs, the greater the organisational commitment. On the other hand, failure by the organisation to provide ample rewards in exchange for the employees’ efforts is likely to result in decreased organisational commitment. This viewpoint is consistent with Becker’s (1960) thought of
calculative commitment where individuals' commitment to the organisation is in part, a function of accumulated investments.

From the point of view of the employee-employer relationship, social exchange theory suggests that employees act in response to perceived favourable working conditions by behaving in ways that benefit the organisation and/or other employees. Equally, employees hit back against dissatisfying conditions by engaging in negative work attitudes, such as absenteeism, lateness, tardiness or preparing to quit the organisation (Crede et al., 2007; Haar, 2006). It is therefore, expected that employees who perceive their working conditions to be negative and stressful, would reciprocate with negative work attitudes such as job dissatisfaction, low morale and reduced organisational commitment, while those who see the workplace conditions as positive and demanding would reciprocate with positive work attitudes, such as high commitment, job satisfaction and low turnover (Cropanzano et al., 2003; Crede, Chernyshenko, Stark, Dalal & Bashshur, 2007).

Another view of the social exchange theory is the norm of reciprocity which is based on two assumptions: “(a) people should help those who have helped them, and (b) people should not injure those who have helped them” (Gouldner, 1960, p. 171) Therefore, employees who perceive that the organisation values and treats them fairly, will feel duty-bound to “pay back” or reciprocate these good deeds with positive work attitudes and behaviours (Aryee et al., 2002; Gould-Williams & Davies, 2005; Parzefall, 2008).

Studies have suggested that the norm of reciprocity is taught as a moral obligation and then internalised by both parties (i.e. employees and employers) in an exchange relationship such that whoever receives a benefit feels
obligated to pay back (Gouldner, 1960; Liden, Wayne, Kraimer & Sparrowe, 2003; Parzefall, 2008). This suggests that employees, who execute enriched jobs devoid of stress, receive attractive pay, job security and fair treatment from the organisation, are bound to express their appreciation for the support received by increasing their commitment to their organisation. In summary, therefore, the exchange theory posits that commitment develops as a result of an employee's contentment with the booty and inducements the organisation offers, rewards that must be sacrificed if the employee leaves the organisation.

**Behavioural Theory**

The behavioural approach views commitment as being purely instrumental and not psychological (Becker, 1960; Stevens, Beyer & Trice, 1978). The assumption of this approach is that employees keep their membership with an organisation because of the perceived cost of doing otherwise is likely to be high. Mowday et al. (1982, p. 26) has defined behavioural commitment as the “process by which individuals become locked into an organisation and how they deal with this problem”. This approach is now referred to as continuance commitment. This approach developed from Howard Becker’s studies in 1960 which described commitment as a disposition to engage in “consistent line of activity” (namely maintaining membership in the organisation) resulting from the accrual of ‘side bets’ which would be gone if the activity was discontinued (Becker, 1960, p. 33). Kanter (1968, p. 504) referred to it as “profit associated with continued participation and ‘cost’ associated with leaving” the organisation. In this regard, commitment emanates from the accumulation of some investments or side-bets tying the individual to a specific organisation, which would
otherwise be missing if the activity or membership to the organisation were discontinued.

Becker (1960) argues that over a period of time, certain costs accrue which make it thornier for the person to disengage from a course of activity such as working for a particular organisation or pursuing a certain occupational career. The greater the costs and investments which accrue, the more difficult disengagement becomes. He termed these costs as “side-bets”. These “side bets” or investments may relate to one’s education, marital status, promotion, pension fund, organisational specific skills and other factors which may be perceived as rewards or sunk costs in the particular organisation, hence rendering other job opportunities unacceptable.

According to this approach, individuals may be averse to quit their organisations lest they be perceived as “job hoppers” (Reichers, 1985). Employees therefore make side bets by staking their reputation for stability on the decision to stay in the organisation. Organisations have also been found to make side bets for employees using practices that lock them into sustained membership in the organization through rapid promotion, non-investment pension plans, organisation-specific training among others. However, Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin and Jackson (1989) warned that such tactics by the organisation may not instill in employees the desire to contribute to organisational effectiveness. Instead, some employees may find that they have little desire to remain with the organisation but cannot afford to do otherwise. Such employees may be motivated to do little more than perform at the minimum level required to maintain the job they have become reliant on. Organisations should therefore cultivate affective commitment in their
employees rather than continuance commitment since employees who value their association with the organisation will not only remain in the organization but work towards its success.

The attitudinal, normative and behavioural approaches to commitment represent what is now referred to as affective, normative and continuance commitment in the modern commitment literature. The attitudinal and normative approach describes commitment as an emotional attachment, involvement, identification and loyalty that the employee has towards the organisation while behavioural commitment relates to an employee’s evaluation of the costs likely to be incurred by leaving the organisation. Most of the commitment literature advocates for the attitudinal (affective) commitment which inculcates desirable work attitudes in the employees. Such employees are predicted to be high performers, chronicle less absenteeism and turnover less (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

On the contrary, behavioural (continuance) commitment has been criticized for failing to lead to positive work attitudes since the employee only retains membership with the organisation to preserve their investments (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Multi-Dimensional Theory

Curiosity in the study of the multidimensionality of organisational commitment has been as a result of two factors. Firstly, previous studies on organisational commitment have been criticized for failing to explore commitment as a construct that is separate from other psychological concepts (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). This is in spite of studies showing that one’s commitment to an organisation can result from value congruence, financial
investments, effective reward and control systems or a simple lack of opportunities (Becker, 1960; Wiener, 1982). Secondly, although attitudinal or behavioural approaches explained different ideas of commitment (i.e. psychological attachment, loyalty and costs attached to leaving the organisation), Mowday et al. (1982) found that the two approaches were not mutually exclusive but interrelated. According to Mowday and colleagues, there is an ongoing cyclical relationship between these two types of commitment whereby high levels of attitudinal commitment leads to committing behaviours which in turn buttress commitment attitudes.

Similarly, Coopey and Hartley (1991) propose that the two approaches could be integrated into a single approach which recognises that commitment can develop either through affect or through behaviour and that each may strengthen the other. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) also report that the two approaches are not completely distinguishable concepts and that the measurement of each contains elements of the other. For instance, an employee may be drawn into the organization for exchange reasons (calculative commitment) but later develop attitudes consistent with maintaining membership (attitudinal commitment). Alternatively, a person might join an organization because of attitudinal commitment but persist to stay because of accumulated side-bets resulting in calculative commitment (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005).

In their support for the inter-relationship between attitudinal and behavioural commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) report that, unlike Porter and colleagues who restricted commitment to reflect only a psychological state, they … incorporate both the attitudinal and behavioural approach and
their complementary relationship... that this psychological state need not be restricted to value and goal congruence ... that it can reflect a desire, a need and/or an obligation to maintain membership in the organisation.

Even though studies on the multidimensionality of organisational commitment began to gain prominence from the early 1990s, its roots date back to work done by Kelman (1958) on attitude change. Kelman argues that an individual can accept influence in three different ways, namely:

(a) **Compliance** which occurs when “an individual accepts influence because he hopes to achieve a favourable reaction from another person or group” (p.53). In this case, the individual adopts the behaviour in order to achieve specific rewards or approval but not necessarily because he/she shares in the goals or beliefs of the organisation. This is analogous to continuance commitment.

(b) **Identification** which occurs when “an individual accepts influence because he wants to establish or maintain a satisfying self-defining relationship to another person or group” (p.53). This implies that an individual may feel proud to be a part of a group, respecting its values and accomplishments. This is similar to affective commitment.

(c) **Internalisation** which occurs when “an individual accepts influence because the content of the induced behaviour—the ideas and actions of which it is composed—is intrinsically rewarding. He adopts the induced behaviour because it is congruent with his value system” (p. 53). The individual accepts the influence because it is similar to his/her own values. This is similar to normative commitment. Identification and internalisation dimensions of commitment are similar as they concern employees’ psychological state and
value systems. Although Kelman’s study generated interesting ideas on employees’ behaviour, researchers did not follow up on this line of thought until three decades later.

The first research that explored the multidimensionality of organisational commitment were carried out by Meyer and Allen (1984) who adopted Becker’s (1960) side bet theory by introducing the concept of continuance commitment alongside the concept of affective commitment. Reichers (1985) in a review of 32 commitment studies did not find a constant definition of commitment. However, from these studies, Reichers (1985) classified commitment into three categories:

a) **Side-bets** which suggest that organisational commitment is a function of the rewards and costs associated with organisational membership. These typically increase as tenure in the organisation increases.

b) **Attributions** whereby commitment is a binding of the individual to behavioural acts that results when individuals attribute an attitude of commitment to themselves after engaging in behaviours that are volitional, overt and irreversible.

c) **Individual/organisational goal congruence** where commitment occurs when individuals identify with and extend effort towards organisational goals and values. In addition, Reichers found that organisations comprised various “coalitions and constituencies” (such as top management, work groups, co-workers, supervisors, customers/clients) each with its own goals and values that may or may not be well-matched with the goals of the organisation. As a result, organisational commitment can best be understood as a collection of multiple commitments to the goal orientations of multiple work groups that
constitute the organisation. Reicher's review provided rule for the future direction on the study of multidimensionality of organisational commitment by categorising commitment into three dimensions.

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) who adapted Kelman's (1958) work on attitude and behavioural change, argued that although commitment reflected the psychological bond that ties the employee to the organisation, this bond can take three different forms, namely, compliance, identification and internalisation. According to O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) compliance occurs simply to get specific rewards and not because of collective beliefs; internalisation occurs when the values of the individual and the organisation are identical; and identification arises from being part of a group, respecting its values and accomplishments without the individual adopting them as his or her own. The study found that identification and internalisation were negatively related to turnover intentions, while compliance was positively related to employee turnover. Following up on Meyer and Allen’s (1984) study, McGee and Ford (1987) found that continuance commitment was bi-dimensional consisting of ‘high personal sacrifice’ and ‘low perceived alternatives’. The current development in multidimensional commitment is attributed to studies carried out by Meyer and Allen (1993). From a review of several organisational commitment studies, they concluded that it consisted of three general themes namely; affective attachment to the organisation; perceived costs associated with leaving the organisation; and debt to remain with the organisation. These themes became known as affective, continuance and normative commitment respectively.
Empirical Review

According to Lahiry (1994), previous research has shown that employee commitment has an effect on how well the organisation performs and delivers its services and that organisational commitment can be strengthened by changing the organisation’s culture. Indeed some researchers found that organisational commitment is a function of several variables such as job satisfaction, motivation, participative decision making, organisational support, financial reward, communication, promotion prospects, and leadership styles (Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000; Brown, 1998; Salami & Omole, 2005).

Organisational Culture and Job Satisfaction

There has been a long debate amongst researchers regarding the relationship between organisational culture and job satisfaction. Many researchers have found supporting evidence about the relationship between these two concepts (Schneider & Snyder, 1975; Field & Abelson, 1982; Hellriegel & Slocum, 1974; Kerego & Mthupha, 1997).

Kerego and Mthupha (1997) view job satisfaction as the evaluation of the organisational context, while organisational climate provides a description of the work context. They defined job satisfaction as the feeling of employees about their job. Hutcheson (1996) on the other hand referred to it as the difference between the outcomes, which a person actually receives and those that he expects to receive. Job satisfaction is thus related to job characteristics and people will evaluate their satisfaction level according to what they perceive as being important and meaningful to them. The evaluation of the
different aspects of the job by employees is of a subjective nature, and people will reflect different levels of satisfaction around the same factors.

Research studies (Kerego & Muthupha, 1997; Robbins, 1993; Hutcheson, 1996) supported the five main job satisfaction dimensions as pay, nature of work, supervision, promotional prospects and relations with co-workers. Since the job dimensions are components of the organisation, and represents its climate, job satisfaction is an evaluation of organisational factors. Job satisfaction describes the feelings of employees regarding the environmental factors (climate factors), while organisational climate provides only a description of the work context.

Some researchers believed that job satisfaction level increases as employees’ progress to higher job levels (Corbin, 1977). Kline and Boyd (1994) however indicated that managers at a higher level of the organisation are satisfied with the salary, but less satisfied with promotional opportunities. The study also revealed that organisational variables like structure do not affect employees in the same way.

Schneider and Reichers (1983) conducted research on the relationship among organisational climate and job satisfaction, production and turnover indexes amongst five financial institutions. The findings of their study revealed that climate and satisfaction measures correlates for people in certain positions and not for others. A relationship between satisfaction and production was not found, while satisfaction correlated with turnover.

Kline and Boyd (1994) conducted a study to determine the relationship between organisational structure, context and climate with job satisfaction
amongst three levels of management. Their study revealed that employees at different levels of the organisations were affected by different work factors. Based on the outcome of this study, they recommended that different aspects of the work environment be looked into when addressing the issues of job satisfaction amongst different positions in the same organisation. Based on the above overview of the literature and a number of research studies (Schneider & Snyder, 1975; Hellreigel & Slocum, 1974) within a production environment it is clear that some relationship exists between the constructs organisational culture, climate and job satisfaction.

Abbas, Ahmad, and Taiebeh (2013) in a study of the relationship between organisational culture and job satisfaction among middle school teachers in Tehran city in Iran; using independent t-test, ANOVA and descriptive statistics found supportive organisational culture as crucial for enhancing job satisfaction. The sample size of 123 teachers was selected by cluster sampling. Analysis of data revealed a significant relationship between organisational culture and job satisfaction.

Tash, Razmara, Hemmatinezhad, and Lonbar (2011) in another study of the relationship between organisational culture and job satisfaction of the teachers of physical education in Guilan found a positive and significant relation between organisational culture and job satisfaction of the teachers of Physical Education in Guilan. The population of the study was 617 teachers with a sample size 287. In order to analyse data, the methods of descriptive Statistics in the format of frequency distribution, measures of central tendency and variance was used. The test of Kolmogorov – Smirnov was used to analyse the normality of data distribution, and the inferential statistical tests of
Wilcoxon, Multivariate regression correlation, correlation coefficient of Spearman, Kendall, and Mann Whitney U were used. It was concluded that organisational culture significantly predicts the Job Satisfaction of the Teachers of Physical Education in Guilan.

Mahmudi, Amani and Sadeghi (2013) in a study of the effect of organisational culture on job satisfaction among teachers using a structural equation modeling approach. Hofstede’s (1980) dimensions of culture were used to inform the theoretical framework. For this purpose, 187 secondary school teachers, 101 male and 86 female, in Education District 2 of Urmia, Iran, participated in the study. Findings indicated that power distance and masculinity/femininity dimensions had a direct negative and meaningful effect on basic psychological needs. Furthermore, basic psychological needs had a direct positive effect on job satisfaction. Besides, the effect of uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism/individualism on basic psychological needs was not statistically significant. In short, the findings confirmed the role of organisational culture and basic psychological needs in job satisfaction.

Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction

Due to competition for scarce skills, the attraction and retention of lecturers in universities is probably the biggest challenge in the tertiary education sector today. It is imperative for the university to have knowledge of the impact of job satisfaction and some demographic variables on lecturers’ turnover intentions to improve the attraction and retention of lecturers.

In a study by Scott, Swortzel and Taylor (2005) to determine what demographic factors were related to the level of job satisfaction of extension agents in Mississippi; the study followed a descriptive correlational design.
Based on 143 usable responses, significant relationships existed between the job satisfaction constructs and the demographic factors of gender and race. Significant relationships were determined at the p < .05 level.

According to Poling (1990), the best predictor of job satisfaction is when the employees’ personal values match those of the organization. When considering job satisfaction, demographic variables should be considered to thoroughly understand the possible factors that lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) identified several characteristics of satisfied/dissatisfied workers. They indicated that morale is high when people first start their jobs. Morale decreases during the next few years and remains at a relatively low level until workers are in their late twenties or early thirties. At this time, job satisfaction levels begin to rise and continue to rise through the remainder of the workers’ careers. The same trend is found in regard to a worker’s length of service. Workers begin with high morale, which drops during the first year and remains low for a number of years. Then as length of service increases, job satisfaction levels tend to rise.

Concerning gender, there are no simple conclusions about the differences between males and females and their job satisfaction levels. Some studies reviewed by Herzberg et al. (1957) indicate that males are more satisfied with their jobs, while others indicate that females are more satisfied. Educational level is not clear either. Furthermore, these studies showed that workers with more education have a higher job satisfaction level, while other studies indicate that workers with more education have a lower job satisfaction level. Other studies showed no relationship between the two. Herzberg et al.
(1957) suggested that a clear conclusion cannot be drawn concerning job satisfaction and its relationship to marital status, number of dependents, number of previous occupations, or ethnicity.

In a study of agricultural education teachers in Ohio, Cano and Miller (1992b) found that the teacher’s age, years in current position, total years teaching, and degree status were not significantly related to overall job satisfaction. In general, both males and females were equally satisfied with their jobs. These findings are similar to a later study of the same nature by Castillo, Conklin, and Cano (1999). Therefore, over an approximate ten year period, agriculture teachers’ selected demographic characteristics were not significantly related to their overall level of job satisfaction. The findings from these two studies (Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 1999) implied that older or younger teachers were not necessarily more or less satisfied with their jobs. Additionally, the longer a teacher remained in the profession the less his or her overall job satisfaction level was affected (Castillo & Cano, 1999).

When the same demographic variables were examined in yet another study that explored six different classifications of agriculture teachers (Cano & Miller, 1992a), it was found that overall job satisfaction was not significantly related to any of the demographic variables. Although the Ohio researchers’ findings are consistent, their findings on age, total years of teaching and degree status are contrary to the findings of Berns (1989) and Grady (1985).

Berns (1989) found that as the age of the teacher increased, so did his or her overall job satisfaction level. Grady (1985) found that as the number of years of teaching experience increased, overall job satisfaction increased as well. Berns (1989) discovered that a teacher’s educational level also affected
his or her overall job satisfaction level. A teacher with a master’s degree was more satisfied with his or her teaching position than a teacher with only a bachelor’s degree. Because of these inconsistencies in the literature, perhaps findings on the relationship of demographic variables to overall job satisfaction should only be applied to the area in which the study was conducted.

Research has been conducted on whether Extension faculty’s level of job satisfaction was related to age, years of experience, educational level, and marital status (Andrews, 1990; Bowen, Radhakrishna, & Keyser, 1994; Fetsch & Kennington, 1997; Griffin, 1984; Nestor & Leary, 2000). Regarding age, intrinsic job satisfaction was higher for those in the age groups of 23 to 33 and 46 to 50 (Nestor & Leary, 2000). This is consistent with the findings of Griffin (1984), who found in a study of Extension home economists that age was related to job satisfaction. The findings of Bowen et al. (1994) indicated that age was related to job satisfaction, since they found in a study of 4-H agents that those who were older had a higher level of job satisfaction. On the other hand, Andrews (1990) found no relationship between age and the job satisfaction levels of Extension agricultural agents.

Nestor and Leary (2000) did find that as one’s years of experience increased as an Extension faculty member, his or her intrinsic and overall job satisfaction increased as well. Bowen et al. (1994) also found this to be true for 4-H agents, while Fetsch and Kennington (1997) found it to be true for all Extension agents in their study. In contrast, Griffin (1984) and Andrews (1990) both found no relationship between job satisfaction and years of experience.
Concerning the educational level of Extension faculty, Andrews (1990) discovered a relationship between educational level and job satisfaction. However, Bowen et al. (1994) and Griffin (1984) found no such relationship.

Marital status was related to the job satisfaction levels of 4-H agents as indicated by Bowen et al. (1994) who found in a study that married 4-H agents were more satisfied with their jobs than those who were single. Fetsch and Kennington (1997) also found a relationship between marital status and job satisfaction levels. They found both divorced and married agents to be more satisfied with their jobs than agents who were never married, remarried, or widowed.

Several studies involving Extension agents regarding their job satisfaction levels and gender have been conducted (Bowen et al., 1994; Nestor & Leary, 2000; Riggs & Beus, 1993). However, the literature is divergent, illustrating that some studies indicate that females have higher levels of job satisfaction, while other studies indicate that males do (Bowen et al., 1994; Riggs & Beus, 1993). There are even some studies that indicate that there is no relationship between gender and job satisfaction levels (Nestor & Leary, 2000). Whereas Nestor and Leary (2000) found no relationship between gender and job satisfaction, Riggs and Beus (1993) found that as the number of areas of responsibility increased for female agents, job satisfaction increased as well. The opposite was true for males. When their areas of responsibility increased, their job satisfaction levels decreased. However, males with more areas of responsibility were more satisfied with their colleagues than were female agents. It was also found that both male and female agents alike who had fewer areas of responsibility and fewer children
living at home were more satisfied. Bowen et al. (1994) as well found a relationship between job satisfaction and gender. They discovered that female 4-H agents were more satisfied with their jobs than male agents.

Demographic Factors and Organisational Commitment

An analysis of the organisational commitment literature shows a long list of demographic factors that have been linked with commitment. Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (1996) found out that variables related with commitment that may be important for those employed in higher education institutions and business organisations in general include personal characteristics such as age, tenure, gender, family status, and educational level, sense of competence and a sense of professionalism. Only those personal characteristics of particular interest to this study will be reviewed further.

Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) meta-analytic study involving 41 samples and 10335 subjects, has shown a statistically significant positive correlation of ($r=2.0; \ p<.01$) between age and affective organisational commitment. Meyer and Allen (1993) also studied the relationship between age and affective commitment. In a study of university librarians and hospital employees, they obtained a statistically significant positive mean correlation of ($r=.36; \ p<.05$) between age and affective commitment. Age has been regarded as a positive predictor of commitment for a variety of reasons. Kaldenberg, Becker and Zvonkovic (1995) argue that as workers age, alternative employment options generally decrease, making their current job more attractive. They further state that older individuals may have a stronger investment and greater history with the organisation than younger workers.
Other researchers have not been able to show a significant link between age and organisational commitment. For example, Hawkins (1998) in a study of the affective commitment levels of 396 high school principals found a statistically non-significant correlation (r = -.004) between age and affective commitment. Colbert and Kwon (2000) in a study of 497 college and university internal auditors failed to show any reliable relationship between age and organisational commitment. Overall, age seems to have an inconsistent although moderate correlation with affective commitment.

As far as gender is concerned the reports are conflicting. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) in a meta-analytic study of 14 studies with 7420 subjects relating gender and organisational commitment obtained a mean correlation of (r=-.089; p< .01) for organisational commitment and gender. Although they report a weak association between gender and attitudinal commitment, they suggest that gender may affect employee’s perceptions of their workplace and attitudes towards the organisation. Kalderberg et al. (1995) found no significant difference between the mean level of commitment for female and male high school principals. Wahn (1998) on the other hand argues that women can show higher level of continuance commitment that men can. She cites reasons such as the fact that women face greater barriers than men when seeking employment as possible explanations to the high continuance commitment of women. She argues that having surmounted these barriers women would be more committed to continue the employment relationship. Although the literature referred to here is not exhaustive on the subject of the effect of gender on organisational commitment, it seems as if gender makes no difference on organisational commitment levels. Ngo and Tsang (1998)
support the viewpoint that the effects of gender on commitment are very subtle. When considering women in higher education institutions, Britt (2003) reviewed the relationship between organisational commitment and women’s career progression in New England higher education executive positions. The purpose of the study was to examine if the "glass-ceiling" existed. The study made use of executive administrators (Deans, Vice-Presidents, Presidents, Provosts, Chancellors, Executive Directors, College Officers, etc.) from colleges and universities in the six states of the New England region. The results made it bare that normative and continuance commitment related positively to career progress, and that women were encouraged to seek top positions.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) reviewed 38 samples that include 12290 subjects and established a positive link between organisational tenure and affective commitment. They report an overall weighted mean correlation of ($r = .17; p<.01$). Kushman (1992) in his study of urban elementary and middle school teachers also found a positive correlation($r = .17; p>.05$) between the number of years in teaching and organisational commitment. Meyer and Allen (1993) stated that an analysis of organisational tenure showed a mild curvilinear relationship with organisational commitment. They showed that middle tenure employees exhibited less measured commitment than new or senior employees did. These findings are supported by Liou and Nyhan (1994), who found a negative relationship between tenure and affective commitment ($t=-3.482$). However, these two authors did not find significant correlations between continuance commitment and employee tenure.
In Japan a study of industrial workers; Tao, Takagi, Ishida and Masuda (1998) found that organisational tenure predicted internalization ($R^2 = .262; P<.05$). Consistent with other researchers, Hawkins (1998) found a statistically significant positive correlation of ($r=.25; p<.05$) between the organisational commitment and tenure of 202 high school principals. Colbert and Kwon (2000) found a significant relationship ($r=.11; P<.05$) between tenure and organisational commitment. They found that employees with a longer tenure had a higher degree of organisational commitment than that of their counterparts. Although there appear to be empirical evidence to positively link tenure and organisational commitment, it is still not clear how this link operates (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1997) suggest that employees with long organisational tenure may develop retrospective attachment to the organisation. These kinds of employees attribute their long service to emotional attachment in an effort to justify to themselves why they have stayed that long. Meyer and Allen (1997) also suggest that the results of a positive relationship between tenure and affective commitment might be a simple reflection of the fact that indifferent employees leave an organisation and only those with a high commitment stay.

A range of studies have revealed that education is negatively correlated to organisational commitment and job satisfaction, and positively allied to turnover intentions (Steers, 1977; Angle & Perry, 1981; Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Eskildsen, Kristensen & Westlund, 2004). Mowday et al., (1982, p. 30) reports that"... this opposite relationship may result from the fact that more educated individuals have higher expectations that the organisation may be incapable to meet" resulting in the loss of
commitment. As a result, highly educated individuals were likely to become more committed to their professions than their organisations. It therefore, becomes thorny for organisations to vie for the psychological involvement of such members.

Commitment levels and intentions to remain are expected to be lower for highly educated staff that has a greater number of job options (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Abagi (1998) reports that, this corresponds to the situation in Kenyan public universities where highly trained academics in the fields of medicine, science and technology turnover more than those in the humanities. Habomugisha (1998) found that failure by the Ugandan government to sufficiently compensate highly educated academics has accounted for the high level of brain drain in their universities.

Studies have found a positive association between marital status and organisational commitment with married staff being more committed than staff member who is single (Hrebiniaik & Alutto, 1972; Lincoln & Arne, 1990). Married employees showed higher organisational commitment principally due to greater family obligations which hold back their opportunities to change employers (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Taormina, 1999; Cetin, 2006). Camilleri (2002) found that marital status was more correlated to continuance commitment, suggesting that married employees had more financial concerns.

**Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment**

Job satisfaction can be labeled as a positive emotional state ensuing from evaluating one’s job experiences and job dissatisfaction occurs when these prospects are not met (Mathis & Jackson, 2000). Robbins (1998)
described job satisfaction as an individual’s general attitude towards the job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards the job.

Oshagbemi (2000) investigated the extent to which UK academics were satisfied with their primary task of teaching, research and administration. In a survey study of 554 academics from 23 universities, he found that 80% of the academics were most satisfied with their task of teaching, followed by research (65%) and institutional management (40%). The study found that most UK academics are satisfied with the courses they teach and the freedom they have to choose the content of their courses, while some were dissatisfied with their class sizes and workload. Most of the respondents were dissatisfied with their administrative activities and complained that the excessive paperwork demanded of them reduced the time left for research.

Lacy and Sheehan (1997) using a sample of 12,599 respondents from eight nations (Australia, Germany, Hong Kong, Israel, Mexico, Sweden, UK and USA) examined aspects of academics satisfaction with their jobs. Academics across the eight nations reported general satisfaction with their colleagues, job security, opportunity to pursue their own ideas, and their job situation as a whole. However, 44.1% of the respondents were dissatisfied with their promotion prospects compared with 27.6% who indicated satisfaction. Academics from Israel and USA expressed the highest levels of job satisfaction with the courses they teach as compared to academics from Hong Kong, Sweden and Germany. With the exception of Israel and Mexico, there were significant gender differences across the nations, with male academics being more satisfied with most aspects of their jobs (i.e. job
security, promotions, opportunity to pursue own ideas and overall job satisfaction) as compared to the females. With regard to overall job satisfaction, most of the academics from Sweden and USA were more satisfied with their jobs than their colleagues in Germany, Mexico, Australia and UK.

Further studies by Lacy and Sheehan (1997) of 1394 Australian academics, found that male academics were more satisfied than females with most aspects of their jobs. Academics in the lowest rank (i.e. tutors) were less satisfied with their jobs as compared to their professorial colleagues. Academics indicated greatest satisfaction with the classes they teach (77%), relationships with colleagues (69%), opportunity to pursue own ideas (65%) and job security (58%). However, they were most dissatisfied with their promotion prospects (25%) and the way their institutions were managed (18%). Lacy and Sheehan concluded that if academic staff were to be encouraged to express higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of dissatisfaction, attention must be paid to the environment in which they work (i.e. their sense of community, faculty-administration relationship, faculty morale and intellectual atmosphere).

Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) in a survey study of 1,511 faculties from 10 public universities in America found that the best predictors for academics morale were their engagement in their work (i.e. enthusiasm and satisfaction with their work, intellectual stimulation and sharing a common purpose), their sense of institutional regard and their own personal morale. They concluded from their study that morale was the primary factor in faculty members’ intention to leave their positions, institutions and professions.
Volkwein and Zhou (2003) in a survey study of 1,178 administrators from 122 American universities found that intrinsic satisfaction was lower among administrators who worked in a controlled work environment, had job insecurity, and experienced interpersonal conflict. Extrinsic satisfaction was negatively influenced by job insecurity, external regulation, job stress and pressure, and inadequate facilities and funding. Teamwork positively influenced extrinsic, intrinsic and interpersonal satisfaction. Volkwein and Zhou suggested that university presidents should respond to the intrinsic needs of their managers by creating opportunities for them to be creative, to exercise their initiative and match their talents to their job responsibilities.

Similarly, Smerek and Peterson (2007) in a study of 1,987 non-academic respondents from a public American university examined the relationship between employees’ personal characteristics, job characteristics, perceived work environments and job satisfaction. Testing Herzberg, Maunsner and Synderman (1959) duality theory, the study found that ‘motivator’ factors (i.e. work itself, opportunity for advancement and responsibility) and ‘hygiene’ factors (i.e. effective senior management, supervisory support and satisfaction with salary) were the strongest predictors of job satisfaction. Age was the only personal characteristic to predict job satisfaction. The researchers concluded that the perceived work environment variables were more important than personal characteristics in predicting job satisfaction.

Hagedorn (1996) examined the role of female/male wage differentials in job satisfaction. In a survey study of 5,450 respondents from American universities, Hagedorn found that a significant proportion of female faculty
members received lower wages than their male colleagues resulting in reduced levels of job satisfaction, increased stress and increased likelihood to leave the academic profession. Hagedorn concluded that gender-based discriminatory practices in higher education, such as wage differences between men and women were costly as it led to the turnover of qualified female academics. Since the study was exploratory in nature, Hagedorn reported that some contextual factors that may have had significant effect on job satisfaction may not have been captured.

Wolverton, Montez, Guillory and Gmelch (2001) in a survey study of organisational commitment and turnover intentions among 822 Deans from 360 American institutions, found that deans who were inside hires tended to be more committed and less likely to leave than deans brought from outside their institutions. Deans who had external opportunities exhibited lower organisational commitment and were more intent on leaving unlike deans who were satisfied with their jobs and believed that they worked in good institutions. The study found that work-related stress was positively related to organisational commitment suggesting that some levels of stress challenged deans to do their best. Wolverton and colleagues conclude that universities should enhance the professional development and recognition of the institutional worth of their deans if they expect loyalty from them. The above studies show that intrinsic aspects of the job mainly shape the extent to which university academics are satisfied with their jobs and committed to their institutions.
Organisational Culture and Organisational Commitment

Organisational culture can be seen to have important influences on organisational commitment (Hellreigel et al., 2004). Firstly, organisational culture is considered to influence employees’ attitudes concerning their commitment to their organisation (Bourantas & Papalexandris, 1992; Chen, 2004). Secondly, Lytle, Hom, and Mokwa (2006) believe that commitment is an element of the organisation’s culture, and is similar to organisational glue that binds employees to one another, and being part of that organisation creates a sense of pride among employees.

Cohen (as cited in Rashid, Sambasivan & Johari, 2003) found a relationship between Hofstede’s (1993) cultural typology with organisational commitment. In combining Hofstede’s cultural model and Meyer and Allen’s (as cited in Rashid et al., 2003) organisational commitment components, Cohen (as cited in Rashid et al., 2003) found that the cultural dimensions predicted organisational commitment. Geiger (as cited in Rashid et al., 2003) also conducted a study using Hofstede’s (1993) cultural dimensions, and found that cultural values impacted on the escalation of organisational commitment. Rashid et al. (2003) used Deshpande and Farley’s (as cited in Rashid et al., 2003) cultural typology, and Meyer and Allen’s (1990) concept of organisational commitment; and, like Cohen (as cited in Rashid et al., 2003) and Geiger (as cited in Rashid et al., 2003), also found a positive relationship between organisational culture and organisational commitment.

Rashid et al. (2003) believed that there is an appropriate match between the type of organisational culture and the type of organisational commitment that, if correctly matched, will be beneficial to the performance
of an organisation. It is therefore clear that organisational culture and organisational commitment have an impact on an organisation’s performance (Rashid et al., 2003). Brewer (as cited in Chen, 2004) conducted research into the effect of organisational culture on organisational commitment, and it was found that a culture that has a bureaucratic nature often has a negative relationship with the commitment of an organisation’s employees. Odom, Boxx and Dunn (1990) believe that if an organisation were to remove the barriers erected as a result of it having a bureaucratic culture, this may contribute to creating a stronger organisational commitment by employees. Brewer (as cited in Chen, 2004) also found that there is a positive relationship when the culture is supportive, which results in greater commitment and employee involvement. Likewise, Odom et al. (1990) found that employees who worked in an environment that is supportive have a greater degree of organisational commitment. Lok, Westwood and Crawford (2005) agree with Odom et al. (1990) by stating that supportive cultures had stronger positive relationships with commitment than a bureaucratic-type culture, which had a negative relationship with commitment.

Naicker (2008) also conducted a study into the organisational culture and commitment of employees in Riverview Paper Mill using a sample size of 52 employees and adopting descriptive and inferential statistics found that the preferred culture is achievement culture but there is a strong preference for support culture.

Solimun, Troena and Syanta (2012) in the study of the influence of organisational culture, organisational commitment to job satisfaction and employee commitment at Municipal Waterworks of Jayapura, Papua
Indonesia, and the result showed that organisational culture does not influence directly to the employee commitment. And that organisational culture is able to influence commitment if mediated by job satisfaction. In other words, organisational commitment influence significantly to employee commitment to the organisation directly or indirectly through work satisfaction. The study made use of a sample size of 127 employees. The data was collected using questionnaire and analysed using descriptive and inferential analysis with partial Least Square method and Sobel Test.

Organisational Commitment within Academic Institutions

Several studies have looked into the organisational commitment of both educators and administrators in academic institutions and both groups were found to show commitment to their organisations (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Borchers & Teahen, 2000; Chiefo, 1991; Celep, 1992; Richards, O’Brien & Arkyod, 1994; Richards, O’Brien & Arkyod, 2000; Thornhill et al; 1996; Wolverton et al; 2001). Chiefo (1991) found that mid-level administrators in higher education are fairly committed to their organisations basically because they are proud of what they are doing and the autonomy of their work. Her result also showed a significant correlation between leadership behaviours ($r= .60$ to $.70$, $P< .01$) such as, vision, influence orientation, people orientation, motivational orientation and values orientation and organisational commitment.

In a survey of 1147 general and special educators, Billingsley and Cross (1992) determined the predictors of teacher’s commitment. Their cross-validated regression results suggested that work-related variables such as
leadership support, role conflict, role ambiguity and stress are the best predictors of commitment of educators. They concluded that increasing administrative support and principals’ behaviours such as feedback, encouragement, acknowledgement, use of participative decision making and joint problem solving are key in building a committed and satisfied teaching staff. Celep (1992) tried to determine the level of organisational commitment of teachers with regard to the commitment to the school, to the teaching work, to work group and to the teaching profession. Teacher’s commitment to the school was tested with such factors as exerting effort on behalf of the school, and having proper pride in belonging to the school, among others. His result showed a direct relationship between the teachers organisational commitment and having proper pride to belong to the school ($t=7.13$, $P<.01$) and work group ($t=13.25$, $P<.05$).

In a study to investigate the ability of extrinsic and intrinsic work related rewards to predict the organisational commitment of health occupations educators, Richards et al. (1994), found that two intrinsic and one extrinsic work related rewards significantly predicted organisational commitment. Significance, involvement and general working conditions, were significant at the .01 level; with standardised beta weights of .2411, .2135 and .159, respectively. Similar results were found by Richards et al. (2000) when they predicted the organisational commitment of marketing education teachers. They found that six of the eight work related rewards entered the stepwise multiples regression. The variables that were significant at the .01 level were supervision (.2188), significance (.2158), involvement (.2137) promotion (.1592), and co-workers (.1258).
Thornhill et al. (1996) have showed that communication with employees is significantly related to the organisational commitment of higher educational institutions. They found that communication in terms of information flow down the organisation, information flow up the organisation and leadership or management style were imperative in the context of higher education. Of the employees, who believed that management made a positive effort to keep staff well informed, 68 percent indicated that they felt part of the institution, 88 percent reported that it was a good place to work and 85 percent reported that their organisation had a great future.

In a study of 479 full time and part-time academics at two Mid-Western universities, Borchers and Teahen (2000) found that the level of organisational commitment does not vary significantly between faculty members who are part-time on-ground, part–part-time on line, full time on ground and full - time on line. These findings point to the fact that despite employment status educators are equally committed to their organisations. Wolverton et al. (2001) found that organisational commitment of deans appeared to increase with age (t=2.46, P<05), number of years in the position (t=3.00, P<.05), and the level of overall job satisfaction (t=2.69, P <.05).

**Summary of Literature Review**

This chapter has reviewed the different conceptual approaches in understanding organisational culture, job satisfaction and organisational commitment. The literature has revealed that there is a lack of consensus by different researchers regarding the meaning, dimensionality and measurement of the construct resulting in inconsistent results. Different researchers have used the social exchange theory, and behavioural theory to explain
organisational commitment. However, since each of these theories on their own do not give a complete picture of the nature of employee commitment to the organisation, research studies have shown that organisational commitment is a multidimensional construct consisting of affective, normative and continuance commitment.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the research methodology adopted for this research. Collis and Hussey (2003) define research methodology as the overall approach that the research process will take. In this chapter, the methodology that is used in this research will be explained, indicating how the research was undertaken. The chapter describes the research design followed by the population, the sample and sampling procedure, the instrument for the data collection, then the data collection procedure and the data analysis. Once the population and sample have been clarified, the instruments that were used for data collection will be explained in depth. The reliability and validity of the instrument that was used will also be discussed in this section. A description of how the data was collected and analysed will be given, focusing on the steps that were taken to administer the measuring instruments. The statistical techniques utilized in this research to analyse and test the data will be explained.

Research Design

This study employs correlational design. Correlational research as a research design has both the positives and the negatives. One of the positives is that; it helps to identify the linear relationships that exist between or among educational variables. It can also be said that correlational research are for prediction, if relationship exists between a predictor variable and the criterion variable. Correlational studies do not establish the cause and effect
relationship. In other words, it must be noted that the fact that there is a relationship does not imply that one is the cause of the other.

In this research data were gathered using the questionnaire. The unit of analysis is the individuals who responded to the questionnaire. The study adopted multivariate regression procedures. Multivariate regression procedures were chosen because it will help clarify the relationships among organisational culture variables and organisational commitment among academic staff of University of Cape Coast.

Population

The target population for this study was academic employees from the University of Cape Coast while the accessible population was full-time academic staff of University of Cape Coast. Full-time academic employees were selected to ensure that their views on the organisational culture on organisational commitment are known. Supporting staff were excluded from the sample because they do not have direct link with improving the academic performance of the students. Part-time lecturers were also excluded from the samples because they may not have a basis to form any long-lasting attachment with the university.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

Sampling from the population is an important process in research because it can be quite unfeasible to survey the entire population of university academic staff. Because of budgetary and time constraints, a sample of academic employees was selected. Stratified random sampling was used in the selection of respondents in order to get ample representations of groups that were significant for the study. The groups of interest were gender, marital
status, age and tenure. Sample frame was drawn for both males and females for all the departments in the bid to achieve unbiased sample. Simple random sampling method was used where each case was assigned an exclusive number and using a table of random numbers, the respondents were selected. This was considered the best method for reducing sampling bias and achieving a high level of representation (Saunders et al, 2007; Sekaran, 1992). Amedahe (2002) noted that, the simple random sampling is suitable when the population of study is similar in characteristics of interest such as the university lecturers under study.

Preceding the identification of the requisite samples of the study, the Registrar in charge of Administration of the university was contacted to get the total number of full-time academic staff in the specified faculties/schools. There was a total of 601 full-time academic staff from the university. The sample size for this study was obtained using a formula developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). In order to make simpler the process of sample size determination for researchers, Krejcie and Morgan created a table based on the formula which shows the population of a study and the expected sample size thus ensuring that the researcher obtained a representative sample for the study. According to the writers, “as the population increases the sample size increases at a decreasing rate and remains comparatively constant at slightly more than 380 cases” (p.607). With a letter from the department, the researcher was able to identify the respondents with the help of the various heads of department of the university. From the Krejcie and Morgan’s table the sample size of 248 was selected from the university. The respondents
include lecturers, senior lecturers and professors. The table below shows faculties/schools representation in terms of sample.

**Table: 1 Faculties, Lecturers population and Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTIES/SCHOOLS</th>
<th>LECTURERS</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Physical Sciences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Agriculture</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medical Sciences</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I . E . P . A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>601</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Finance office University of Cape Coast April, 2013.

**Instrument**

Prior to designing the questionnaire, a review of the relevant literature was carried out to identify the key concepts from which the variables were identified. The questionnaire consisted of the dependent, intervening and independent variable of the study. The dependent variable was commitment to ones university while the intervening variable was job satisfaction. The independent variable was organisational culture whereas the demographic characteristics served as the control variable.
The questionnaire as a method of data collection has strengths and weaknesses that the researcher must be aware of. Strengths and weaknesses are factors that have a significant impact on a researcher’s decision about whether or not to use the questionnaires in the study (Amedahe, 2002). He indicated that most researchers and writers consider the following.

The questionnaire as a tool for data collection cannot be administered on illiterates, and people who are too young to read and write. It also does not offer opportunities for motivating the respondent to participate in the survey or answer the questions. The characteristics of non-response associated with questionnaire especially the mail-questionnaire is likely to affect the representativeness of the sample. This may result in a biased final sample. Questionnaires do not provide an opportunity to collect additional information through observation, probing, prompting and clarification of questions while they are being completed.

Notwithstanding these negatives, questionnaires are less expensive than other methods - interview and observation. It can be sent through mail, but interview and observation cannot hence the expenses and time involved in training interviewers and observers as well as time spent on interviewing and observing are not involved in the use of questionnaire. The use of questionnaire promises a wider coverage since researchers can approach respondents more easily than other methods. They are not affected by problems of no-contacts. Questionnaires are also a stable, consistent and uniform measure, without variation. Questionnaires unlike other means of collecting data allow the respondents the freedom to respond to the items at
their own convenience. Lastly, questionnaires offer an assurance of anonymity.

The questionnaire as a tool for data collection was adopted because of the advantages noted above and in minimizing the negatives the researcher took the following measures.

With regards to the first disadvantage of questionnaire not suitable for illiterate; the researcher excluded non-academic staff which has a large chunk of its population been illiterate. In addressing the second disadvantage of questionnaire which has to do with its inability to offer opportunities for motivating the respondents, the researcher tried very hard and succeeds in coining very simple and straight forward items through the effort of his principal and co-supervisors reading through and making the necessary corrections before the administration of the questionnaire. On the non-response associated with mailed questionnaire the researcher delivered all the questionnaires by hand. Lastly, in overcoming the disadvantage of the questionnaire which has to do with its inability to collect additional information through observation, probing, prompting, and clarifying questions while being completed, the researcher again employed personal contacts in administering the questionnaires instead of adopting other available means like mailed questionnaire so that the difficulties respondents had can be dealt with.

The questionnaire consisted of five sections. In section one, respondents were asked to provide personal information. Section two measured the extent to which lecturers perceived the organizational culture of the university while section three measured the extent to which lecturers were
satisfied with their job. Section four consisted of series of items on the types of organizational culture. Section five had statements measuring lecturers’ commitment to their university.

**Pilot Testing of Instrument**

The phrase pilot study is used in two different ways in social science research. It can refer to feasibility studies which are "small scale version(s), or trial run(s), done in preparation for the major study" (Polit, Beck & Hungler, 2001, p. 467). To Baker (1994) a pilot study can also be the pre-testing or 'trying out' of a particular research instrument. Bell (cited in Naoum, 1998, p.87) described a pilot study as

getting the bugs out of the instrument (questionnaire) so that subjects in your main study will experience no difficulties in completing it and so that you can carry out a preliminary analysis to see whether the wording and format of the questions will present any difficulties when the main data are analysed”.

Following the development of the questionnaire, a pilot study was carried out to ensure that the items in the questionnaire were stated clearly, had the same meaning to all the respondents, and also to give the researcher an idea of approximately how long it would take to complete the questionnaire. In all a total of 30 questionnaires were administered to academic staff of University of Education - Kumasi in August, 2013. This university was selected for reasons such as geographical expediency and similarity to the genuine cases. This university was not included in the main study to avoid contamination of the
respondents (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). Twenty five (25) completed
questionnaires were returned.

The respondents were informed that the questionnaire was a pilot for a
larger study. A short questionnaire was attached at the end in which they were
asked to indicate the length of time it took to complete the questionnaire;
indicate questions that they found to be ambiguous or which they were
uncomfortable with and to make any other comments that would improve the
questionnaire. The respondents indicated that it took them between 20 and 30
minutes to complete the questionnaire. Questions that were indicated as
ambiguous were rephrased.

Pallant (2001) explained validity as a term describing a measure that
accurately reflects the concept it is intended to measure. In this regard validity
simply refers to how accurately the questionnaire was able to collect the
responses from the respondents as intended by the researcher. Validity is the
degree to which the study accurately answers the questions it was intended to
answer. It examines the truthfulness or the quality of the research process and
the accuracy of the results. Content validity was used in this study. Content
validity is a measure of the degree to which data collected using a particular
instrument represents the content of the concept being measured (Mugenda &
Mugenda, 1999). Gravetter and Forzano (2006) on the other hand defined
content validity as the degree to which a test measures an intended content
area. For them, content validity is determined by expert judgment and that
content validity cannot be calculated through quantitative technique.

To ensure content validity, a thorough review of the literature was
carried out to identify the items required to measure the concepts. To enhance
the validity of the research instrument, the questionnaire was made available to the researcher's supervisors, both the principal and the co-supervisor, to review and comment on with the view of establishing content validity. Under the guidance of the principal supervisor, the researcher modified and deleted materials the study considered inaccurate or which the study felt infringed on the confidentiality of the respondents. My two supervisors further scrutinized unclear, biased and deficient items, and evaluated whether items were members of the subsets they have been assigned. The questionnaire was further critiqued by experts during the pilot study, all in a bid to ensuring its validity.

Reliability on the other hand, is the degree of stability or consistency of measurement (Gravetter & Forzano, 2006). Reliability refers to the ability of measurement instrument to produce the same answer in the same circumstances, time after time (Johnson & Harris, 2002; De Vaus, 2002). This means that if people answered a question the same way on repeated occasions, then the instrument can be said to be reliable. There are three different techniques for assessing reliability of data. These are test-retest, split-half and internal consistency.

The test-retest method of assessing reliability of data was not found to be suitable for this study because it involves administering the same instrument twice to the same group of subjects, with a time lapse between the first and second test. This technique is more suitable for longitudinal studies and not for correlational studies. Another disadvantage with this process is that respondents may remember their responses during the second testing thus resulting in artificially high coefficients.
The split-half reliability technique involves splitting items in a scale into two halves and correlating the results of each half with each other. If the correlations are high, then both parts of the scale are deemed to be measuring the same construct (Johnson & Harris, 2002). The disadvantage with this method is that when the items in the scale are an odd number, for example, 13 or 15 items, one half will have more items than the other half.

In this study, the internal consistency method was used. The rationale for internal consistency is that the individual items should all be measuring the same constructs and thus correlates positively to one another (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). The most widely used measure for determining internal consistency is the Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. The number of respondents used for the pilot study was sufficient to include any major variations in the population as confirmed by Ary et al. (2006) that for most descriptive studies using questionnaires, a range of five to ten percent (5% - 10%), of the sample size, for pilot study is sufficient.

The instrument was administered personally to the respondents. The internal consistency of the instrument was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbach’s alphas of the instrument generated was 0.802 with the help of Test Analytics for Surveys (TAfS), a tool of Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) Version 18.0, which is used for coding data and analysing verbatim responses to close and open-ended questionnaire and produces tables and charts directly to enable data interpretation.

Further calculation of reliability of the questionnaire was done on construct and variable bases. This statistical validation on the Likert-type scale of the items in sections two, three, four and five were based on the Cronbach’s
alpha reliability test. With the help of the same statistical software the internal consistency of the Likert-type scales and the demographic data for Cronbach’s alpha co-efficient was determined. There was 83 percent response rate. The reliability co-efficient of the sections are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Computed Reliability Co-efficient of the Instrument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Category</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1: Personal Information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2: Power Culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3: Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4: Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5: Commitment to the University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Instrument</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>.802</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data August, 2013.

The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ranges between 0 and 1 (De Vaus, 2002). Higher alpha coefficient values means that scales are more reliable. As a rule of thumb, acceptable alpha should be at least 0.70 or above (Hair et al., 1998; De Vaus, 2002; Maizura, Masilamani & Aris, 2009). However, the value of cronbach alpha may vary for different studies, for instance, in exploratory research a Cronbach alpha value of 0.60 is acceptable (Hair et al.,
1998; Maizura et al., 2009). Other studies have recommended that reliability coefficient of 0.50 or 0.60 was sufficient for exploratory studies (Nunnally, 1967; Davis & Cosenza, 1988; Davis & Cosenza, 1993). Further, De Vaus (2002) suggests that the relationship between one item and the rest of the items in the scale should be at least 0.30. Therefore, items with coefficients below 0.30 are considered to be unreliable and should be deleted resulting in improved alpha.

Based on the responses given during the pilot study, few modifications were effected to improve the final instrument for the main survey which was then administered. Items that were not clearly stated were corrected.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Having decided on the apt sample size and identified the respondents, the corrected questionnaires were distributed by hand. A letter of introduction accompanied the questionnaires explaining the purpose of the study and also assuring the respondents of confidentiality and anonymity. The data was collected in August and it took one month two weeks to receive the responded questionnaires.

**Data Analysis**

The data from the questionnaires were screened and entered in readiness for analysis using SPSS software. This was analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were computed to obtain a general understanding of the university and respondents’ characteristics such as age, tenure, gender and marital status. Inferential statistics were computed in the second stage of the analysis. The purpose here
was to test a number of relationships so as to make generalisations of the findings from the sample to a larger population.

Different statistical techniques were used to achieve the objectives of the study as follows:

1. To what extent do the lecturers perceive the university’s organisational culture in positive terms? – *Mean, Median, Standard Deviation.*

2. To what extent does the perceived organisational culture of the university relate to the lecturers satisfaction with their job in the university? – *Correlation.*


4. To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment relate to their marital status? – *Point-biserial Correlation.*

5. To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment relate to their age and length of service? - *Pearson Product Moment Correlation.*

**Research Hypothesis**

Ho

The university’s organisational culture does not directly predict lecturers’ commitment to the institution. – *Multiple Regressions.*
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of university’s organisational culture on organisational commitment of the academic staff of the University of Cape Coast (UCC). Specifically, the study finds out the extent to which lectures perceive the university’s organisational culture in positive terms and the relationship between the perceived organisational culture of the university and lecturers satisfaction with their job in the university. The study further examines the relationship between lecturers’ job satisfaction and their perceived organisational commitment with regard to their gender, marital status, length of service and age. Finally, the study looks at the influence of the university’s organisational culture on lecturers’ commitment to the university as a whole.

This chapter of the study presents the findings emanating from the data collected from the self-administered questionnaires. The discussion includes the interpretation of the findings in reference to the previous findings and theory. Through logical deduction, each finding was evaluated and its implications were examined with respect to the current theoretical position on the direct predictability of the university’s organisational culture on lecturers’ commitment to the university. The chapter is organised into two main parts. The first part deals with the demographic data of the respondents and covers areas such as respondents’ gender, age, marital status and lecturers’ length of service in the university. The second part is devoted to responses given by the
respondents in accordance with the research questions and hypothesis. It must be noted that at the end of data collection, 237 academic staff were captured for the study.

**Demographic Data of the Respondents**

This part deals mainly with cross tabulation of the respondents’ gender, age, marital status and length of service as an academic staff in the university. The results are presented as follows:

**Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group of Respondents</th>
<th>Gender of Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 31 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 39 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59 years</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and above</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013.

Table 3 presents distribution of respondents by their age groups. As contained in the Table, majority (82.7%) of the respondents captured for the study were males. The Table further indicates that (38.8%) of the male respondents and majority (56.1%) of the female respondents were between the age group of 50 – 59 years. However, 15.8% of the male respondents were 60 years and above.
years and above while none of the female respondents were 60 years or above. The combined percentage shows that the majority (85.2%) of the respondents was more than 39 years of age. The data shows that there is a large ageing lecturer population, and that it will be necessary for the university’s human resource directorate to make long-term policy decisions on its human resource future.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Gender of Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/Widower</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013.

Table 4 indicates that majority of the male (61.7%) and female (92.7%) of the respondents were married. Again, the Table shows that 25.5% of the male respondents were widowed while 4.9% of the female respondents were widowed. However, none of the respondents indicated that they were
divorced. The Table further shows a percentage total (67.1%) of the respondents being married and (21.9%) widowed.

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Gender of Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013.

Table 5 contains findings on respondents’ length of service as academic staff in the university. As depicted in the Table, the combined percentage shows that more (46.4%) of the male respondents had served or worked in the University for more than 15 years. Similarly, majority (58.5%) of the female respondents had served or worked in the university for more than 15 Years. It can therefore be said of this research that more in terms of percentage of the female respondents had served the University for a longer period of time than males.
Analysis Pertaining to Research Questions and the Testing of the Research Hypothesis

This section presents the results pertaining to the research questions and the testing of the research hypothesis. Statistical tools such as mean, median, standard deviation; skewness, correlation, independent sample t-test, point bi-serial correlation and pearson product moment correlation, were used to analyze data for the research questions while multiple regression analysis was used to test the research hypothesis. The results are presented as follow:

Research Question One

To what Extent do the Lecturers Perceive the University’s Organizational Culture in Positive Terms?

The first research question of the study was to ascertain the extent to which lecturers perceive the university’s organisational culture in positive terms. Subcultures considered were power culture, role culture, achievement culture and support culture. Each of the subcultures was made up of five items. These items were pooled together to form each subculture which were later pooled together again to form the major variable, that is the perceived organisational culture of the university.

These items were measured with a five-point scales ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). As indicated earlier, each of the main constructs were made up of many items that were pooled together using average responses with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) Version 18.0. After the pooling process, descriptive statistics such as mean, median, standard deviation and skewness were used to analyze the data. The results are presented in Table 6.
Table 6: Lecturers Perception on the University’s Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power culture</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role culture</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement culture</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support culture</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational culture of the university</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013. (n = 237)

Where SD = standard deviation and SK = skewness

Based on the five-point scale used, the average response score used in categorising the data into positive and negative was a mean score of 3.0. That is \( \frac{1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5}{5} = 3.0 \). Similarly, using the median score, any value greater than 2.5 was deemed to be perceived as positive while any score equal to 2.5 or less than 2.5 was deemed to be perceived as negative. These categorisations were done based on the recommendation of Pallant (2001) regarding the interpretation of descriptive statistics such as mean and median.

As contained in Table 6, respondents perceived all the organisational subcultures of the university positively. In order of importance, the most positively perceived subcultures are role culture (Mean = 4.34, SD = 0.25), achievement culture (Mean = 3.86, SD = 0.43), power culture (Mean = 3.48, SD = 0.57) and support culture (Mean = 3.45, SD = 0.62). This means that the most perceived organisational subculture is role culture while the least perceived organisational subculture of the university is support culture. In all, the data show that lecturers perceive the university’s organisational culture in
positive terms ($\text{Mean} = 3.78$, $\text{SD} = 0.21$). The lecturers of the university have identified that the university has rules, procedures and job descriptions which control the lecturers’ behavior (Brown, 1995; Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Martin, 2001).

The struggle for power is moderated by the rules and there is rationality, order and dependability in the university (Brown, 1995; Harrison & Stokes, 1992; Van de Post et al., 1997). The working environment is characterised by bureaucracy, where authority and responsibility are delegated downwards, and each level in the organisation has a defined area of authority where work is able to be done continuously with direct supervision from the top management (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). One of the greatest strengths of the role culture is the ability of the lecturers to allocate more energy to doing their work than without the rules and structures of the role orientation (Harmse, 2001).

A major weakness of this culture type is that lecturers are assumed not to be trusted; and individual autonomy and discretion is not given to lower-level lecturers (Harrison & Stokes, 1992) and lecturers are also controlled so much that they may be prevented from making the correct choices and being innovative if it is outside the rules (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Again, traditional role-orientation organisations may have difficulty keeping up with rapidly changing environments because in the interests of rationality and order, it is difficult to change the rules and therefore, it may take longer to make any necessary changes in order to adapt (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The results of this research identify, in Table 6, that the least strong organisational culture is support subculture.
The finding of this research indicate that the university has a predominantly role culture which is in consonance with Hellriegel et al.’s (2004) theory that most government institutions have a bureaucratic culture, which can hinder their effectiveness and efficiency. The role culture, which is the strongest culture, is also referred to as a bureaucratic culture type, which supports Hellriegel et al. (2004).

It can therefore be said of the finding that to ensure effectiveness and efficiency, the university authorities should allow for individual lecturers autonomy, discretion and above all be trusted. Also the controlled systems ought to be relaxed to give room for innovation and making of correct choices as well as keeping up with the rapidly changing environment. Thus achievement subculture should be the subculture that would elicit the utmost positive perception of the lecturers.

Research Question Two

To what Extent Does the Perceived Organisational Culture of the University Relate to the Lecturers Satisfaction with their Job in the University?

The second substantive research question of the study focused on the association between organisational culture of the university and lecturers satisfaction with their job in the university. The level of job satisfaction among the academic staff was obtained using five items. Examples of the items were “I am generally satisfied with my job in the department”, “I am satisfied with the rules governing promotions in the university” and “I am satisfied with my salary”. These items were pooled together to form the job satisfaction variable of the academic staff. The items were measured with five-point scale ranging
from strongly satisfied (5) to strongly dissatisfied (1). With regard to the organisational culture of the university variable, the explanation of how the variable was derived has been explained earlier. The results of the assumed association between the two main variables are presented in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Satisfaction with the Job</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational culture of the university</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013. **p<0.01 (n = 237)

As contained in Table 7, with the exception of power culture, all the perceived organisational subcultures of the university relate positively to lecturers level of job satisfaction in the university. Power culture was statistically significant and negatively correlated with lecturers satisfaction with their job in the university (r = -0.45, p = 0.00). Using Gravetter and Forzano’s (2006) suggestion for interpreting correlation co-efficient, the association between power subculture and lecturers level of job satisfaction in the university was strong. In other words, there was a negative strong relationship between power subculture and lecturers level of job satisfaction in
the university. This means that as the use of power culture increases job satisfaction of the lecturer’s declines. The findings support the findings of Mahmudi, Amani and Sadeghi (2013) who posit that power distance had a direct negative and meaningful effect on job satisfaction.

The Table further shows that achievement culture was the most statistically significant and positively correlated variable with lecturers level of job satisfaction in their job \( (r = 0.56, p = 0.00) \). The association between achievement culture and lecturers level of job satisfaction in their job was strong (Gravetter & Forzano, 2006). In other words, there was a positively strong relationship between achievement subculture and lecturers level of job satisfaction with their job.

The finding here is at a tangent with the conclusion drawn by Abbas, Ahmad, and Taiebeh (2013) who found supportive organisational culture as crucial for enhancing job satisfaction of middle school teachers in Tehran city in Iran. The achievement subculture of the organisation aligns employees with a common vision or purpose (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). Also, systems and structures are necessary in an achievement-oriented organisation, and are in place to serve the organisation’s mission (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). These systems and structures are altered when alterations in the mission occur, and are therefore more flexible than the rules of law of the role orientation (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

An advantage of this type of culture is that employees give more willingly to their organisation because employees make their contributions more freely in response to their commitment to their shared purpose, and as a result, the entire organisation prospers (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). An
achievement-orientation organisation also has advantages in the enthusiasm, high energy, and involvement of the employees of the organisation, yet these may also become disadvantages to the organisation (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The high energy and involvement of employees within this culture type are often difficult to sustain because employees may be subject to burnout and disillusionment when results are not achieved (Harrison & Stokes, 1992). The achievement orientation also has a disadvantage in the fact that these organisations are often under-organised because employees lack the necessary time for objective planning, and they may rely on the common mission to organize their work (Harmse, 2001; Harrison & Stokes, 1992). When the mission takes on different forms for various parts of the organization, the organization may lose unity of effort (Harrison & Stokes, 1992).

Table 7 shows that organisational culture of the university relates positively to lecturers level of satisfaction with their job in the university (r = 0.42, p = 0.00). The relationship between organisational culture of the university and lecturers level of satisfaction with their job in the university is positive and moderate. The finding of this study is in agreement with the findings by Tash, Razmara, Hemmatinezhad & Lonbar (2011) that did a similar study about physical education teachers in Guilan and concluded that organisational culture significantly predicts the job satisfaction of the teachers.

In all, there is a moderately positive significant relationship between the organisational culture of University of Cape Coast and lecturers’ job satisfaction.
Research Question Three

To what Extent do Lecturers’ Job Satisfactions and Organisational Commitment Differ by Gender?

The third substantive research question of the study focused on the significant gender differences among lecturers with regard to their job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Five items each were used to elicit data on lecturers’ job satisfaction and their commitment to the university. The items were pooled together to form the two main variables, that is, lecturers level of job satisfaction and their commitment to the university. The items were measured with five-point scale ranging from one to five. The pooling was done with the help of the Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) Version 18.0. Again, using the same analytic software, the independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the gender difference with regard to the issues. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Gender Differences in Lecturers’ Job Satisfaction and their Organisational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender of Respondents</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013. (n = 237)

Where N = sample size, and SD = standard deviation.

The result in Table 8 indicates that there was no statistically significant gender difference in lecturers’ job satisfaction and their commitment to the
university. This finding is a departure from Scott, Swortzel and Taylor (2005) who concluded that there is a statistically significant relationship between the job satisfaction constructs and the demographic factors of gender and race of extension agents of Mississippi. Also, Riggs and Beus (1993) found that as the number of areas of responsibility increased for female agents, job satisfaction increased as well. The opposite was true for males. When their areas of responsibility increased, their job satisfaction levels decreased.

However, males with more areas of responsibility were more satisfied than their colleagues’ female agents. It was also found that both male and female agents alike who had fewer areas of responsibility and fewer children living at home were more satisfied. Bowen et al. (1994) as well found a relationship between job satisfaction and gender. On the other hand, in a study of agricultural teachers in Ohio by Cano and Miller (1992a), it was found that overall job satisfaction was not significantly related to any of the demographic variables. Nestor and Leary (2000) also found no relationship between gender and job satisfaction.

However, with regard to the lecturers job satisfaction, even though the means of both sexes appear to be similar, female lecturers (Mean = 3.32, Std. Dev. = 0.52) had higher level of satisfaction than their male counterparts (Mean = 3.24, Std. Dev. = 0.53). This finding is contrary to studies reviewed by Herzberg et al. (1957) which indicated that males are more satisfied with their jobs, than females. The study is also incongruous with the study conducted by Ohio, Cano and Miller (1992b) who found out that there is no statistically significant gender difference between males and females with regard to their satisfaction and commitment with their jobs. From the
foregoing it is clear that there is no gender difference in terms of their job satisfaction. They both appear to be satisfied with their job though.

Similarly, in relation to their commitment to the university, female lecturers (Mean = 3.75, Std. Dev. = 0.42) level of commitment to the university is not different from that of the male lecturers (Mean = 3.73, Std. Dev. = 0.44). This is in line with the findings by Kalderberg et al. (1995) who found no significant difference between the mean level of commitment for female and male high school principal. Wahn (1998) on the other hand argues that women can show higher level of continuance commitment than men can. She cites reasons such as the fact that women face greater barriers than men when seeking employment as possible explanations to the high continuance commitment of women. She argues that having surmounted these barriers women would be more committed to continue the employment relationship.

Research Question Four

To what Extent do Lecturers’ Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment Relate to their Marital Status?

The fourth substantive research question of the study focused on the association between demographic variable marital status of the lecturers and their job satisfaction and commitment to the university. The level of job satisfaction among the academic staff and their commitment to the university were obtained using five items. As indicated earlier, the items were pooled together to form the job satisfaction and commitment to the university variables of the academic staff. Since the marital status variable was a true dichotomy and the academic staff job satisfaction and commitment to the university were continuous, the researcher used the Point-biserial correlation
to examine the relationship between the marital status of the academic staff and their job satisfaction and commitment to the university.

The results of the assumed association between the two main variables and the marital status of the academic staff are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9: Relationship between Marital Status and Academic Staff Job Satisfaction and Commitment to the University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Commitment to the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>-0.130*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013. **p<0.01     *p<0.05 (n = 237)**

As contained in Table 9, marital status of the academic staff did not have any statistically significant relationship with their job satisfaction. It means, the marital status of the academic staff has no link with their job satisfaction in the university. This is contrary to findings by Bowen et al. (1994) who found that married 4-H agents were more satisfied with their jobs than those who were single. Fetsch and Kennington (1997) also found a relationship between marital status and job satisfaction levels. They found both divorced and married agents to be more satisfied with their jobs than agents who were never married, remarried, or widowed.

However, in relation to their marital status and commitment to the university, there was a statistically significant negative relationship (r = -0.130, p = 0.046). The correlation coefficient shows that the relationship is weak. This means that as academic staff get married or have partners, the less they become committed to the university. Also, if the academic staff are
single or are not in any romantic relationship, they become more committed to the university. This contradicts Hrebiniak and Allutto, (1972); Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) who reported that several studies had found a positive relationship between marital status and organisational commitment with married staff being more committed than staff member who is single. The finding is also divergent with the views of Mathieu and Zajac (1990); Taormina, (1999); and Cetin, (2006) who posit that married employees show greater organisational commitment principally due to greater family obligations which hold back their opportunities to change employers.

The finding shows that lecturers’ marital statuses to some extent do relate negatively to their commitment to the university. That is, those that are not married or have a partner are more committed to the university while those that are married are less committed to the university.

The result from various research show unclear relationship between marital status and job satisfaction as well as organisational commitment.

**Research Question Five**

**To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment relate to their age and length of service?**

The fifth substantive research question of the study focused on the association between demographic variables such as age and length of service of the lecturers and their job satisfaction and commitment to the university. The level of job satisfaction among the academic staff and their commitment to the university were obtained using five items. As indicated earlier, the items were pooled together to form the job satisfaction and commitment to the university variables of the academic staff.
With regard to the age and length of service of the academic staff and its association with their job satisfaction and commitment to the university, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used, since all the variables were measured on a continuous scale. The results of the assumed association between the two main variables and the demographic variables of the academic staff are presented in Table 10.

### Table 10: Relationship among Selected Demographic Variables and Academic Staff Job Satisfaction and Commitment to the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Commitment to the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>-0.268**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2013. **p<0.01  *p<0.05  (n = 237)

As contained in Table 10, age of the academic staff did not have any statistically significant relationship with their job satisfaction. It means, the age of the academic staff has no link with their job satisfaction in the university. Therefore, the academic staff job satisfaction with the university has nothing to do with the age. But with age, Nestor and Leary (2000) found that intrinsic job satisfaction was higher for those in the age groups of 23, to 33 and 46 to 50. This is consistent with the findings of Griffin (1984), who found in a study of extension home economists that age was related to job satisfaction. Also, the findings of Bowen et al. (1994) indicated that age was
related to job satisfaction, since they found in a study of 4-H agents that those who were older had a higher level of job satisfaction. On the other hand, Andrews (1990) found no relationship between age and the job satisfaction levels of extension agricultural agents.

The Table again shows that there was no statistically significant relationship between the age group of the academic staff and their commitment to the university. The coefficient for the two variables was even very small and non-significant. This means that the academic staff commitment to the university has no link with their age. Therefore, the academic staff commitment to the university has nothing to do with the age. The finding does not corroborate with the views of Kaldenberg, Becker and Zvonkovic (1995) who argue that as workers age, alternative employment options generally decrease, making their current job more attractive to them. They further stated that older individuals may have a stronger investment and greater history with the organisation than younger workers hence become committed.

The academic staff length of service in the university has significant and negative relationship with their job satisfaction ($r = -0.268$, $p = 0.000$). This means that, the longer they stay in the service, the less satisfied they become. The relationship was moderate. This is a departure from the research findings of Grady (1985) who found that as number of years of teaching experience increased, overall job satisfaction increased as well. Nestor and Leary (2000) did find that as one’s years of experience increased as an Extension faculty member one’s intrinsic and overall job satisfaction increased as well. Bowen et al. (1994) also found this to be true for 4-H agents, while
Fetsch and Kennington. (1997) found it to be true for all extension agents in their study. In contrast, Griffin (1984) and Andrews (1990) both found no relationship between job satisfaction and years of experience. Also, Cano and Miller (1992b) found that the teacher’s total years of teaching were not significantly related to overall job satisfaction. The link between length of service and job satisfaction is not firmly established.

However, with regard to their commitment to the university, there was no relationship with the length of service. The results mean that the more the academic staff stays longer in the university the less they become committed with it and the less they had stayed in the university the more they become committed. The finding does not support the views of Colbert and Kwon (2000) who found that employees with a longer tenure had a higher degree of organizational commitment than that of their counterparts. The results do not also support the views of Meyer and Allen (1993) who found a mild curvilinear relationship between organisational tenure and organisational commitment. They showed that middle tenure employees exhibited less measured commitment than new or senior employees did.

The finding shows that lecturers’ length of service had some negative relation with their job satisfaction. That is, the longer the lecturers stay in the university the more they become dissatisfied with their job in the university.

The result from various research show unclear relationship between age, length of service and job satisfaction as well as organisational commitment.
Testing of the Hypothesis

Another substantive objective of the study was to examine the direct contribution of university’s organisational culture on lecturers’ commitment to the university. The rationale was to find out whether lecturers perception of the university’s organisational culture will directly or indirectly predict their commitment to the institution. The multiple regression analysis was used to test the research hypothesis that was coined from this objective. The study hypothesised that:

$H_0$: The University’s organisational culture do not directly predicts lecturers’ commitment to the institution.

$H_1$: The University’s organisational culture directly predicts lecturers’ commitment to the institution.

The hypothesis tested as indicated in Table 10 was that the lecturers’ perception on the university’s organisational culture will not predict their commitment to the university directly and that it will predicts it indirectly. First, the various subcultures of the organisational culture of the university, which are, power culture, role culture, achievement culture and support culture, were used as the independent variables while lecturers’ commitment to the university was used as dependent variable. The lecturers’ satisfaction with their job in the university as a result of the organisational culture of the university was used as an intervening or mediating variable. The study indicates that for organisational culture of the university to predict significantly lecturers’ commitment to the university, the lecturers must first be satisfied in their job within the university. The results are presented in Table 11.
Table 11: Influence of University’s Organisational Culture on Lecturers’ Commitment to the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model One</th>
<th>Model Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power culture</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role culture</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement culture</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support culture</td>
<td>0.533**</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Lecturers’ commitment to the university (n = 237)

**p< 0.01; *p< 0.05

Source: Field Data, 2013

In the first model, the four types of subculture of the university’s organisational culture were entered as independent variables with lecturers’ commitment to the university operating as the dependent variable. The results as shown in Table 11 indicate that the standardised beta co-efficients for power culture, role culture and achievement culture were not statistically significant. However, support culture was statistically significant (Beta = 0.533 (0.048), p = 0.001). This means, support culture is the only statistically
significant subculture of the university’s organisational culture. The findings support the view of Brewer (as cited in Chen, 2004) who posits that there is a positive relationship when the culture is supportive, which results in greater commitment and employee involvement. Likewise, Odom et al. (1990) also found that employees who work in an environment that is supportive have a greater degree of organisational commitment. Lok, Westwood and Crawford (2005) agreed with Odom et al. (1990) by stating that supportive cultures had stronger positive relationships with commitment than a bureaucratic-type culture, which had a negative relationship with commitment. Naicker (2008) also found that the preferred culture is achievement culture but there is a strong preference for support culture.

In addition, the unique proportional contribution of the university’s organisational culture to lecturers’ commitment to the university was 0.456 with an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.442. This means that the university’s organisational culture was able to predict or explain only 45 percent of the variance in lecturers’ commitment to the university.

It therefore means that besides the university’s organisational culture, identified, other factors not yet in the model have a chance of contributing or predicting about 55 percent to lecturers’ commitment to the university. The result suggests that the university’s organisational culture alone does not contribute significantly to lecturers’ commitment to the university and that they do so when other variables are considered. The findings corroborate the view of Bourantas and Papalexandris (1992) and Chen (2004) who observed that organisational culture is considered to influence employees’ attitudes concerning their commitment to their organisation. Lytle et al. (2006) believe
that commitment is an element of the organisation’s culture, and is similar to
organisational glue that binds employees to one another, and being part of that
organisation creates a sense of pride among employees. Cohen (as cited in
Rashid et al. 2003) found that the cultural dimensions predicted organisational
commitment. Geiger (as cited in Rashid et al. 2003), also found a positive
relationship between organisational culture and organisational commitment.
Rashid et al. (2003) also believed that there is an appropriate match between
the type of organisational culture and the type of organisational commitment
that, if correctly matched, will be beneficial to the performance of an
organisation.

The study indicates that the support subculture of the university
directly predicts the organisational commitment of the lecturers since, it was
the only subculture which was statistically significant at the initial stage of the
analysis. That is, before the introduction of the intervening variable of job
satisfaction. This is suggestive of the fact that if the subculture of the
university is supportive in the short to medium terms those who matter in the
progress of the university can still elicit lecturers commitment without job
satisfaction as an intervening variable.

In the second model, as presented in Table 11, the mediating variable
which was job satisfaction was entered into the model. The theory here was
that the university’s organisational culture in itself would not predict directly
lecturers’ commitment to the university significantly, and that they would do
so indirectly through the lecturers’ level of job satisfaction. When the job
satisfaction variable was entered into the model, the beta co-efficients of some
of the subcultures of the university’s organisational culture shrank while
others expanded. Also, role culture beta co-efficient which was not significant in the first model became statistically significant at 0.05 significant levels in the second model.

The resultant shrinkages, expansions and levels of significance in the beta co-efficients mean that the university’s organisational culture does not directly influence lecturers’ commitment to the university. They do so only when the lecturers’ are satisfied with their job in the university. In other words, they do so when they are satisfied with their job as a result of the university’s organisational culture. However, it is important to observe that the unique proportional contribution of organisational culture and job satisfaction of the lecturers’ to the dependent variable, that is lecturers’ commitment to the university, was 0.581 with an adjusted $R^2$ of 0.563. This means that the university’s organisational culture and lecturers’ job satisfaction were able to predict or explain about 56 percent of the variance in lecturers’ commitment to the university. The study further concludes with the introduction of job satisfaction that role subculture also significantly predicts the lecturers commitment to the university since it becomes statistically significant (Beta = 0.457 (0.172), $p = 0.047$)

The significant increase with regard to the unique proportional contribution of the university’s organisational culture and lecturers’ job satisfaction to lecturers’ commitment to the university mean that when lecturers’ are satisfied with their job in the university, the predictability of the university’s organisational culture becomes stronger on lecturers’ commitment to the university. The finding suggests that when lecturers’ perceive the university’s organisational culture positively yet are not satisfied with their job
in the university; they will not be committed to the university in the long run. Therefore, the current study rejects the hypothesis that the University’s organisational culture directly predicts lecturers’ commitment to the institution. The findings support the views of Solimun, Troena and Syanta (2012) who stated that organisational culture does not directly influence employee commitment to the organisation, and that organisational culture is able to influence employee commitment if mediated by job satisfaction. In other words, organisational culture influences employee commitment to the organisation through satisfaction with the job.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter outlines the findings of this study. Based on the results obtained from the study, a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications is presented. Recommendations to the management of the university, with regard to improving the culture and lecturers’ commitment are also presented.

Overview of the Study

The organisational culture of the university can be seen to have an effect on the organisational commitment of the lecturers, therefore the proper fit between the organisational culture and lecturers will positively affect the organisational commitment of lecturers.

The prime objective of this research was to examine the relationship between organisational culture and the organisational commitment of lecturers of University of Cape Coast. In the bid to realise the objectives the following research questions were coined to guide the study: To what extent do the lecturers perceive the university’s organisational culture in positive terms? To what extent do the perceived organisational culture of the university relate to the lecturers satisfaction with their job in the university? To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment differ by gender? To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment relate to their marital status? To what extent do lecturers’ job satisfaction and
organisational commitment relate to their age and length of service? And the hypothesis: The university’s organisational culture do not directly predicts lecturers’ commitment to the institution.

The study adopted a sample size of 237 given the population of 601 academic staff with the help of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table. Data was collected using a self-administered questionnaire as a tool in quantitative research. Before the data collection the instrument was pilot tested in the University of Education, Kumasi and it showed an overall reliability coefficient of 0.802.

The first research question pertaining to the lecturers’ perception of the organisational culture of the university was tested through the use of descriptive statistics such as Mean, Median, Standard Deviation, and Skewness for each of the four organisational subculture; namely power, role, achievement, and support.

The second set of research question, pertaining to the relationship between organisational culture and lecturers’ satisfaction with their job in the university was analysed through the use of Correlation Coefficient.

The third set of research question, pertaining to the gender of the lecturers was tested to identify whether there was significant difference between lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment in relation to gender through the use of Independent Sample t-test.

The fourth set of research question, pertaining to the marital status of the lecturers was tested to identify whether there was significant relationship between their job satisfaction and organisational commitment in relation to their marital status through the use of Point-Biserial correlation.
The final set of research question, pertaining to the age and length of service were tested to identify whether there was significant relationship between the lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment in relation to their age and length of service, through the use of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

The hypothesis pertaining to the influence of organisational culture and organisational commitment of the academic staff was tested through the use of Multiple Regression procedures.

**Key Findings**

The first research question was the extent to which the lecturers perceive the university’s organisational culture in positive terms. The finding was that the lecturers perceived all the organisational subcultures of the university positively. In order of importance, the most positively perceived subculture was role subculture followed by achievement subculture, power subculture and support subculture. This means that the most positively perceived organisational subculture was role subculture while the least perceived organisational subculture is support subculture. In all, the results showed that the lecturers perceived the university’s organisational culture in positive terms.

The second research question was the extent to which the organisational culture of the university relates to the lecturers satisfaction with their job in the university. The finding was that with the exception of power subculture which related negatively, all the perceived organisational subcultures of the university related positively. But achievement subculture was the most statistically significant and positively correlated variable with
lecturers’ level of job satisfaction in their job. The conclusion is that the organisational culture of the university is positively related to lecturers’ level of satisfaction with their job in the university. The relationship between the organisational culture of the university and lecturers level of satisfaction with their job in the university is positive and moderate. In all, there is a moderate positive significant relationship between the organisational culture and lecturer’s job satisfaction.

The third research question was the extent to which lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment differ by gender. The finding was that there was no statistically significant gender difference in terms of lecturers’ job satisfaction and their commitment to the university.

The fourth research question was the extent to which lecturers’ marital status relates to their job satisfaction and organisational commitment. The finding with regard to marital status was that the academic staff marital status did not have any statistically significant relationship with their job satisfaction. However, in relation to their marital status and commitment to the university, there was a statistically significant negative relationship, but the relationship is weak.

The fifth research question was the extent to which lecturers’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment relate to age and length of service. The answer with regard to age of the academic staff and their job satisfaction and commitment to the university, it was established that there was no statistically significant relationship between the age group of the academic staff and their job satisfaction. Again, there was no statistically significant relationship between the age group of the academic staff and their
commitment to the university. But the academic staff length of service in the university had moderately statistically significant negative relationship with their job satisfaction. On the contrary, with regard to their commitment to the university, there was no relationship with the length of service.

The hypothesis was that the university’s organisational culture directly predicts lecturers’ commitment to the institution. The finding was that the lecturers’ perception on the university’s organisational culture did not predict their commitment to the university directly and that it did predict it indirectly. The study indicates that for organisational culture of the university to predict significantly lecturers’ commitment to the university, the lecturers must first be satisfied with their job in the university. That is, lecturers can be committed to the university only if they are satisfied with the culture prevailing in the university.

Conclusions

The organisational culture of the university is positively related to the lecturers’ satisfaction with their job as well as their commitment. However, the results show that organisational culture does not influence lecturers’ organisational commitment directly. It does so only if it boosts the lecturers’ satisfaction with their job. If lecturers perceive the culture of the institution in positive terms, they are likely to be satisfied with their work in the university, and eventually they will show high levels of organisational commitment.

The findings also did not confirm gender differences in terms of lecturers’ job satisfaction and commitment to the university. Again it did not give weight to the relationship between lecturers’ marital status and job satisfaction, but there was negative relationship between their marital status.
and commitment. The study again showed that age of lecturers had no relationship with their job satisfaction as well as their commitment to the university. On their length of service, the study showed a negative relationship with their job satisfaction, but not their commitment.

**Recommendations**

With regard to the research findings, several recommendations to the university have been made. The most consistent predictor of lecturers’ commitment to the university is that of support subculture, but when job satisfaction was introduced, role subculture also became significant. This suggests that the lecturers’ commitment to the university will be stronger if support subculture was promoted. It is therefore recommended that, the university authorities should nurture support subculture so as to elicit maximum commitment on the part of the lecturers.

It is further recommended that policy-makers should put in place projects and programmes that would shore-up commitment levels of lecturers after marriage. This may include incentive packages, workshops on marriage and work and reduced additional responsibilities.

Lastly, the university should institute an award scheme for long-serving lecturers to rekindle their level of satisfaction.

**Suggestion for Further Research**

Research dealing with the university’s organisational culture and the lecturers’ work performance is conducted at the university in order to ascertain under what conditions organisational culture is critical to the effectiveness and efficiency of the university’s performance.
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Questioinnaire

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LECTURERS OF UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TOPIC: INFLUENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY’S ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF THE ACADEMIC STAFF OF UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST.

The main objective of this research is to assess the influence of the school’s organizational culture on the organizational commitment of the academic staff of the University of Cape Coast. This questionnaire is designed to elicit the relevant information. The information given will be used solely for this research. You are therefore requested to answer all the questions as frankly as you can. You are also assured of full confidentiality and anonymity of all the information that will be given by you.

Please make a tick [✓] in the box against your response. Thanks for your cooperation.

SECTION ONE: Personal information

1. Gender:
   1. Male                      [ ]
   2. Female                   [ ]

2. Age:
   1. Below 30               [ ]
   2. 31 – 39                   [ ]
   3. 40 – 49                   [ ]
   4. 50 – 59                   [ ]
   5. 60 +                      [ ]

3. Marital status:
   1. Single                    [ ]
   2. Married                  [ ]
   3. Divorced               [ ]
   4. Widow/Widower   [ ]
   5. Separated               [ ]

4. How long have you worked for the university?
1. Less than 5 years [ ]
2. 5 - 10 [ ]
3. 11 - 15 [ ]
4. 16 - 20 [ ]
5. 21 and above [ ]

SECTION TWO: Types of organizational culture
The following statements indicate the types of organizational culture of the university. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by ticking [ √ ] the appropriate boxes. Kindly answer all the statements.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 I follow the channels of communication in the department and the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 As a custom, I must always wait for instructions from my superiors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Decisions made always descend from the top to the bottom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I have very little autonomy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Leadership resides in only a few hands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 I am aware of my responsibilities and I work accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I know that my success on the job is interdependent on the success of other lecturers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 There are rules and procedures that guide professional conduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I am aware that the success of the institution is a collective responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I am to a large extent autonomous in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 I insist on quality of academic work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I encourage students to aim high.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. I reward students for hard work.

18. The university is worth dying for.

19. I receive reward for hard work and achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Culture</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. I am supportive of the institution’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I work hard enough to help the university to achieve excellence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Decision-making has been all-inclusive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Superiors show concern about the personal needs of the lecturers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Interpersonal conflicts are dealt with in a manner that makes partners satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION THREE: The level of job satisfaction among the academic staff.**
To what extent are you satisfied with the following job issues in the university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. I am generally satisfied with my job in the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am generally satisfied with my job in the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am satisfied with the rules governing promotions in the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am satisfied with my salary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am satisfied with the security of my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION FOUR: Types of commitment to department.
The following statements indicate the types of commitment of lecturers to their department. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by ticking [ √ ] the appropriate boxes. Kindly answer all the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 I will be willing to spend the rest of my career in this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 I feel as if this university’s problems are my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 I take delight in discussing my university with people outside it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 I feel emotionally attached to this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 I hardly think I could become attached to another university as I am to this one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 I will not quit my job in the university because if I do I may lose some benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 My life may be disrupted if I leave the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving my job in this university.

38. Staying with the university is a necessity rather than a desire.

39. It will cost me if I leave the university.

Normative Commitment 1 2 3 4 5

40. I feel obliged to remain with this university.

41. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave.

42. I would feel guilty if I left my university now.

43. This university deserves my loyalty.

44. I don’t intend to quit my job in this university because the normal thing to do is to stay in one’s job and help it to grow.

SECTION FIVE: Commitment to the university.
The following statements indicate commitment of lecturers to the university. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following aspects of your job by ticking [ √ ] the appropriate box.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I will be willing to contribute my quota towards the achievement of the university’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I am proud of the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I like what the university is doing so I will stay and support it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I prefer working at this university even though I have choices for working at the other universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I perceive the university to be one of the best in the country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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