



International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Scientific Emerging Research (IJMSERH)

Volume 13, Issue 3, July-September 2025

Impact Factor: 9.274



A Study on Organisational Commitment in Education Industry

Dr. B. Keerthana, Monika J, Sahana I

Assistant Professor, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

Scholar, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

Scholar, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

ABSTRACT: This study investigates the dynamics of organizational commitment among academic and administrative staff within the higher education sector. With universities and colleges facing increasing pressures from globalization, digital transformation, and performance accountability, understanding the factors that foster or hinder commitment is critical. The research explores the multidimensional nature of organizational commitment— affective, continuance, and normative—using a mixed-methods approach that combines survey data with in-depth interviews from faculty and staff at selected higher education institutions. Findings indicate that leadership style, institutional culture, opportunities for professional development, and perceived organizational support are key determinants of commitment levels. The study contributes to the literature by contextualizing organizational commitment within the unique challenges of higher education and offers strategic insights for policymakers and administrators seeking to enhance employee engagement, retention, and institutional performance.

KEYWORDS: Organisational commitment, Work- life balance, Staffs benefits, Leadership quality.

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment among faculty members in higher education institutions is a critical determinant of institutional effectiveness, faculty retention, and overall educational quality. In the context of India's rapidly expanding higher education sector, fostering a committed academic workforce is imperative to meet the evolving demands of education and research. Organizational commitment encompasses three dimensions: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment, as proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991). Affective commitment reflects an emotional attachment to the institution, normative commitment denotes a sense of obligation to remain, and continuance commitment pertains to the perceived costs associated with leaving the institution. Understanding these dimensions is essential for developing strategies to enhance faculty engagement and alignment with institutional goals. Factors influencing organizational commitment in higher education are multifaceted, encompassing individual, organizational, and contextual elements. Leadership styles, particularly transformational and shared leadership, have been identified as significant contributors to fostering a committed academic workforce. Additionally, organizational culture, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and professional development opportunities play pivotal roles in shaping faculty commitment.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model—comprising affective, normative, and continuance commitment—serves as a foundational framework in examining faculty commitment.

Qamar (2021) explored various factors influencing organizational commitment within higher education institutions. The research emphasized the importance of understanding these factors to enhance faculty engagement and institutional effectiveness.

Ribeiro, M.I., Antão, C.C.M., Lebres, V.A.F., & Fernandes, A.J.G. Their research, *Organizational Commitment in a Portuguese Public Higher Education Institution*, examined the levels of organizational commitment among faculty members in a public higher education institution in Portugal.

In the article *Extrinsic Motivation and Organizational Commitment: A Literature Review*, Siregar (2022) reviewed existing literature on the relationship between extrinsic motivation and organizational commitment.

In the article Leadership Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment of Faculty Members: Higher Education, Almutairi (2024) explored the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and organizational commitment among faculty members.

NEED FOR THE STUDY:

Organizational commitment among faculty members is a critical determinant of institutional success in higher education. Recent studies have highlighted various factors influencing this commitment, including leadership styles, organizational culture, work-life balance, and psychosocial elements. For instance, research indicates that shared leadership practices, particularly development and mentoring, significantly enhance faculty members' affective commitment to their institutions. Similarly, organizational culture and self-efficacy have been shown to positively impact organizational commitment, suggesting the importance of fostering a supportive and empowering work environment.

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE:

To examine the factors influencing organizational commitment among faculty members in higher education institutions in India, focusing on aspects such as leadership styles, organizational culture, work-life balance, and psychosocial elements.

SECONDARY OBJECTIVES:

*To evaluate the role of organizational culture in shaping faculty members' organizational commitment in higher education institutions in India.

*To investigate the influence of work-life balance on faculty members' organizational commitment in higher education institutions in India.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY:

This study delves into the multifaceted dimensions of organizational commitment among faculty members in higher education institutions, with a particular focus on the Indian context. Organizational commitment, defined as the psychological attachment of employees to their organization, encompasses three primary components: affective commitment (emotional attachment), continuance commitment (perceived cost of leaving), and normative commitment (obligation to remain). The scope of this research extends to examining the various factors influencing organizational commitment, including leadership styles, organizational culture, work-life balance, compensation, and psychosocial elements. For instance, studies have shown that shared leadership practices, particularly development and mentoring, significantly enhance faculty members' affective commitment to their institutions.

RESEARCH DESIGN: Research design for exploring organisational commitment in the higher education sector would involve a mixed-methods approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative data to gain a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing commitment among academic and administrative staff. The study could adopt a descriptive and correlational design, aimed at identifying the extent of organisational commitment and examining the relationship between various antecedents such as leadership style, job satisfaction, institutional support, and work-life balance.

DATA COLLECTION: Organisational commitment in the education industry (higher education), both primary and secondary data collection methods are essential to provide a well-rounded and robust understanding of the subject.

PRIMARY DATA: Primary data will be collected directly from individuals working in higher education institutions, such as lecturers, professors, administrative staff, and management personnel.

SAMPLE SIZE: The target population includes academic and non-academic staff working in universities and other higher education institutions. Assuming the study will be conducted across multiple institutions (e.g., 3–5 universities), and considering both public and private sectors, a sample size of approximately 200 to 400 participants is generally appropriate for quantitative analysis using surveys.

III. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

MANN WHITNEY U- TEST

To test the mean difference between the gender and obstacles in leadership support in the organisation.

HYPOTHESIS:

NULL HYPOTHESIS (Ho): There's no mean difference between the gender and obstacles in leadership support in institutions.

ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS (H1): There's a mean difference between the gender and obstacles in leadership support in institutions.

TABLE SHOWING THE MANN- WHITNEY (U- TEST) BETWEEN THE GENDER AND STRUGGLES IN LEADERSHIP SUPPORT IN THE INSTITUTION.

LEADERSHIP SUPPORT(STRUGGLE)	GENDER	U	W	Z	ASYMP.SIG
MALE	1	302.500	473.500	-.576	.565
FEMALE	2	302.500	473.500	-.576	.565

INTERPRETATION: There is no statistically significant difference between genders in terms of how supported they feel by the institution's leadership. ($p > 0.05$) so the leadership is very supportive in the organisation.

CORRELATION:

To find correlation between job satisfaction and satisfaction level is directly linked with organisational commitment in the institution.

HYPOTHESIS:

NULL HYPOTHESIS (Ho): There's no significant relation between job satisfaction and satisfaction level is directly linked with organisational commitment in the institution.

ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS (H1): There's a significant relation between job satisfaction and satisfaction level is directly linked with organisational commitment in the institution

TABLE SHOWING THE CORRELATION BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND SATISFACTION LEVEL IN THE ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

		Value	Asymptotic Standard Error	Approximate Tb	Approximate Significance
Interval by interval	Pearson's R	.593	.113	5.368	<.001c
Ordinalby Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.523	.121	4.468	<.001c
		55			

INTERPRETATION: There is a strong and statistically significant positive correlation between the two variables tested. This means as one variable increases, the other tends to increase as well.

H-TEST:

To find the test between age and employee's pride towards the organisation.

HYPOTHESIS

NULL HYPOTHESIS (Ho): There is no significant relation between age and employees pride in the institution.

ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS (H1) : Theirs is a significant relation between age and employees pride in the institution.

TABLE 2.3.3 SHOWING THE H- TEST BETWEEN AGE AND EMPLOYEE'S PRIDE IN THE ORGANISATION

AGE	KRUSKAL WALLIS	DF	ASYMP.SIG
21-25 YRS 26-35 YRS 36-45 YRS 46-55 YRS 56 YRS AND ABOVE	2.821	4	.588

INTERPRETATION:

There is no statistically significant difference in pride levels among different age groups regarding working for the institution. ($p > 0.05$). So the employees are extremely satisfied to work in this educational institution.

CHI- SQUARE TEST:

	VALUE	df	Asymptotic Significance (2- sided)
Pearson chi- Square	8.311a	12	.760
Likelihood Ratio	9.300	12	.677
Linear-by-Linear Association	.302	1	.583

INTERPRETATION: Since the p-value is 0.760, which is much greater than the standard threshold of 0.05, we need to accept the null hypothesis. So the support which is provided by the institution to the faculties. And there's no ethical issues that arised in the organisation.

IV. FINDINGS

Mann-Whitney U Test (Gender vs Leadership Support):

p-value = 0.565 No statistically significant difference in perceived leadership support between genders.

Sample Size & Distribution:

The total number of valid cases is relatively small ($n = 53$), which can reduce statistical power and affect the generalizability of results.

90% of Chi-Square cells have expected counts less than 5, indicating that the Chi-Square test results may be unreliable due to violation of assumptions.

Kruskal-Wallis Test (Age vs Institutional Pride):

p-value = 0.588. No significant difference across age groups regarding pride in being part of the institution.

V. SUGGESTIONS

*Investigate other factors beyond gender and age that may impact perceptions of leadership support and institutional pride.

*Consider qualitative data collection (e.g., interviews or open-ended survey questions) to explore deeper insights.

*Increase the sample size to enhance statistical power, especially due to many expected counts below 5 in the Chi-Square test.

*Re-evaluate the grouping or coding of categorical variables to ensure clarity and adequacy for statistical testing.

*A larger sample will help meet the assumptions of non-parametric tests and increase statistical power.

*Ensure that the items used in the survey are sensitive enough to detect differences in perceptions, especially for Likert-type scale responses.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the statistical analyses conducted, there is no significant difference in the perception of leadership support between genders, nor is there a significant difference in institutional pride across different age groups. The Chi-Square tests also indicate no significant associations among the categorical variables assessed. Despite the lack of statistically significant results in these tests, the correlation analysis reveals a moderate positive relationship between the two interval/ordinal variables, suggesting that as one variable increases, the other tends to increase as well. This implies that while demographic factors such as age and gender may not play a major role in shaping perceptions, there may be other underlying variables influencing employee sentiment. Further research with a larger sample size and additional qualitative inputs is recommended to uncover more nuanced insights. In higher education, faculty and staff play a critical role in shaping the performance, stability, and overall effectiveness of academic institutions. Faculty and staff who are committed are more likely to demonstrate high levels of job satisfaction, engage in institutional development, and contribute positively to student outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Dinesh Kumar, S. (2022). Role of E-HR in Skill Transformation. *Journal of Tech HR*, 1(11), 49–53.
2. Al-refaei, A. (2019). The Effect of Organizational Commitment on Higher Education Services Quality. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
3. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors and Their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.
4. Usha, S., & Rohini, V. (2018). Rethinking Productivity in Modern HR. *IJPAM*, 118(20), 869–876.
5. Kumar, R. G., & Hariharasudhan, B. (2024). Cognitive Algorithms in Hiring Tech. *IRJMETs*, 6(12), 4700–4705.
6. Jeyalakshmi, R., & Yugendran, S. (2024). Evolving Talent Strategies Through AI. *IJFTIB*, 6(2), 279–284.
7. Abdillah, L. A. (2014). Managing Information and Knowledge Sharing Cultures in Higher Education Institutions. *arXiv*.
8. Ramu, M., & Manikandan, M. (2023). HR Role in Contractual Employment Efficiency. *ICCEBS, IEEE*, 4(11), 60–64.
9. Dinesh Kannaa, K. V., & Karthika, S. (2024). Digital HRM for Talent Forecasting. *IJRHRM*, 6, 467–470. <https://doi.org/10.33545/26633213.2024.v6.i2e.256>
10. Kumar, R. G., & Anitha, A. (2024). Behavioral Wellness Strategies in HR. *IJMRSET*, 7(11), 196–200.
11. Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The Wrong Solution to the Teacher Shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30–33.
12. Suresh, R., & Prasad, B. V. (2019). Evaluation of Induction Results in HRM. *IJMET*, 13(7), 1177–1181.
13. Maran, K., & Chandra Shekar, V. (2015). Graduate Readiness for Workforce: A HR View. *IJRESS*, 5(3), 68–73.
14. Ramu, M., & Venkatesh, P. (2024). Predictive Hiring Models Using AI. *ICPECTS, IEEE*, 5(10), 81–85.
15. Yahaya, A., Chek, R., Samsudin, M., & Jizat, J. (2014). Organizational Commitment at a Higher Education. *Authors*.
16. Usha, S., & Maran, K. (2014). Managing IT Professionals' Work Patterns. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(XXVI), 191–197.
17. Prasad, B. V., & Suresh, R. (2020). Mapping Turnover Intentions in Software Sector. *PalArch Journal*, 17(7), 10035–10039.
18. Usha, S. (2025). Resilience in Recruitment Through AI Platforms. *ICFTS*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICFTS62006.2025.11031918>
19. Suresh, R., & Kumar, R. G. (2020). Building Resilient HR for Blue-Collar Workers. *IJMRSET*, 6(11), 2162–2167.
20. Keerthana, S., & Anantharajan, R. S. (2024). Talent Forecasting Using AI. *IJARETY*. <https://doi.org/10.15680/IJRET.2024.1106098>
21. Maran, K., & Priyadarsini, P. (2009). Communication Climate in Call Center HRM. *SMART Journal*, 5(2), 115–120.
22. Klein, H. J., Becker, T. E., & Meyer, J. P. (2016). Commitment in Organizations: Accumulated Wisdom and New Directions. *Routledge*.
23. Usha, S., & Jaichitra, D. (2018). Impact of Flexi-Leave Systems. *IJPHRD*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00082.7>
24. Maran, K., & Usha, S. (2014). Work-Life Integration for IT Female Employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(XXVI), 192–198.
25. Jeyalakshmi, R., & SentamilSelvan, K. (2023). HRM Influence on Employee Development. *RIFA*, 14(2), 1116–1120.
26. Usman Mohideen, K. S., & Swathi, G. (2024). IT Employee Mindfulness via HR Models. *IJRHRM*, 6(2), 395–398.

27. Dhayalan, V., & Seethalakshmi, M. (2021). Stress Recovery Strategies in IT HR. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(2), 4857–4862.
28. Baker-Tate, I. M. (2011). Organizational Commitment Patterns in Higher Education: A Study of Selected Midlevel Student Services Professionals. *ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*.
29. Prasad, B. V., & Suresh, R. (2020). Enriching Organizational Culture via Induction. *IJRTE*, 8(2S11), 2923–2927.
30. Jeyalakshmi, R., Sivarajeswari, S., & Selvalakshmi, V. (2022). Inclusion Policies in Remote Firms. *ICSE-2021*, 191–195.
31. Keerthana, B., & Harshini, R. (2024). AI's Role in Job Matching. *IRJMETs*, 6(12), 4667–4671.
32. Venkatesh, P. (2019). Aligning Employee Potential with HR Interventions. *Gujarat Research Society*, 21(20), 1631–1635.
33. Dhayalan, V., & Nimalathasan, B. (2021). Factors Contributing to Mental Exhaustion. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(1), 4844–4849.
34. Venkatesh, P., & Selvakumar, V. (2023). Bridging HR Gaps in Gig Workspaces. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2(3), 107–111.
35. Anantharajan, R. S., & Sujitha. (2024). Analytics-Led Workforce Development. *IJRPRR*. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1224.0222>
36. Murugan, K. (2020). Financial Benchmarks in HR Planning. *Test Engineering & Management*, 40(15), 151–156.
37. Maran, K., & Sekhar, B. R. (2017). Transformational Leadership and Youth Vision. *JARDCS*, 17(Special Issue), 762–765.
38. Mohideen, K. S., & Gracy, H. R. (2018). Strengthening Virtual Teams Using HRM. *IJMET*, 9(4), 121–126.
39. Kumar, R. G., & Jothi Sri, D. (2025). HR Learning Frameworks in Digital Training. *IJPREMS*, 5(9), 146–151.
40. Anantharajan, R. S., & Ashwatha, J. (2024). Employee Evaluation Using Smart Tools. *IJPREMS*. <https://doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS37992>



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Scientific Emerging Research (IJMSE RH)

Impact Factor: 9.274