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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between organisational culture, leader-member exchange, organisational commitment and quality education. The study was prompted by reports of perceived poor quality education in the institutions of higher learning such as Universities.

The objectives were to examine the relationship between organizational culture and quality education, relationship between organizational culture, and organizational commitment, relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational commitment, relationship between organizational commitment and quality education and the relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education.

A cross-sectional research design was applied in the study of five Public Universities in Uganda.

The findings revealed that there was a positive relationship between organisational culture, Leader-member exchange, organisational commitment and quality education.

Universities interested in implementing quality education would be well advised to; define quality education to ensure it is aligned in the university strategy; ensure a supportive culture and a collegial system of administration. The quality of the relationship between leaders and their subordinates at all levels in the University should be encouraged.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Back ground to the study

The demand for educational services has increased globally of recent compelling countries into commercialization of education (Mazzarol & Soutar, 2008). The economic forces arising from the increased reduction of government funds has forced Higher Education into competition (Abdullah, 2006). This is due to the desire to seek alternative sources of finance. Amidst these reforms, tertiary institutions need to account for the quality of education they provide. Quality in the educational setting varies from one institution to another. However, the focus of quality is on customer, process orientation and continuous improvements in relation to teaching and learning (Venkatraman, 2007). He further noted that Higher education institutions involve employees and learners in their quality missions. Quality education involves improving institutional cultures embedded in the Universities and Faculties. Quality service in education is determined by the culture, quality assurance, instructional materials and equipment, costs and guiding policies and curriculum content (Odhiambo, 2008). Hodgkinson & Kelly (2007) noted that where TQM has been of great success in the administrative and support structures, it has not been effectively implemented in the teaching process. However in Uganda, Universities have continued to experience low quality education (Rubanju, 2008; Eupal, 2009).

The practices and beliefs by public universities have contributed to low quality education. For example in an effort by the government to reduce funding of higher institutions, universities resorted to commercialization and vocationalisation of programmes to raise funds. This made Faculties and departments start offering programmes outside their disciplinary competence (Mamdani, 2007). Faculties and departments thus attracted too many students to
accommodate in the lecture theatres such as the Faculty of Arts of Makerere University leading other faculties with more than 80% of students. The challenges that followed included; lack of space by faculties and yet the same faculties renting their space, use of junior staff as part time lecturers since they were willing to accept the least remuneration, lack of student interest in lectures arising from space in lecture rooms. Students expressed concern in the way they were attended to by their lectures. They noted that most Lecturers were over worked, unprepared for lectures, use of no course outlines, use of old notes late coming or dodge lectures, dictation of notes without explanations and lack of cooperation between students and lecturers. In the academic year of 2004/2005, five weeks in a semester it was reported that eight courses had not been taught Administrative staff also became over stretched leading to non registration of students such as in July 2004 exams where over 1500 2rd and 3rd year students did exams with forged or with no registration and examination cards in Makerere University (Mamdani, 2007).

Kairanga (2007) noted with concern how Makerere University was unresponsive in the issuance of certificates. Furthermore Universities such as Makerere University and Mbarara University of Science and Technology are managed on the bureaucratic model management based on managerial hierarchies (Neema-Aboki, 2004). Anecdotal findings indicate the hurdles students experience during the time of issuing registration and examination cards in public universities that undermine quality in such an academic institution (Ofwono, 2007). This has become a cultural practice for most public universities.

It should however be noted that Mamdani’s analysis did not look at the leader-member exchange in explaining the quality of education. Wanambwa and Kibuuka, (2007) further reveal poor leader-subordinate relationship that has caused strikes such as Kyambogo
University which has negatively contributed to perceived low quality education. Leaders in Kyambogo University failed to communicate to their subordinates and this caused a misunderstanding. Academic staff at Kyambogo University went on a sit down strike after the University Council had failed to fire the embattled Vice Chancellor by then and taking action against the University Bursar and the University Secretary. Mohamad (2009) noted that “supervisor-subordinate relationships quality and supervisory communication are important processes in influencing individual commitment in work group”. Eupal (2009) observed that poor infrastructure that is facilities in Uganda makes the learning environment unfavourable.

The quality of the relationship between the leader and the follower leads to employee’s commitment and satisfaction (Dionne, 2000). Chen et al, (2007) found out that effective interactive network in institutions, academic curriculum, and sufficient and modern facilities enable quality education.

There is need for Institutions to ensure quality consistence and improved criteria for assessment in addressing the ever increasing concerns on quality education practices (Pathirage et al, 2007).

1.2 Statement of the problem

Quality education in Public Universities Uganda has continued to decline overtime. This may be attributed to weak culture and the quality of the relationship between the leader and subordinates. Rubanju (2008) also noted that most universities in Uganda lack a supportive professional culture, academic staff and the available academic staffs tend to be overloaded with teaching.
1.3 **Purpose of the study**

The study was to investigate the relationship between Organisational Culture, Leader-Member Exchange, Organisational Commitment and quality education.

1.4 **Research objectives**

i. To examine the relationship between organizational culture and quality education.

ii. To examine the relationship between organizational culture, and organizational commitment.

iii. To establish the relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational commitment.

iv. To examine the relationship between organizational commitment and quality education.

v. To establish the relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education.

1.5 **Research questions**

i. What is the relationship between organizational culture and quality education?

ii. What is the relationship between organizational culture, and organizational commitment?

iii. What is the relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational commitment?

iv. What is the relationship between organizational commitment and quality education?

v. What is the relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education?
1.6 Scope of the study

1.6.1 Conceptual scope

The study was limited to organizational culture, Leader-member exchange as independent variables and quality education as a dependant variable. These variables were mediated by organizational commitment.

1.6.2 Geographical Scope

The study focused on both academic and administrative staff of Public Universities in Uganda. They contribute to the core values of the institution of academic leadership and excellence.

1.7 Significance of the study

i. Organizations will use the findings to identify and design appropriate quality education strategies for continuous quality improvements.

ii. The study will also add new insights in the field of performance management by seeking information from respondents in relation to quality education.

iii. Policy makers will use the findings to ensure that employees have an enabling work environment and tailor-made quality education supportive programs to encourage them to achieve organizational goals.

iv. The findings will help policy-making management executives and human resource specialists to support initiatives such as employee training and leadership career development, and help positively shape the organization’s future.
1.8 The Conceptual Framework

Organisational Culture
- Supportive
- Innovative
- Bureaucratic

Leader-Member Exchange
- Affect
- Loyalty
- Contribution
- Professional respect

Organizational commitment
- Affective
- Continuance
- Normative

Quality Education
- Quality of Academic curriculum
- Quality of teaching
- Quality of facilities
- Research Output


Description of the conceptual framework
The model examines the relationship between organizational culture, leader-member exchange, organizational commitment and quality education. Quality education is determined by organizational culture and leader-subordinate relationship. Cultural dimensions such as supportive and innovative cultures provide a work environment for organizational workers to meet performance targets. Furthermore the quality of the social exchange relationships
between leaders and their subordinate’s influences employee commitment at work (Yukl, 2002). This will lead commitment of workers in meeting organizational goals and objectives and subsequently quality education.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0  Introduction

This chapter presents the review of the existing scholarly literature about organizational culture, Leader-member exchange, organizational commitment and quality education. This review focuses on supportive, bureaucratic and result oriented which are the constructs of organizational culture. Leader-member exchange focuses on four dimensions of loyalty, affect, contribution and professional respect. Organizational commitment was denoted by the constructs of affective normative and continuous. Quality education was reviewed using the constructs of the quality of academic curriculum, quality of teaching, quality of facilities and research output.

2.1  Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment

Organizational culture can be considered as the assumptions, beliefs and values of an organisation, with these intangibles being manifested through organizational artifacts such as uniform, jargon, rituals, logos and office furniture (Lomas, 1999).

Harrison (1972) looks at culture as a collection of beliefs, values, work styles and relationships that give an organisation an identity as compared to others. Cleland (1994) analysed culture as an environment of beliefs, practices, customs, knowledge and acceptable behaviour of a particular social group. These act as set standards and principles that guide a social group or organisation. This means that beliefs, customs and practices of one organisation are distinctive from another organisation termed as a social group. Hofstede
(1991) describes organisational culture as “software of the mind” that refers to “collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organisation from another”. Employees in organisations are directed and governed by a set of values, beliefs, customs and systems. These determine the level of job involvement, job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

De Waal (2004) describes organizational culture from a performance perspective that is a culture that focuses on continuous improvements. An organizational culture that ensures open communication of results and emphasizes knowledge sharing stimulates improved performance. Schein (1991) noted that Culture is the basis for allocation of authority, status, authority, rewards, punishment friendship and respect. It determines what the group pays attention to (Willcoxon & Millett, 2000) and so does the institution of higher learning. Buono et al. (1985) noted that culture affects the way people interact with one another as they perform their work. They further argue that it affects the decisions made in the firm, its organizational policies and strategic considerations. Organizational culture according to Alas and Vadi, (2006) say that it can predict attitudes and behaviours of the organization and organizational beliefs, values and expectations produce norms that shape the behavior of organizational members.

Many scholars confirm to the notion that organisational culture contributes to superior organisational performance (Van der Post et al, 1998; Denison, 1990; Kotter and Heskett, 1992). Organizational culture plays a biggest role in mission and vision statements. It fills the gaps between what is formally announced and what actually takes place (Martins and Terblanche, 2003). Martins (2000) noted that organizational culture is the direction indicator that keeps strategy on track.

Most research view commitment in terms of the employee identifying himself with the organization’s goals, mission and values (Fink, 1992). This implies that the organization’s
business strategy defined by the goals and mission must be clear. Organizational values that
give an organization its identity must be understood and shared by all organizational
members. Rashid et al (2003), argue that the commitment of people contributes to the
effective implementation of organizational policies and plans. They further argue that
commitment of employees or managers is paramount when the organization is trying to shape
its appropriate values and culture. It is imperative to note that there is a positive relationship
between organizational culture, business strategy and commitment of employees towards
performance. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982), described organizational commitment as a
strong belief and acceptance in the goals and values of the organization and desire to
maintain membership in the organization.

Cohen (2000) argued that there is a relationship between Hofstede’s (1980) cultural
dimensions with organizational commitment, while Geiger (1998) found the impact of
cultural values on the escalation of commitment. Cohen (2000) found that Power distance
was related to normative commitment, uncertainty avoidance related to continuance
commitment while the collectivism dimension was related to the three types of commitment
that is affective, continuance and normative. Rashid et al (2003) argue that the commitment
of employees/ people in the organization contributes to successful implementation of
organizational policies and plans.

2.2 Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Commitment

The leader-member exchange theory of leadership focuses on the interaction between
leaders/supervisor and subordinates (Green, 2008). It is therefore a two-way relationship
between supervisors and subordinates. In the studies by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) and
Liden et al., (2000) argue that the leader-member exchange is related to organizational
commitment. Gerstner and Day (1997) in their studies on the LMX outcomes contend that
LMX is correlated with subordinate performance and organizational commitment. Research studies by Lee (2005) found out a relationship between LMX and organizational commitment with Affect, contribution and professional respect related positively to affective commitment; Affect and professional respect positively related to normative commitment. According to the studies carried out by Schyns & Wolfram (2008) on the relationship between leader-member exchange and outcomes as rated by leaders and followers, it was found out that contribution one of the constructs of LMX is positively related to affective commitment. Ito and Brotheridge’s (2005) agree that supervisory support that play an important role in the quality relationship between leaders and followers leads to organizational commitment although their studies focused on the labour turnover intentions.

2.3 Organizational Culture and Quality Education

Recent research on quality observes that implementing quality practices requires a supportive culture to enable the organization realize value (Sousa-Poza, Nystrom, and Wiebe, 2001). Mathew (2007) found out that there is a significant relationship between organizational culture and quality. He observed that an informality type of organizational culture enables free interaction between employees and clients and clarifies their understanding which is a basis for quality. He further noted that “organizational culture has an impact on the conception, planning, implementation and effectiveness of quality initiatives”.

Hofstede (1998) established a customer interface culture that encourages interactions and face-to-face contact with customers. This type of culture enables organizations to survive in this competitive environment since it is result oriented. Xingxing Zu, Fredendall and Robbins (2006) found out that organizational culture has a significant influence on quality management and different cultural orientations influence quality practices differently. They observed that three cultural orientations such as group culture, developmental and rational
culture are significant in implementing quality practices. Group and developmental culture focus on flexibility and people oriented while the rational culture emphasizes control-oriented cultural orientation.

Prajogo and McDermott (2005) in their study on quality management observed that organizational culture related to people and flexibility is significant in managing quality. However their studies overlooked cultural characteristics of control and standardization. Strengthening the organizational culture for better quality of services and performance requires a workflow management system (Doherty and Perry, 2001). Mertova and Webster (2009) indicate that quality in universities require transparency in educational processes, a student-centered approach across the whole higher education system, positive teaching approach, learning and assessment. All these are cultural specific issues in adopting higher education quality systems and mechanisms.

An active participation of staff members is relevant in the management of quality education. When university staffs are given responsibilities, it will increase their sense of ownership and will lead to positive changes and improvement. This can be achieved when staff members are informed about the goals of the quality culture and be given the opportunity to discuss them (EUA, 2003) It was further established that emphasis on staff development is a major requirement for increasing the quality of staff in higher institutions (EUA, 2002). Staff development schemes such as training and other measures like funding for participation in international conferences, to develop skills, strengthen accountability and quality awareness, increase the motivation of staff. These staff development schemes should have a quality culture imbedded in them.
It was further revealed that higher education should focus on innovation and change in higher education; collegial approach and sharing of opinions and values; value of research in teaching practice; quality in higher education stemming from personal involvement of the academic in the educational processes; hierarchical approach to research and teaching; and benefit of exposure to different worldviews within different disciplines (Mertova and Webster, 2009)

It is also fundamental for Universities to have autonomy in their operations. This gives them adaptability and flexibility to the changing society demands (EUA, 2007). Autonomy leads to accountability of both internal staffs and students and the community. In promoting research and innovation, universities should include research in the curricula at all levels, thus promoting a new generation of leaders able to integrate multiple perspectives and be responsive to the needs of rapidly changing labour markets (EUA, 2007). This implies that a research and innovation culture will be created in the entire University structure. This is relevant for the quality of education.

2.4 Leader-Member Exchange and Quality Education

There are limited studies on the relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education. Scholars such as Yukl (2002) have found out that leaders help to create an environment that influences the behaviors of their followers at work. Similarly the behaviors of leaders in academic institution create dyadic relationship between them and their followers. This creates an environment of innovativeness that improves quality education in public Universities.

The teaching culture is a developmental one which requires a person to person contact and should work as leader and facilitator (Rowley, 1996). This indicates that there is a relationship between the quality of relationship between leaders and their subordinates in
Universities. The satisfaction model looks at quality education in relation to the satisfaction of students, teachers, parents, administrators, the education authority, the management committee and alumni (Cheng and Tam, 1997).

Studies by Amy (2008) on Leaders as facilitators of individual and organizational learning confirm that leader-follower relationship contributes to learning through which leaders engage followers cognitively and emotionally. Research findings indicate that providing employees with information and support contributes to quality service in organisations and that if employees are treated fairly by management, they will be in position to treat service recipients fairly (Hartog & Verburg, 2002)

### 2.5 Organizational Commitment and Quality Education

According to Muthuveloo and Rose (2005), organizational commitment refers to ability of employees to be loyal and identify with the organization in relation to the duties and responsibilities being held. In organizational commitment, the employees identify themselves with the goals and values of the organization they work for to enable it achieve increased performance (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). They argue that commitment can be in form of affective, normative and continuance. Commitment comes with job related behaviours such as reduced absenteeism and this leads to effective quality service. Affective commitment is related to emotional attachment to the organization based on positive feelings of job characteristics. This type of commitment is associated with age and organizational tenure (Mottaz, 1988; Rowden, 2003). Continuance commitment emerges when the employee perceives the costs of leaving being high and decides to remain with the organization. Normative commitment refers to an employee’s obligation to stay working with the organization due to clear understanding of organizational values and goals (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997)
Greenberg and Baron (1997) look at organizational commitment as the willingness of the individual in identifying with the organization and getting involved in it. Allen and Meyer (1990) analyzed organizational commitment from a multidimensional perspective, involving affective commitment, normative commitment and continuous comment. It should be noted that organizational commitment is concerned with employee attitudes towards the organization. This like or dislike will contribute to organizational outcomes such as quality output (Zeithaml et al., 1990; Boshoff and Tait, 1996).

Further studies by (Unzicker et al., 2000) indicated that any organisation’s success will be jeopardised if its employees fail to accept the firm’s missions, goals and objectives and fail to believe in what the company stands for (Congram and Friedman, 1991). Researchers have also noted that not all forms or commitment lead increased performance. There is variation the forms of commitment and (Allen & Meyer, 1991; Malhotra and Mukherjee, 2004) noted that an affectively committed employee exerts a lot of effort in doing organizational work compared to normative commitment.

Maignan and Ferrell (1999) perceived higher commitment level to contribute towards increased or higher performance. Joolideh and Yeshodhara (2009) noted that “organizational commitment is critical to retain and attract well-qualified personnel”. They observed that educational organizations need committed individuals towards the organization, profession and giving attention to the students. Education organization’s energy entirely depends on the willingness of the facilitators to support their cause. Committed employees dedicate their time, talents and energy compared to none committed employees (Boshoff and Mels, 1995). This implies that organizational commitment of employees contributes to improved quality education. The innovativeness of employees requires commitment that contributes to greater flexibility affecting quality (Morris et al, 1990).
Research findings further indicate that the quality and ranking of institutions internationally, depends on the publications in top journals in various disciplines (Williams, 2010). While conducting his studies in Australian Universities Williams noted that the quality in academia is measured by research outputs in terms of publications in prestigious journals, citations and number of conference proceedings. He asserts that technologically based institutions tend to be favored compared to non technological institutions.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology that was employed by the researcher in conducting the study. It covers the research design, the study population, the Sampling Procedure and Sample Size, the variables and their measurements, reliability and validity of the research instrument, data collection methods, data processing and analysis procedures and techniques.

3.1 Research Design

A cross-sectional research design was adopted to evaluate organizational culture and leader-member exchange with the objective of establishing whether they have an impact on the quality education. The design was used because data about variables can be obtained at any given period. A correlation approach was used to establish the relationships amongst the variables.

3.2 Study Population

The study population size consisted of 3121 respondents, constituting 1855 academic and 1266 administrative staff of 5 public Universities in Uganda. The respondents were selected from both academic and administrative staff.
Table 1: Study Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makerere University (MUK)</td>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>National Council for Higher Education June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development and Public universities/Committee on Harmonization of salaries of staff in Public Universities June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyambogo University (KYU)</td>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>National Council for Higher Education June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST)</td>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>National Council for Higher Education June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development and Public universities/Committee on Harmonization of salaries of staff in Public Universities June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulu University</td>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>National Council for Higher Education June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development and Public universities/Committee on Harmonization of salaries of staff in Public Universities June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busitema University</td>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Secondary data

3.3 Sample Size

A total of three hundred forty one (341) respondents was selected to constitute a sample size and was supplied with the questionnaires. The researcher went to public universities, their websites and got the total population of academic and administrative staff. There after the researcher determined the sample size using Morgan (1970) table.

3.4 Sampling Design and procedure

3.4.1 Sampling Method

The study employed a stratified proportionate and disproportionate sampling to select the number of respondents. This sampling method was used because according to Krejcie
Morgan (1970) in Sekaran (2003), if all subgroups have equal number of elements, researcher should choose proportionate stratified random sampling but if all subgroups do not have equal number of elements, researcher should choose disproportionate stratified random sampling. For disproportionate stratified random sampling, the number of subjects from each stratum can be altered, while keeping the sample size unchanged. After determining the number of respondents from each stratum, a simple random sampling was applied to obtain respondents who were interviewed.

**Sampling Procedure**

The researcher obtained introductory letters from the Graduate Research Centre Makerere University Business School addressed to various respondents targeted for the study. The researcher will visit the selected respondents sampled to complete the Questionnaires.

### 3.4.2 Data Collection Methods

Data were collected using primary and secondary methods. A semi structured close ended Questionnaire was administered by the researcher to obtain data from the respondents (Primary data). Secondary data was obtained from the literature review.

### 3.5 Variables and their Measurement

Organizational culture was measured in terms of items developed by Wallach (1983) and adapted by Ahamad and Yiing, (2009)

Leadership-Member Exchange was measured by items adapted from Liden and Maslyn (1998)

Organizational commitment was measured by items Myer and Allen (1997)

Quality education was be measured by items that were adopted from the quality education measure by Chen et al, (2007) and Williams (2010)
3.6 **Validity and Reliability.**

A pre-test of the research instrument was done for quality control. This was to test for the reliability and validity. A content validity was used to check for clarity, simplicity, ambiguity and relevance of the instruments. The research questionnaire was checked for item consistence basing on Cronbach’s alpha test.

The results in the table were generated so as to assess the levels of reliability and reliability of the research instrument. The reliability was computed using the Cronbach alpha values while the Validity was assessed using the CVI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Reliability and Validity Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Scale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Academic curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that the instrument had reliable and valid scale items since the Cronbach Alpha and the CVI values were above 0.5 in either case. With this set of the results, the researcher then went to the field to gather the data.
3.8 **Data Analysis**

After collecting questionnaires from the respondents, they were compiled, sorted, edited and coded to have the required quality, accuracy and completeness. The collected data was coded on a coding sheet and then entered in the computer and then analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS version 16.0) – a computer package used for analysis. The data were analyzed using cross tabulations, regression, relationships and P tests to determine the difference in perception about the variables in relation to the sample characteristics. Cross tabulations were used to describe sample characteristics, whereas the multiple regression analysis will be used to find out the variable (Organizational culture and leader-member exchange) with the most influence on the dependent variable (Quality education). The relationship between organizational culture, commitment, and quality education was analyzed using Pearson’s correlation coefficient.

3.9 **Limitations of the study**

i. There was limited research on quality education in relation to higher institutions in Uganda. The study therefore was limited to literature from studies outside Uganda.

ii. Some respondents were unwilling to show cooperation in filling questionnaires. This is due to a number of studies that have been done on the institution and respondents may be reluctant to give out any information for fear of implications.

iii. The study adopted a cross sectional research design which is defective in critically analyzing the behavior of the variables under study therefore this has an implication on the conclusions of the study.

iv. Measurements tools that were used were adopted from previous studies and therefore any limitations that are embedded in them may have equally affected this study.

v. The study used a Quantitative approach and this has a weakness of limiting the amount of data collected.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction
The results in this section reflect the results that were generated from the data analysis phase. The results highlighted in this section were generated using statistical tools such as the Cross tabulations, Correlations, Regression and Analysis of variance (ANOVA). The research was guided by the following objectives:

To examine the relationship between organizational culture and quality education, examine the relationship between organizational culture, and organizational commitment, establish the relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational commitment, examine the relationship between organizational commitment and quality education, establish the relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education.
4.1 Descriptives

4.11 Age Group and Gender Distribution

The results in the table highlight the distribution of the age groups across the gender categories.

Table 3: Age Group and Gender Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 yrs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 yrs &amp; Above</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The study revealed that most respondents were Male (54.1%) while females comprised only 45.9%.

On the other hand, the majority of respondents were also observed to fall in the 40-49 year age group (41.1%). The population of this age group was closely followed by respondents in the 30-39 year age group (30.0%), 50 yrs & above (19.4%) and those in the 20-29 year age group (9.1%). It was further observed that among the males, most (45.1%) were in the 40-49 year age group while only 9.1% were in the 20-29 year age group. Similarly, among the females, the least populous age category was the 20-29 year age bracket (12.2%).
4.12 **Marital Status and Number of years worked Distribution**

The results in the table below highlight the Distribution of the Marital Status and Number of years worked among the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Less Than 3 yrs</th>
<th>3-6 yrs</th>
<th>7-10 yrs</th>
<th>More than 10 yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divorced</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The data revealed that majority of respondents in the five Public Universities were married with a representation of 85.0%. This was followed by single respondents (8.2%) and divorced, 0.9%. Most respondents married had worked in the Institution for more than six years (82.3%). This was followed by respondents of more than ten years (84.9%) and 3-6 yrs (57.4%) respectively.
4.13 Distribution of Level of Education and Number of years worked
The results in the table below showed the distribution of level of education of the respondents by the number of years worked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The results above indicate that 56.2% of the respondents had Masters degree with majority of the respondents having worked for between 3-6yrs(74.5%) followed by respondents who had worked for a period 0f 7-10years (70.4%). PHD respondents followed with a representation of 36.2% with majority having worked for more than 10 years (59.6%), professional level 4.7% and the least being at the Diploma level (0.3%).
4.14 Level of Education and Job Family Distribution
The results in the table below showed the distribution of the level of education and Job family distribution of the respondents.

Table 6: Level of Education and Job Family Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Job Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
The results above indicate that majority of the respondents were academic staff (55.6%) and administrative staff accounted for 44.4%. Of the 55.6% of academic staffs, majority possessed Masters Degree (67.2%), PHD staff 20.1%, staff with Professional qualification 8.5%, first degree (4.2%) and Diploma holders were not represented. This implies that Universities had no Diploma teaching staff.
4.2 Relationship between the variables
The results for the relationship between the variables were as presented below, using the Pearson (r) Correlation coefficient

The table below shows the relationship between organizational culture, Leader-member exchange, organizational commitment and quality education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Leader-Member Exchange</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Quality Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Education</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level 2-tailed.
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level 2-tailed.

Source: Primary data

4.21 The relationship between organizational culture and quality education.
The results showed a positive and significant relationship between Organizational culture and the Quality of Education (r = .523**, p<.01). The results imply that if the Organizational cultural issues such as emphasis of employee loyalty, openeness and procedures are well structured, this is bound to result into improved Quality of Education. This quality of education may for instance be manifested in form of regular assessment of courses in the institution and possession of up-to-date textbooks in the library.

4.22 The relationship between organizational culture, and organizational commitment.
A positive and significant relationship was observed to exist between organizational culture, and organizational commitment (r =.304**, p<.05). This implies that cultural dimensions such as encouraging employee participation, team work, freedom in doing organizational activities leads to organizational commitment by employees. This commitment is exemplified
in the employees’ desire to spend most of their career in such organization, believe in the mission and values of the Institution and feel part of the Institutions’ family.

4.23 The relationship between leader-member exchange and organisational commitment.
The correlations revealed that there also exists a positive and significant relationship between leader-member exchange and organisational commitment (r = .133*, p< .05). This observation signifies that Leader-member characteristics like parent-child relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate leads to organizational commitment. This leads to employee loyalty to the organization, desiring to work with such an employer, and a feeling part of the solutions to organizational problems.

4.24 The relationship between organisational commitment and quality education.
Organisational commitment and quality education were significantly and positively related to each other (r = .384**, p< .01). The results imply that organizational commitment dimensions such as feeling emotional attached to the Institution, developing the career in the same Institution for the rest of employees’ life in the Institution, and employees feeling part of the Institutions family lead to quality education. This will lead to improvement in research skills, continuous auditing of the University curriculum, and morale to facilitate in the Institution.

4.25 The relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education.
The results showed a positive and significant relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education (r = .287**, p< .01). This signifies that Leader-member dimensions such as liking the supervisor by the subordinate, respect of the supervisors’ knowledge and competence and admiring the professional skills of the both the supervisor and subordinate create an environment for quality education. This quality can be manifested in commitment to
regular assessment of the curriculum, following course outlines systematically, satisfaction of University facilities that may be available for the Institution’s activities.

**Regression Analysis**

The regression model was generated so as to examine the degree to which the Organizational Culture, Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Commitment can explain the Dependent Variable (Quality Education).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Regression Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Quality Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Primary data**

The results showed that the Organisational Culture, Leader-Member Exchange and Organisational Commitment can explain 34.4% of the Variance in Quality Education (Adjusted R Square = .344). Among these independent variables, the Most powerful at explaining the Quality Education, was Organisational culture (Beta = .416, sig. <.01). The regression model was generally significant (Sig. <.01). The results imply that if the Quality Education improves by 1000 units, then 344 of these units will be a result of efforts directed at improving these independent variables.
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results for Respondent Category by Variable

The result in the table below show the ANOVA results for respondents on the variables.

Table 9: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results for Respondent Category by Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>4.185</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>13.835</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>3.883</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>48.666</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Education</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>4.073</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>15.074</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results showed that on Organizational culture, The Administrative staff (Mean = 4.18) perceive it to be better than their Academic counterparts (Mean = 3.95). There were significant differences between these two classes of persons on this construct (sig. <.05).

There were no significant differences on Leader member exchange Perceptions (Sig. > .05) though the Academic staff had a higher mean than the administrative staff (Mean = 3.88).
The result in the table below show the ANOVA results for respondents on the Public Universities

Table 10: ANOVA results for respondents on the Public Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>4.206</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYU</td>
<td>4.315</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>21.191</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUK</td>
<td>3.764</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUST</td>
<td>4.360</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader-Member Exchange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYU</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>10.580</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUK</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUST</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>3.206</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYU</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>15.608</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUK</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUST</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>4.091</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYU</td>
<td>4.137</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>13.745</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUK</td>
<td>3.757</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUST</td>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results showed that on Organizational culture, MUK staff (Mean = 3.76) perceive it not to be better than their Academic counterparts (Mean = 3.95. There were significant differences between these Institutions on this construct (sig. <.05). There were no significant differences on Leader member exchange Perceptions (Sig.>.05) though the Academic staff had a higher mean than the administrative staff (Mean = 3.88).
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents discussion of the findings from the previous chapter. This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section places emphasis on the discussion and the resulting conclusions. The second part deals with the recommendation while the third and final part presents the areas for further research. The discussion was done by reviewing the literature of the previous scholars relative to the findings of this particular study.

5.1 The Relationship between organizational culture and Quality education

A positive and significant relationship was observed between the organizational Culture and Quality Education. The findings on the relationship between Organizational culture and quality education is consistent with the related literature. For example, Bowen et al. (1989) highlighted the role of cultural systems in developing and sustaining service quality. Furthermore the findings are supported by Mathew (2007) who noted that “organizational culture makes the requirements of quality an important part of organizational life, where deviations attract even emotional disapprovals”. He also noted focusing to high standards of quality by an organization is a prerequisite to attracting business from major clients abroad, and organizational culture plays a crucial role in ensuring and improving quality. This is exhibited by Makerere University which has attracted clients from the neighboring countries such as Kenya, Tanzania Rwanda and Sudan among others. It has also patterned with other outside Universities on exchange of students for the programmes offered.
The finding of the relationship between organizational culture and quality education is also consistent with the works of (Ehlers, 2009). While focusing his studies on higher Education, Ehlers observed that Quality development in higher education is often limited to bureaucratic documentation, and disregards the development of quality as an organization’s holistic culture. Therefore Quality culture requires cultural factors such as values, rituals, symbols and the like to build social interaction at the place of work and subsequently trust. However there is need for structural dimensions such as instruments, rules, regulations; and competences to have a great impact on the organization. This finding could assist top University administration in several ways. They need to understand better the type of culture prevalent in their organization, and how such culture can be transmitted in all University activities. This implies that they need to assess the strengths and weaknesses of such cultures in their University setting. It is also observed that organizational culture impacts on the behavior of employees. This is a challenge to University Management to shape and develop corporate cultures that are more conducive to the employees and University setting.

Trivellas and Dargenidou (2009) findings on higher education service quality noted that cultural values such a innovativeness and proactiveness are relevant in enhancing the quality of teaching. They argue that “quality of teaching building on academic resources, teaching expertise, theoretical and practical knowledge, attitude of academic staff, and curriculum content, requires creative spirit, experimentation, receptiveness to radical new ideas, tolerance to ambiguity and inclination to change”. This confirms the studies by (Mosadeghhard, 2006) that improvement of higher education quality depends on the organisation’s ability provide a favourable and conducive culture for change through its various decision-making systems, operating systems and human resource practices.
5.2 The Relationship between Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment

A positive and significant relationship was observed to exist between organizational culture and organizational commitment. This is in support of the findings by Lok and Crawford (2001). They noted that cultural dimensions such as innovative and supportive have a positive impact on commitment. On the other hand they further noted that a bureaucratic culture has a small but significant negative effect on organizational commitment.

The findings are also supported by the works of (Wallach, 1983; Kratina, 1990 & Brewer, 1994). These argued that commitment is greatly affected by a bureaucratic culture. They contend that a bureaucratic culture results to low levels of commitment. This is also supported by the works of (Rashid, Sambasivan & Johari, 2003) who noted that there is a relationship between the type of organizational culture and type of organizational commitment required to motivate the employees in an organization.

This finding could assist top University administration in several ways. They need to understand better the type of culture prevalent in their organization, and how such culture can be transmitted in all University activities; need to assess the strengths and weaknesses of such cultures in their University setting. It is also observed that organizational culture impacts on the behaviour of employees. This is a challenge to University Management to shape and develop corporate cultures that are more conducive to the employees and University setting.

5.3 The Relationship between Leader-Member exchange and Organizational Commitment

The results in the previous chapter revealed a significant and positive relationship between Leader-Member exchange and organizational commitment. Indeed, empirical research has demonstrated that LMX has a significant, positive influence on employee work attitudes. One of the consistent findings in LMX research is that the dyadic exchange relationship with an
immediate supervisor is positively related to job satisfaction and intent to remain because a high quality of LMX provides intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to members (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Harris et al., 2005; Liden et al., 1997; Meglino et al., 1991; Organ, 1994; Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Sherony & Green, 2002; Vecchio & Gobdel, 1984; Wilhelm et al., 1993). Thus, prior LMX studies have theoretically and empirically explained that high-quality LMX has significant positive effects on job satisfaction and intent to stay.

With regard to the relationship between LMX quality and organizational commitment, several studies have provided evidence that organizational and supervisory support plays a critical role in enhancing organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Mottaz, 1988; Reichers, 1986; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991; Vancouver et al., 1994).

This study also demonstrates the role of LMX in promoting employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and reducing their desire to leave the organization. The findings support earlier studies on LMX-attitudinal outcome relationships (Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982; Rosse and Kraut, 1983; Scandura and Graen, 1984; Duchon, Green and Taber, 1986; Nystrom, 1990; Vecchio and Gobdel, 1984). This seems to be more true in a relationship-oriented society, where loyalty, trust, and a sense of belonging are highly valued (Abdullah, 1996). According to Abdullah, in order to be effective, the manager must cultivate a personalized relationship with people with whom he or she has to deal. The result is in line with studies examining the relationship between cultural values and leadership effectiveness in India (Sinha, 1980; Hassan, 1989). For instance, Sinha identifies preference for personalized relationship and dependency on superiors as employees’ strong values in Indian organizations. According to him, leaders who are able to cultivate a personalized relationship
with subordinates and act as nurturing superiors are rated as more effective in terms of task performance and satisfaction of group members.

5.5 The relationship between Leader-Member Exchange and Quality Education

According to the research findings, there exists a positive and significant relationship between leader-member exchange and quality education. This shows that the relationship that exists between subordinates and supervisors in the work environment can lead to performance outcomes such as quality education. Followers are likely to exert extra effort to generate creative solutions for their problems as a result of intrinsic motivation caused by their leaders' articulation of long-term goals and visions (Avolio and Bass, 1988; Conger and Kanungo, 1987; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1996). Schneier, MacCoy, and Burchman (1988) argued that leaders who coach, counsel, mentor and train their followers can enhance their skills and motivation to seek out opportunities and attempt new methods of approaching a problem.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and research suggest that the quality of the exchanges that develop between employees and their leaders are predictive of performance-related job outcomes, especially for employees (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). These performance outcomes can be exhibited in the ability of facilitators to carry out research, quality of the teaching and the zeal to remain focused on the relevant curriculum. High-quality exchange relationships are characterized by mutual trust, respect, and obligation that generate influence between an employee and his or her supervisor. Low-quality exchange relationship, on the other hand, are characterized by formal, role-defined interactions and predominantly contractual exchanges that result in hierarchy-based downward influence and distance between the parties.
Furthermore, given mastery-oriented employees' intrinsic work motivation and willingness to work hard, supervisors may provide these employees with support, decision latitude, and freedom so that they can initiate, control, and carry out their tasks without excessive supervision. In turn, employees may reciprocate by working hard, doing extra tasks needed for performance improvement, and performing spontaneous and innovative extra role behaviors going beyond contractual expectations (e.g., Basu & Green, 1997; Howell & Hall Merenda, 1999; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). As such, exchanges between mastery-oriented employees and their supervisors are likely to develop to high levels. That is, they can count on each other for support and loyalty, share important informational and behavioral resources, and base the exchange process on mutual trust, respect, and obligation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

The quality of the relationships between leader and members determines the amount of physical or mental effort, material resources, information, and social support that are exchanged between leader and follower (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). Thus, subordinates in such relationships interact frequently with their leaders and have their leaders' support, confidence, encouragement, and consideration, and they take on added duties or expend extra effort to achieve work group goals beyond contractual or transactional expectations (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997; leader-member exchange six months later (Liden et al., 1993). Leaders' expectations alter their perceptions of subordinates. Leaders holding high expectations of subordinates may be more likely to attribute their good behavior to their internal qualities and poor behavior to forces external to them, whereas attributions would be the reverse when the leaders have low expectations of the subordinates (Heneman, Greenberger, & Anonyuo, 1989). Leaders' expectations may also influence their behavior toward members. High leader expectations for a subordinate may translate into the provision
of challenging tasks, feedback, and training. Conversely, a subordinate of whom a leader has low expectations may be left with relatively routine tasks, little feedback, and few training opportunities (Feldman, 1986; Leana, 1986).

5.5 The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Quality Education.

A positive and significant relationship was observed between the organizational commitment and Quality Education. This was supported by the findings of (Malik et al., 2010) who noted that the quality of supervision and satisfaction with work itself has a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Employees who are committed to the organization are inevitably bound to accept organizational goals and objectives (Valentine et al., 2002). It should be noted that quality education is a mandate by all Public Universities in Uganda. This further shows that committed University employees offer high quality service to customers, as these employees tend to exhibit discretionary effort. The finding is line with the works of Zeithaml et al. (1990) who argue that Service quality suffers when employees are unwilling or unable to perform service at the level required. Findings by Unzicker et al. (2000) and Congram and Friedman (1991) show that any organisation’s success will be jeopardised if its employees fail to accept the firm’s missions, goals and objectives and fail to believe in what the company stands for. Arfan (2005) noted that research output which is a key dimension of quality in higher education can be realized when there is institutional commitment to excellence in research. This commitment can be achieved when there organizational members have affective commitment. Similarly findings by Adeyemo (2000) indicated a positive relationship between organizational commitment and education.
5.6 Conclusions

With reference to the above discussion, the following issues can be drawn;

Cultural dimensions such as bureaucratic tendencies contribute to perceived poor quality education. This implies that University officials should recognize this as they seek to influence employees and achieve their organizational goals, of which success can be contingent upon the type of organizational culture being practiced.

When supervisors provided feedback about performance and allowed employees to participate in decision-making, employee levels of affective commitment was stronger than both continuance and normative. That is, employees indicated staying with the organization was more related to wanting to, rather than needing to or feeling they ought to. Employees who believe their superiors are considerate leaders will be more committed to their organizations than those who do not perceive their managers as such.

From the research findings was observed that organizational culture, the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate and organizational commitment lead to quality Education. This implies that for quality education to prevail, there must supportive and innovative culture, respect of the supervisor and the subordinate and a commitment of staff. The quality of the curriculum, teaching, facilities and research output can be realized when the above constructs are prevalent.

5.7 Recommendations

In relation to the findings, discussions and the conclusions, the following recommendations can be noted; The study recommends that University management should to create an environment for building and strengthening organizational culture issues that promote quality
education. Universities should encourage a culture of team work, result oriented management and flexibility in the handling of issues in the institution. Management should lobby support from government in form of funding. A supportive culture is also relevant at both departmental faculty levels. This will promote trust and commitment among members towards the common goal of ensuring quality in the institution. Without an appropriate and supportive organizational culture, there is little chance of employees living the brand.

It is imperative to note that Universities should be focused and glued towards building a quality culture. This should start from the University administration by providing a leadership role towards promoting quality culture. University members at the lower level such as academic staff and administrators should be given the mandate to own the process. Once this is done, a continuous investment in financial and human resources, monitoring and evaluation of the entire process will streamline the quality culture.

There should be some effort geared towards ensuring a positive relationship between supervisors and subordinates. The liking and respect for one another’s competences and professional conduct requires an environment that encourages employee involvement, participation and empowerment. This should be emphasised by University management. Besides, this relationship should be built on open communication and fair processes and procedures in the handling of University issues.

The relationship between organisational commitment and quality education highlights the importance of making employees loyal to the organisation. Management can address this by communicating as early as the employees join the organisation their vision and mission. This will make employees personally attached towards achieving organisational values. Public University Managements can further reinforce this commitment by benchmarking other
University in the region in terms favourable environment created by other Universities and
the compensation packages given. This will make employees focused rather than diverting
their minds towards other institutions or making evaluations in the alternative foregone if
they joined other Universities or private and government organisations. University
management should know that quality can be realised when employees are committed to their
profession (Joolideh & Yeshodhara, 2009).
Public Universities in Uganda should focus on innovation and change; a collegial approach
and sharing of opinions and values; value of research in teaching practice; quality in higher
education stemming from personal involvement of the academic in the educational processes;
hierarchical approach to research and teaching; and benefit of exposure to different
worldviews within different disciplines.
In order to ensure quality, University management need to put in place quality audits. These
should focus evaluating the curriculum in remaining relevant to the stakeholders, seeking
feedback from the service recipients regarding the quality of the products produced such as
employers and continuous assessment on the quality of research produced that should be
recommended for publications in prestigious journals.

5.8 Areas for future research
This study explored the relationship between the Organizational Culture, Leader-Member
Exchange, Organizational Commitment and Quality Education. Future research could be
recommended in areas such as;

The relationship between Organizational culture, organizational commitment, Job
satisfaction and Total Quality Management in Public Universities. This will help assess the
overall impact of the cultural construct on the Total Quality Management of Private
Universities. Another interesting research area could be to explore the dimensions of
Organizational culture which impact most on the Total Quality Management of Public Universities.
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