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ABSTRACT

The study examined the relationship between leadership behaviours and the organisational commitment of academic staff at Kyambogo University, mediated by job satisfaction. Specifically, the study tested the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment and job satisfaction, the influence of job satisfaction on the organisational commitment of academic staff, and the mediating effect of job satisfaction on the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment. Based on the three-component model by Allen and Meyer (1990), organisational commitment was studied in terms of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The study adopted a correlational research design on a sample of 175 full-time academic staff of Kyambogo University. The study utilised a self-administered questionnaire to collect the data. Data analysis involved carrying out partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM). The results indicated that leadership behaviours positively but insignificantly influenced job satisfaction, while job satisfaction positively and significantly influenced organisational commitment, and leadership behaviours positively and significantly influenced job satisfaction. The results also revealed that job satisfaction partially mediated the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment. The study concluded that while leadership behaviours are not a prerequisite for increasing organisational commitment among academic staff members, they improve academic staff members' job satisfaction. Also, academic staff members’ commitment is increased by their job satisfaction, and job satisfaction partially significantly affects the association between leadership behaviours and academic staff members' commitment. The study recommends that to improve organisational commitment, university leaders should not overfocus on leaders’ behaviours. Nevertheless, to improve job satisfaction, they should exhibit those leadership behaviours that enhance job satisfaction. Further, university leaders can improve academic staff satisfaction by implementing appropriate job satisfaction practices. Last but not least, in addition to good leadership practices, university leaders should implement appropriate job satisfaction practices to enhance academic staff members' commitment.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The concept of organisational commitment was first expounded by Becker (1960) as referring to an individual’s willingness to continue being a member of the organisation because of the fear of losing the benefits (side-bets) associated with working and staying with the organisation. Mowday et al. (1979) indicated that it denoted the extent to which an employee identifies with and participates in organisational activities. Allen and Meyer (1990) elucidated that organisational commitment was a three-dimensional concept encompassing affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment means an employee’s identity and emotional attachment to the organisation, which leads to his or her continued membership (Nguyen et al., 2020). Therefore, creating rewarding work experiences that employees value and expect to continue has a direct impact on how long employees stay and work for an organisation (Sinaga et al., 2021). According to side-bet theory (Becker, 1960), continuous commitment means that when an employee works for many years in the organisation, he or she tends to accumulate investments, which are in the form of career investment, retirement investment, time, effort, and acquired unique skills that are costly to lose when the employee leaves the organisation. Such investment compels an employee to continue staying with and working for the organisation. Khan et al. (2021) describes normative commitment as a moral obligation by employees to continue offering their services to the organisation because it has invested a lot of time, money, education, and training and has developed them.

The notion of organisational commitment has garnered immense attention in previous studies to comprehend the depth of employee loyalty to the organisation (Harsono and Abdullah’Azzam, 2023). This is because employees with a higher level of commitment are more loyal to the organisation and are more willing to offer support to the organisation to succeed (Almaaitah et al., 2020). Further, committed employees exhibit decreased withdrawal behaviours including tardiness, absenteeism, and turnover which have a negative impact on organisational performance (Jakada, 2019). In addition, Tran et al. (2020) contend that a strong commitment to the organisation by the employees results in self-directed and conscientious application to the work, frequent attendance, less need for supervision, and a higher level of discretionary effort. According to Mugizi et al. (2015), employees who are committed to their work tend to be more likeable, productive, and responsible people. As a result, organisational commitment not only improves performance on specific tasks but also inspires individuals to take numerous voluntary actions that are essential for the success of high-standard systems and organisations.

Despite the importance of organisational commitment, it is low amongst the academic staff of Kyambogo University. This is manifested by rampant absenteeism and poor teaching delivery using techniques that are not student-centred while others exhibit a lack of innovation in
teaching (Kasule et al., 2022). For instance, while the trend today has shifted to including innovative e-learning strategies, academic staff at Kyambogo University are resistant to change and are negative towards e-learning, with many of them sticking to the face-to-face on-campus approach (Mugizi et al., 2023). This is an indicator of low affective commitment that is normally exhibited by employees’ readiness to change in order to enhance organisational success. Academic staff also exhibit low normative commitment, with 78% of them failing to teach all of the lectures scheduled for them during the semester, 67% failing to prepare for lectures, and 56% delaying evaluating students' coursework, examinations, and other forms of on-going evaluation during the semester. Some academic staff members fail to supervise students and are less involved in community outreaches (Kasule et al., 2022; Nabunya et al., 2018). Further, 60% of academics fail to set exams, mark, and grade students on time (Nabunya, 2021).

Still, many academic staff members of Kyambogo University demonstrate low job satisfaction, as indicated by their low interaction with students. Some of the academic staff members meet students for about half of the projected contact hours, miss work, and seldom attend their classes. Others display a lack of job ownership, are unstable in their jobs, and some demonstrate a high intent to leave (Kato et al., 2023). In terms of leadership behaviours, Okello (2019) reported that university leaders lacked a shared vision, demonstrating non-inclusiveness and incoherent leadership, resulting in inefficient service delivery. At Kyambogo University, middle-level academic leadership also exhibits a lack of leadership competence by failing to effectively supervise those under them (Kasule, 2020). According to Mugizi et al. (2022), Kyambogo University experienced maladministration, decadence in governance, a lack of ethics, and incompetence among leaders. The contextual circumstances above indicate that academic staff organisational commitment was low, as well as job satisfaction. In addition, leaders exhibited weak leadership behaviours. Thus, this study examined leadership behaviours and organisational commitment mediated by the job satisfaction of academic staff at Kyambogo University.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

The Path-Goal Leadership Theory by Evans (1970), propagated by House (1971), and Hertzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (Hertzberg, 1959) underpinned this study. The Path-Goal Leadership Theory posits that the actions of leaders have a noteworthy impact on employees’ attitudes (Mickson and Anlesinya, 2020). Such attitudes include organisational commitment and job satisfaction. The Path-Goal Leadership Theory propounds that the behaviours of leaders help employees choose the best path to attain both individual and organisational goals (Dokony et al., 2020). Thus, the leader's job is to help the followers reach their objectives by giving them guidance, support, and inspiration (Malik, 2012). Leaders exhibit four leadership behaviours, namely, directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership behaviours (House, 1971). Directive leadership behaviours involve placing a high value on instruction, close supervision and expected compliance with orders (Mwaisaka et al., 2019). Supportive leadership involves a leader showing concern and providing emotional support for the needs and welfare of employees (Farid et al., 2021). With participative leadership, leaders share authority with those below them by including them in decision-making (Usadolo, 2020). Achievement-oriented leadership behaviours are characterised by the leader expecting high levels of performance from team members while setting hard goals for them (Khan et al., 2020). This study examined how leadership behaviours, namely directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership behaviours, influenced the organisational commitment and job satisfaction of academic staff.

Hertzberg’s Two-Factor Theory (Hertzberg, 1959) identifies sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for employees. The theory indicates that satisfaction sources or factors are
motivators and are embedded in the job, while dissatisfaction factors are hygiene or job context antecedents. Thus, the theory identifies two factors, namely satisfaction factors (intrinsic) and hygiene factors (extrinsic), that affect job satisfaction in two opposite ways (Khanna, 2017). Intrinsic factors are aspects of the job content that satisfy or motivate employees, including autonomy, authority, achievement, recognition, responsibility, and opportunities for growth and advancement (Steinke et al., 2018). Extrinsic factors are aspects related to job contexts that prevent dissatisfaction, such as interpersonal relationships, salary, company policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, job security, personal life, and status (Thant & Chang, 2021). The theory assumes that sufficient provision of intrinsic factors to employees increases job satisfaction, while a sufficient supply of extrinsic factors to employees creates favourable working conditions that prevent dissatisfaction but do not increase job satisfaction (Atan et al., 2021). Employee job satisfaction in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction impacts employee attitudes, including organisational commitment (Dalkrani & Dimitriadis, 2018). Based on Hertzberg's two-factor theory, this study examined the influence of job satisfaction on organisational commitment among academic staff mediated by job satisfaction. The theories above lead to the following hypotheses:

H1: Leadership behaviours have a significant influence on the organisational commitment of academic staff.

H2: Leadership behaviours have a significant influence on the job satisfaction of academic staff.

H3: Job satisfaction has a significant influence on the organisational commitment of academic staff.

H4: Job satisfaction has a mediating influence on the relationship between leadership behaviours and job satisfaction of academic staff.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Behaviours and Organisational Commitment of Academic Staff

Leadership behaviours describe the dispositional and attitude traits of a leader that inspire, influence, mobilize, support, encourage, direct, and facilitate individuals and groups in achieving organisational goals (Syarifa et al., 2020). Leadership behaviours denote how leaders purposefully exert influence over their subordinates in order to steer, structure, and facilitate operations inside an organisation (Çilek, 2019). According to path-goal theory (House, 1971), leadership behaviours include directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership. Oyetunji et al. (2019) indicate that leadership behaviours are necessary for effective employee commitment. Studies (Abd El Muksoud et al., 2021; Al-Hussami et al., 2018; Alzubi, 2018; Al-Yami et al., 2018; Ongechi, 2018; Çilek, 2019; Dou et al., 2017 Suhardi et al., 2020; Palupi et al., 2017) have examined the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment of employees. Nevertheless, population and empirical gaps emerged from the aforementioned studies. For instance, studies (Abd El Muksoud et al., 2021; Alzubi, 2018) included populations outside universities hence needing further study of university contexts. Still, as the studies reveal, there was a lack of empirical analysis in the context of Uganda hence the need for empirical studies in the Ugandan context. These gaps attracted the need for this study to examine the influence of leadership behaviours on the organisational commitment of academic staff in a university in the context of Uganda.

Leadership Behaviours and Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff

Leadership behaviours are postulated to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Positive behaviours of a leader generate job satisfaction of employees in workplaces (Akdol & Arikboga, 2015). Effective leadership behaviours lead to job satisfaction because feelings of employees, personal ambitions and aspirations are aroused.
Good leaders address employees’ individual needs, and direct and advise them which creates satisfaction in them (Dubey et al., 2023). A number of studies (An et al., 2020; Bedoya, 2021; Birbirsa & Lakew, 2020; Cansoy, 2019; Dokony et al., 2020; Dubey et al., 2023; Freire & Bettencourt, 2020; Han et al., 2021; Holbert et al., 2021; Hua, 2020; Loke, 2001; Mefi & Asoba, 2020; Muganda & Muganda, 2020; Tsepetsi et al., 2019) related leadership behaviours and job satisfaction of employees. However, the studies raised population gaps, empirical and methodological gaps. First, all the studies were done outside universities yet the working conditions and job requirements are different. Hence, it was necessary to carry out the study on a university population. Also, the studies revealed a lack of empirical analysis in the context of Uganda. This thus called for a study in the context of Ugandan. Further, the study by Cansoy (2019) raised a methodological gap as it was a systematic review hence the need for more primary studies. The gaps that emerged made it pertinent that further examination should be carried out on the influence of Leadership behaviours and job satisfaction of academic staff in the Ugandan context.

**Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment of Academic Staff**

Job satisfaction describes the positive psychological state derived from workers' evaluation of their jobs (Andrade et al., 2020). It is a set of psychological conditions related to how employees feel about their workplace (Madrid et al., 2020). Huang and Su (2016) indicate that workers with a superior degree of job satisfaction have an advanced level of organisational commitment. Winarsih and Fariz (2021) argue that when a person's job satisfaction increases, commitment also increases. Studies (Candelario et al., 2020; Chordiya et al., 2017; Haaque et al., 2019; Mabasa & Ngirande, 2015; Makhathini & Dyke, 2018; Mitonga-Monga et al., 2018; Nobile, 2017; Qureshi et al., 2017; Sait, 2017; Tekingündüz et al., 2017; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016) have examined the influence job satisfaction and commitment. The aforementioned investigations revealed conceptual, population and contextual gaps. For instance, studies (Makhathini & Dyke, 2018; Chordiya et al., 2017) addressed a single element of commitment which is affective commitment hence a conceptual gap. On the other hand, Mabasa and Ngirande (2015) studied only junior academic staff while Trivellas and Santouridis (2016) study combined academic staff and administrators. This study thus examined the influence of job satisfaction and organisational commitment of academic staff considering organisational commitment as a multidimensional construct comprising affective, continuance and normative. The study also considered various academic staff excluding other staff.

**Job Satisfaction, Leadership Behaviours and Organisational Commitment of Academic Staff**

Job satisfaction has been identified as a mediator of organisational commitment because employees become more committed to their work if they feel satisfied (Halim et al., 2021). Studies (Banjarnahor et al., 2018; Halim et al., 2021; Ishak & Romle, 2015; Mwesigwa et al., 2020; Nadia & Azzman, 2020; Nanjundeswaraswamy, 2023; Sušanj & Jakopec, 2012; Yousef, 2000) have examined the mediating effect of job satisfaction on the influence of leadership behaviours and organisational commitment of academic staff. However, conceptual and population gaps emerged. Conceptually, none of the studies mediated leadership behaviours, but they were obliquely implied by leadership styles. Further, other than the study by Mwesigwa et al. (2020), all the other studies presented population gaps as they were done in contexts outside universities and hence did not involve academic staff. These conceptual and population gaps attracted this study, considering leadership behaviours in the context of a university, to examine the mediating role of job satisfaction on the influence of leadership behaviours and organisational commitment of academic staff.
METHODOLOGY

This section covers the strategies that were the basis for the collection and analysis of data on leadership behaviours and organisational commitment mediated by job satisfaction among academic staff. These include the research design and sample, instrument, and data analysis methods.

Research Design and Sample

The study adopted a correlational research design to enable the examination of the association between two variables (Devi et al., 2022). Thus, using the correlational research design, the study examined the influence of leadership behaviours on the organisational commitment of academic staff mediated by job satisfaction (Kasalak et al., 2022). The study employed the quantitative approach which enabled the carrying out of partial least squares structural modelling (PLS-SEM). This was the basis for drawing inferences necessary for the generalisation of the findings. The study involved a sample of 175 full-time academic staff members of Kyambogo University from a population of 415. The sample size was determined based on the Table for sample determination by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Simple random sampling using a sampling frame provided by Excel was used to obtain the respondents that provided data. Simple random sampling was used because it helped to collect non-biased data as the study participants were chosen by chance hence every academic staff in the university had the opportunity to participate in the study. This enabled the production of generalizable results.

Instrument

A self-administered questionnaire was used to gather data. The questionnaire section A collected data on the demographic characteristics of the respondents while sections B, C and D contained indicators for the measures of the dependent, independent, and mediating variables respectively. The dependent variable was organisational commitment, the independent variable was leadership behaviours, and the mediating variable was job satisfaction. The indicators of the different constructs were adapted from instruments by earlier scholars. The measures of organisational commitment were affective, continuance, and normative commitment from Allan and Meyer (1990), and the measures of leadership behaviours were directive, supporting, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership from Yan-Li and Hassan (2018). The measures of job satisfaction were intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction to Martins and Proença (2012). The indicators of the measures were ranked using an ordinal scale of the Likert scale where 1 (strongly disagree [SD]) represented the lowest ranking and 5 (strongly agree [SA]) the highest. The data were subjected to validity and reliability tests using average variance extracted (AVE) and Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio (Table 1) and Composite reliability and Cronbach's Alpha (Table 2) respectively.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-EM) were used to analyse data. Descriptive statistics involving means showed how the academic staff rated their organisational commitment and job satisfaction, and the leadership behaviours of their leaders. PLS-EM using Smart PLS 3 involved developing the structural model and path estimates showing causal linkages between the variables. PLS-EM was carried out because it shows linear linkages of multiple independent variables with the dependent variable. The method is a higher level of analysis since it produces composite factors of multiple independent variables using principal component analysis while identifying causal linkages between variables and the mediation effect (Hair Jr et al., 2021). This helped to enable examining the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment mediated by job satisfaction.

FINDINGS

The initial sample determined to provide data for this study were 201 full-time academic staff of
Kyambogo University using questionnaire survey. Those who provided the data were 175. However, 12 respondents did not fill all the items for specific constructs in the questionnaire and these were removed from the study as recommended by Hair Jr. et al. (2021). Further, seven items were removed after testing for outliers. As such, a total of 156 individual items were considered for analysis which constituted 77.6% which was a sufficient percentage rate as recommended by Pielsticker and Hiebl (2020) who emphasise 50% as the ideal response rate for social science investigations.

**Demographic Attributes of Academic Staff**

The demographic characteristics results revealed that the majority of the academic staff were males (72.0%) with females being 28.0%. The larger percentage of academic staff (41%) were assistant lecturers, followed by lecturers (39.1%), 13.1% were senior lecturers, 3.2% associate professors, 1.9% were graduate fellows, while 1.3% were professors. The majority (74.3%) had the experience of five years and above, followed by those who had three to four years (17.7%), and those with one to two years 5.1% while 2.9% had an experience of less than a year. The larger percentage (48.6%) were master's degree holders, 48.0% had PhDs, while 1.7% had bachelor's degrees and post-graduate diplomas. The results above suggest that lecturers of a variety of background attributes participated in the study. Hence, the results can be generalised to all academic staff.

**Measurement Models**

Table 1 is a measurement model constructed to ascertain the convergence and independence of the measures of the variables. However, descriptive statistics in the form of means were first calculated to assess how academic staff rated their organisational commitment and job satisfaction, and the leadership behaviours of their leaders. The validity tests involved calculating the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for convergent validity and the Hetero-trait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations for discriminant validity assessment. AVE assessed whether the measures (constructs) were related and thus converged on the variable. Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio correlations were computed to determine the discriminant validity of reflectively measured constructs.

**Table 1: Means, AVE and Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio correlations variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>IJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: OC = organisational commitment; AC = affective commitment; CC = continuance commitment; NC = normative commitment; JS = job satisfaction; EJ = extrinsic job satisfaction; IJ = intrinsic job satisfaction, LB=leadership behaviours, AO = achievement-oriented, DL= directive leadership, PL= participative leadership, SL= supportive leadership.
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Table 1 shows that the study participants rated their organisational commitment \((M = 3.50)\) high because the mean on the five-point Likert scale used rated it close to four for agree. The respondents rated their affective commitment \((M = 4.03)\) and normative commitment \((M = 3.59)\) high but rated their continuance commitment \((M = 2.89)\) moderate as the mean was near code 3, which stood for undecided. Three indicated average, the continuance commitment of academic staff was moderate or fair. The academic staff rated their intrinsic \((M = 4.14)\) and extrinsic satisfaction \((3.74)\) high. Hence, job satisfaction \((M = 3.94)\) was high. With respect to leadership behaviours, they rated directive leadership \((3.97)\) highest, followed by achievement-oriented \((3.84)\), supportive leadership \((3.76)\) and participative leadership \((3.61)\) high respectively. Therefore, the academic staff rated the leadership behaviours of their leaders \((M = 3.77)\) as high.

AVE revealed that all the values for the different measures were above the minimum of 0.5. Therefore, indicators for each construct were related and thus converged on the construct (Hair Jr et al., 2021). Thus, they were suitable measures. Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratio of correlations for discriminant validity assessment revealed that all the ratio correlations were below the upper limit of 0.90. This means the measures were distinct because the correlation between them was low (Franke & Sarstedt, 2019). This means that the predictive variables could independently predict the dependent variable.

Table 2 shows that reliability tests in the form of Cronbach's alpha \((\alpha)\) and Composite reliability \((\text{CR})\) were also calculated. The reliability tests sought to determine the consistency of indicators of various measures. The reliability tests involved calculating both Cronbach’s alpha and CR due to the constraint of Cronbach's alpha of assuming that all indicators should have the same traits in the population and as such, decrease reliability scores. Due to this constraint, Cronbach’s alpha tends to underestimate the indicators’ internal consistency reducing the indicators likely to be reliable. CR was preferred because it is tolerant and considers the external characteristics of the indicator variables (Dash & Paul, 2021), hence likely to increase indicators attaining reliability.

### Table 2: Composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha for the study constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs of the variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha ((\alpha))</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement-Oriented</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability values (Table 2) show that except for the measure of normative commitment whose Cronbach’s alpha was below the minimum level of 0.70 (Hair Jr et al., 2021), all the values of the other measures were above and hence reliable. However, even for the measure with a low value, CR results revealed that its reliability was high above the minimum because Lai (2021) indicates that the composite reliability is also 0.70. Therefore, the indicators used to measure the different measures had a sufficient degree of reliability. Therefore, all the measures were reliable.
The results in Figure 1 show the linkage between leadership behaviours namely directive, supporting, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership on organisational commitment. The figure shows that for directive leadership behaviours (DLB) five items out of six loaded above 0.5 when using factors analysis and only one item (DLB6) did not load above 0.5 which was a threshold level and was removed from the model. The factor loadings for supportive leadership (SLB) show that all nine indicators loaded above 0.5. Also, the factor loadings for participative leadership show that all the ten items loaded above 0.5. However, for achievement-oriented leadership (ALB) none of the indicators loaded. The model also shows the mediation link between job satisfaction on the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment. For extrinsic job satisfaction (EJ), six indicators out of seven loaded highly while for intrinsic job satisfaction (IJ) only three out of 12 loaded highly. The betas (βs) and coefficients of determination (R²) indicated in the figure are explained under the structural equation path estimates model.

Table 3: Structural equation path estimates model for leadership behaviours and organisational commitment of academic staff mediated by job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation Effect</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behaviours → Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behaviours → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction → Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.936</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behaviours → Job Satisfaction → Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients of determination</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 3 indicate that leadership behaviours had a positive but insignificant influence on the organisational commitment of academic staff \((\beta=0.171, t =1.568, p=0.118>0.05))
. However, leadership behaviours had a positive and significant influence on job satisfaction \((\beta=0.717, t = 22.000.560, p = 0.000 <0.05))
. Also, job satisfaction had a positive and significant impact on organisational commitment \((\beta=0.292, t = 2.936, p=0.003< 0.05))
. Mediation results indicate that job satisfaction positively and significantly mediated the influence of leadership behaviours on organisational commitment \((\beta=0.210, t = 2.873, p=0.004< 0.05))
. However, job satisfaction partially mediated the link between leadership behaviours and organisational commitment, given the positive and insignificant direct association between the two variables. The coefficients of determination for commitment showed that the two variables of leadership behaviours and job satisfaction contributed 18.7\% \((R^2 = 0.187)\) but in the combined relationship the significant factor of job satisfaction contributed 17.6\% \((0.176\%))
. This means that 81.3\% was contributed by factors not considered under this model. For job satisfaction, leadership behaviour and other latent variables contributed 51.5\% \((R^2 = 0.515)\) but leadership alone contributed 51.2\%. This means that for job satisfaction 48.5\% was contributed by factors not considered under this model. The results above suggest that while hypothesis one was rejected, hypothesis two and four were supported.

DISCUSSION

The results showed that academic staff members' organisational commitment was positively but insignificantly influenced by leadership behaviours. The results are at odds with those of the majority of scholars (Abd El Mukoud et al., 2021; Suhardi et al., 2020; Çilek, 2019; Palupi et al., 2019; Al-Hussami et al., 2018; Al-Yami et al., 2018; Alzubi, 2018; Ongechi, 2018) that indicated a link between academic staff members' organisational commitment and their leadership behaviours. This suggested that academic staff members' commitment was not increased by leadership behaviours. The results also showed that academic staff commitment was positively and significantly influenced by leadership behaviours. The results were consistent with Han et al. (2021), Holbert et al. (2021), Bedoya (2021), Muganda and Muganda (2020), Mwesigwa et al. (2020), Mefi and Asoba (2020), Birbirsa and Lakew (2020), Hua (2020), An et al. (2020), and Dokony et al. (2020), which indicated a positive link between leadership behaviours and commitment suggesting that the commitment of academic personnel at Kyambogo University was improved by leadership behaviours. The study also indicated that academic staff members' organisational commitment was a positive and significant predictor of their job satisfaction. As such, it was in line with studies by Haaque et al. (2019), Mitonga-Monga et al. (2018), Makhathini and Dyke (2018), Chordiya et al. (2017), Tekingündüz et al. (2017), Sait (2017), and Candelario et al. (2020) that revealed a substantial association between leadership behaviours and commitment. Nevertheless, it can be deduced that job satisfaction influenced academic staff members' organisational commitment at Kyambogo University because the study's results were consistent with those of previous scholars.

Further, leadership behaviours, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment were found to have a positive and substantial association. This revealed that job satisfaction fully mediated the association between commitment and leadership behaviours. Nonetheless, given that the direct link between commitment and leadership behaviours was positive and insignificant, it can be inferred that job satisfaction partially mediated the link between organisational commitment and leadership behaviours. This contrasted with research by Hendri (2018), Silitonga et al. (2020), and Halim et al. (2021) that showed job satisfaction mediated the association between commitment and leadership behaviours. However, research by Banjarnahor et al. (2018) supported the results by indicating that job satisfaction partially mediated the link between the two variables. Thus, it may be deduced that job satisfaction partially mediated the link between the organisational commitment and leadership.
behaviours of academic staff, given that the study's results differed from those of the majority of scholars.

CONCLUSION

The results indicate that leadership behaviours are not a prerequisite for increasing organisational commitment academic staff members. This is because even if leaders set high standards for performance, communicate the level of excellence expected from them, and support them to meet most of their job objectives and continuously improve their performance, commitment does not improve. However, leadership behaviours improve academic staff members' job satisfaction. This when university managers actively listen to academic staff members' ideas and propositions, involve them in various managerial tasks, have cordial working connections with them, say things that inspire them, clarify expectations, and set goals for them to meet, their satisfaction is enhanced. Further, academic staff members' commitment is increased by their job satisfaction. This is when academic staff members are always busy at work, have occasional opportunities to engage in different activities while at work, whose work does not conflict with their moral convictions, love their jobs because they have stable employment, have the opportunity to participate in work that utilises their skills, are free to exercise their own judgment while doing their work help to improve their job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction partially significantly affects the association between leadership behaviours and academic staff members' commitment. Thence, when besides good leadership there is job satisfaction; commitment of academic staff academic staff will be enhanced.

Recommendation

To improve organisational commitment, university leaders should not over focus on their leadership behaviours. This is because while descriptive results revealed that leadership behaviours in terms of setting high standards for performance, communicating the level of excellence expected from staff, and supporting them to meet most of their job objectives and continuously improve their performance remained low, commitment remained low. However, university leaders should exhibit those leadership behaviours that enhance the job satisfaction of academic staff. The descriptive results revealed that leadership behaviours that enhanced job satisfaction employed leadership behaviours including actively listening to academic staff members' ideas and propositions, involving them in various managerial tasks, having cordial working connections with them, saying things that inspire them, clarifying expectations, and setting goals for them to meet. Further, university leaders can improve academic staff satisfaction by implementing appropriate job satisfaction practices. According to the descriptive results, these include always keeping academic staff members' busy, providing them occasional opportunities to engage in different activities, making them carry out activities that do not conflict with their moral convictions, ensuring stable employment, providing them the opportunity to participate in work that utilises their skills, and allowing them to freely exercise their own judgement while doing their work.

Further, in addition to good leadership behaviours, university leaders should implement appropriate job satisfaction practices to enhance academic staff members' commitment.
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