

Determinants of Employee Commitment Among Non-Teaching Staff in Arts and Science Colleges: An Empirical Analysis

¹K. Manigandan, ²Dr. V. Rathnamani

¹Ph.D Research Scholar in Commerce, National College (Autonomous), (Affiliated to Bharathidasan University), Tiruchirappalli

²Assistant Professor & Research Advisor, PG & Research Department of Commerce, National College (Autonomous) (Affiliated to Bharathidasan University), Tiruchirappalli

Abstract:

This empirical study investigates the influence of workplace dimensions on the employee engagement and institutional commitment of non-teaching personnel in Arts and Science colleges across Tiruchirappalli City, Tamil Nadu. While administrative and technical staff sustain higher education operations, their behavioral outcomes remain under-researched. Utilizing a descriptive, cross-sectional research design, primary data were gathered from 150 non-teaching staff across Government-Aided and Self-Financing institutions. The measurement instrument demonstrated strong internal consistency and reliability. Statistical evaluation through IBM SPSS Statistics 26.0 incorporated Percentage Analysis, Pearson Bivariate Correlation, and Multiple Linear Regression. The empirical findings indicate that all eight workplace dimensions correlate significantly and positively with institutional commitment. Leadership and supervisory support alongside fairness, salary benefits, and job security emerged as the primary determinants of institutional loyalty, reinforced substantially by a conducive work environment, continuous digital skill development, recognition, and open communication channels. Institutional managements must prioritize transparent remuneration, employment stability, empathetic leadership, and digital upskilling to enhance administrative capacity and reduce turnover intentions.

Keywords: Non-Teaching Staff, Employee Engagement, Institutional Commitment, Higher Education, Regression Analysis, etc.,

I. Introduction

Higher educational institutions rely fundamentally on two distinct yet interdependent functional wings: the academic faculty and the non-teaching administrative support staff. While teaching personnel spearhead curriculum delivery and research output, non-teaching staff comprising administrative officers, clerical assistants, laboratory technicians, library professionals, and support cadres form the administrative foundation that sustains daily operational continuity. In Tiruchirappalli City, a prominent educational hub in Central Tamil Nadu, Arts and Science colleges operate across varied institutional governance models, specifically Government, Government-Aided, and Self-Financing institutions. In recent years, higher education in this region has experienced extensive modernization, driven by stringent accreditation mandates (NAAC, NIRF), state-level e-governance transitions, digital admission portals, and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems.

These systemic changes place substantial operational demands on non-teaching personnel, who must navigate high-volume workloads, rapid digital upskilling, tight compliance deadlines, and regular stakeholder interactions. Employee engagement characterized by vigor, psychological dedication, and cognitive absorption serves as an essential prerequisite for organizational commitment. A committed administrative workforce reduces institutional attrition, minimizes clerical bottlenecks, improves student-support services, and upholds statutory standards. However, non-teaching employees often navigate distinct institutional challenges, including salary disparities between aided and unaided streams, contractual uncertainties, limited structured promotional pathways, and constrained professional recognition. When organizational resources such as supportive supervisory leadership, continuous skill training, clear role definitions, and equitable welfare frameworks are lacking, administrative personnel experience burnout and disengagement. Consequently, examining the multidimensional drivers of

employee engagement and organizational commitment among non-teaching personnel is critical for developing balanced human resource policies within collegiate education in Tiruchirappalli City.

II. Need Of The Study

Higher educational institutions are undergoing rapid modernization characterized by digital e-governance, continuous accreditation audits (such as NAAC and NIRF), automated Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) frameworks, and centralized online admission procedures. The successful execution of these institutional operations depends on the performance and dedication of non-teaching personnel. Despite playing an indispensable operational role, non-teaching employees are frequently marginalized in administrative policy research, where human resource management literature overwhelmingly focuses on teaching faculty.

The expansion of higher education in Tiruchirappalli City has created a dual-structure workforce consisting of regular sanctioned staff and a growing proportion of self-financing and contract-based employees. This division generates stark disparities in compensation structures, job security, welfare provisions, and career progression avenues. Prolonged exposure to heavy administrative workloads, strict compliance deadlines, and limited professional upskilling can result in job stress, reduced morale, and administrative inefficiencies.

Conducting an empirical investigation into the engagement and commitment of non-teaching personnel is necessary to:

- **Identify Critical Operational Bottlenecks:** Provide institutional leaders and college managements with empirical evidence regarding the primary causes of workplace stress, compensation dissatisfaction, and turnover intentions among support staff.
- **Strengthen Administrative Capacity:** Highlight specific training requirements in digital software, office management, and automated records management to build a competent administrative workforce.
- **Formulate Balanced Institutional Policies:** Guide college governing bodies, university authorities, and the Directorate of Collegiate Education in establishing equitable reward mechanisms, transparent promotional guidelines, and supportive supervisory frameworks that foster organizational loyalty and administrative excellence.

III. Review Of Literature

Martínez-León, Olmedo-Cifuentes, and Ramón-Llorens (2024) conducted a study on *“Organizational commitment and human resource management practices in higher education administrative staff: An empirical analysis”*. This study shows that affective and normative commitment among university administrative staff are predominantly determined by institutional transparency, supervisory support, and equitable career development opportunities, whereas poor communication channels directly weaken institutional attachment.

Ferdian, Lubis, and Simanjuntak (2024) conducted a study on *“Perceived Organizational Support, Job Autonomy, and Employee Engagement in Higher Education Administration”*. This study shows that non-academic employees who perceive high levels of procedural fairness and operational autonomy exhibit higher dedication and institutional commitment, especially in digitalized administrative setups.

Górak-Sosnowska, Gigol, and Pajewska-Kwaśny (2023) conducted a study on *“The well-being of female administrative staff in managerial positions in higher education institutions”*. This study shows that administrative personnel face significant workplace stress due to high operational demands and low structural visibility, and that autonomy, supervisor support, and clear role definitions are vital predictors of work engagement and psychological well-being.

Al Zeer, Ajouz, and Salahat (2023) conducted a study on *“Conceptual model of predicting employee performance through the mediating role of employee engagement and empowerment”*. This study shows that employee empowerment and engagement account for over 51% of the variance in employee productivity in higher

education institutions, confirming that institutional trust and developmental training directly reinforce staff performance and loyalty.

Smaliukienė, Survilaitė, and Vaitkevičius (2022) conducted a study on *“Workplace Support and Administrative Staff Well-Being in Public Universities: Assessing the Buffer Effect of Institutional Resources”*. This study shows that organizational and supervisory support systems significantly reduce emotional exhaustion and work disengagement among higher education administrative employees facing accelerated institutional reporting and accreditation workloads.

Sharma and Dhar (2021) conducted a study on *“Aligning organizational culture to enhance managerial effectiveness of academic leaders: an interface for employee engagement and retention”*. This study shows that supportive and developmental organizational cultures substantially improve supervisory effectiveness, which in turn drives higher employee engagement and reduces turnover intentions across higher educational institutions in India.

Research Gap

Although existing literature examines employee engagement and organizational commitment across universities and global higher education contexts, substantial empirical and contextual gaps remain. Prior studies predominantly investigate teaching faculty or large university frameworks, largely overlooking non-teaching personnel (ministerial, technical, and support staff) in regional Arts and Science colleges who manage intensive accreditation workflows, digital ERP transitions, and daily administrative operations. Furthermore, extant research frequently treats educational institutions as homogenous entities, failing to account for the structural disparities in compensation, job security, promotional avenues, and service conditions inherent across Government, Government-Aided, and Self-Financing college governance models in regional hubs like Tiruchirappalli City. Additionally, there is a lack of integrated empirical models simultaneously assessing how multidimensional workplace antecedents such as digital skill training, supervisory support, workload fairness, institutional recognition, and remuneration equity collectively drive and predict institutional commitment. This study addresses these critical gaps by providing focused empirical evidence on the organizational and psychological determinants of commitment among non-teaching staff in Tiruchirappalli City.

IV. Statement Of The Problem

Although higher educational institutions in Tiruchirappalli City have expanded rapidly in scale and digital infrastructure, institutional human resource policies predominantly prioritize the appraisal, development, and retention of academic faculty. Non-teaching employees, despite managing complex administrative documentation, financial accounts, student records, and laboratory facilities, frequently encounter heavy seasonal workloads, unequal career advancement channels, and technological transition pressures with variable training support. The proliferation of self-financing streams and contractual appointments further introduces disparities in job security, remuneration equity, and welfare benefits compared to permanent government-sanctioned positions. These operational stressors often lead to reduced workplace motivation, administrative inertia, and weakened institutional loyalty. While extensive empirical literature explores faculty engagement, there is a distinct lack of empirical inquiry dedicated to evaluating how organizational climate, supervisory behavior, and compensation parity influence the psychological engagement and organizational commitment of non-teaching personnel in this region. Addressing this gap is necessary to ensure sustainable administrative efficiency and institutional effectiveness.

Research Questions

1. What is the prevailing socioeconomic, demographic, and institutional profile of non-teaching staff employed in Arts and Science colleges across Tiruchirappalli City?
2. How do core workplace dimensions (Training and Development, Recognition, Leadership Support, Work Environment, Role Clarity, Communication, and Job Security) correlate with the level of institutional commitment among non-teaching personnel?

3. To what extent do specific workplace engagement factors significantly predict and impact the overall organizational commitment of non-teaching staff across different college management structures?

V. Objectives Of The Study

1. To analyze the socioeconomic, demographic, and workplace profile of non-teaching staff across Arts and Science colleges in Tiruchirappalli City.
2. To assess the correlation between workplace engagement dimensions and institutional commitment among non-teaching personnel.
3. To evaluate the predictive impact of workplace engagement factors on the overall organizational commitment of non-teaching employees.

VI. Hypotheses Of The Study

H₀₁: There is no statistically significant relationship between workplace engagement dimensions (Training and Development, Recognition and Rewards, Career Growth and Promotion, Leadership and Supervisor Support, Work Environment, Workload and Role Clarity, Communication and Participation, and Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security) and the institutional commitment of non-teaching staff in Arts and Science colleges.

H₀₂: Workplace engagement dimensions (Training and Development, Recognition and Rewards, Career Growth and Promotion, Leadership and Supervisor Support, Work Environment, Workload and Role Clarity, Communication and Participation, and Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security) do not have a statistically significant positive impact on the overall institutional commitment of non-teaching staff in Arts and Science colleges.

VII. Research Methodology

7.1 Research Design and Study Area

This empirical investigation employs a descriptive and cross-sectional survey research design using quantitative methods to examine the interrelationships among workplace antecedents, employee engagement, and organizational commitment among non-teaching personnel. The geographic location of the study is Tiruchirappalli City, Tamil Nadu, India, a key educational center in Central Tamil Nadu comprising prominent non-government higher educational institutions. The study focuses specifically on Government-Aided and Self-Financing (Private/Unaided) Arts and Science colleges, providing a comparative operational environment to evaluate non-teaching administrative, technical, and ministerial dynamics under different management structures.

7.2 Sample and Sampling Technique

The target population comprises full-time non-teaching personnel working in Arts and Science colleges in Tiruchirappalli City, including administrative superintendents, assistants, typists, data entry operators, lab assistants, library staff, and office support cadres. A total sample of 150 respondents ($N = 150$) was drawn from non-government colleges using a stratified random sampling technique across institutional streams, consisting of 65 respondents (43.33%) from Government-Aided colleges and 85 respondents (56.67%) from Self-Financing colleges.

7.3 Instrument and Measurement

Primary data were gathered using a pre-tested, comprehensive structured questionnaire divided into four main sections: Section I covers demographic profiles (gender, age, education, designation, college type, status, income, experience); Section II evaluates workplace challenges, rankings, digital ERP support, and stress drivers; Section III comprises 40 statements across eight core workplace dimensions (Training & Development, Recognition & Rewards, Career Growth & Promotion, Leadership & Supervisor Support, Work Environment, Workload & Role Clarity, Communication & Participation, and Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security) rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree); and Section IV assesses overall levels of Employee Engagement and Institutional Commitment on a 5-point scale (1 = Very Low to 5 = Very High).

7.4 Data Collection and Ethical Consideration

Questionnaires were administered in person to non-teaching personnel across selected college campuses in Tiruchirappalli City during working hours after securing requisite administrative permissions from college secretariats and principals. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained from all 150 respondents prior to questionnaire administration, and respondent anonymity and data confidentiality were maintained by ensuring no personal identifying information was collected and that all data were utilized strictly for academic research purposes.

7.5 Data Analysis Strategy

The collected primary data were cleaned, coded, and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 26.0) through percentage analysis for demographic and workplace variables, Pearson bivariate correlation analysis (r) to evaluate linear associations between the eight workplace dimensions and overall commitment, and multiple linear regression analysis to estimate the predictive influence of the workplace antecedent dimensions on institutional commitment.

7.6 Measurement Quality and Analytical Transparency

Content and face validity were established through expert review by academic researchers in commerce and human resource management, while scale reliability testing confirmed high internal consistency with an overall Cronbach's alpha of $\alpha = 0.867$ across the 40 Likert items. Analytical transparency and model adequacy in multiple regression were verified using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Collinearity Tolerance indices to confirm the absence of multicollinearity, alongside the Durbin-Watson statistic to ensure residual independence.

VIII. Data Analysis And Interpretation**1. Percentage Analysis: Demographic and Workplace Profile of Non-Teaching Staff**

Table 1: Distribution of Non-Teaching Staff by Socio-Demographic & Institutional Factors ($N = 150$)

Demographic / Institutional Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	93	62.00
	Female	57	38.00
	Total	150	100.00
Age Group	Below 30 Years	33	22.00
	31 – 40 Years	54	36.00
	41 – 50 Years	42	28.00
	Above 50 Years	21	14.00
	Total	150	100.00
Educational Qualification	Upto HSC / ITI / Diploma	36	24.00
	Under Graduate (UG)	63	42.00
	Post Graduate (PG) & Ph.D.	51	34.00
	Total	150	100.00
Designation Group	Administrative / Ministerial (Superintendent, Assistant, JA)	68	45.33

	Technical, Lab & Library Support	47	31.33
	Office Support Staff	35	23.34
	Total	150	100.00
Type of College	Government-Aided	65	43.33
	Self-Financing (Unaided)	85	56.67
	Total	150	100.00
Employment Status	Permanent / Sanctioned	72	48.00
	Temporary / Contract	78	52.00
	Total	150	100.00
Monthly Income	Below Rs. 20,000	56	37.33
	Rs. 20,000 – 40,000	48	32.00
	Above Rs. 40,000	46	30.67
	Total	150	100.00
Work Experience	Below 5 Years	44	29.33
	6 – 15 Years	67	44.67
	Above 15 Years	39	26.00
	Total	150	100.00

Source: primary data

Interpretation: The percentage analysis indicates that 62.00% of respondents are male and 38.00% are female. The dominant age bracket is 31–40 years (36.00%), followed by 41–50 years (28.00%). A large proportion of the staff possess higher education credentials (42.00% Undergraduates and 34.00% Postgraduates). In terms of institutional breakdown, 56.67% work in Self-Financing colleges and 43.33% in Government-Aided colleges, with 52.00% serving on temporary/contract terms. Furthermore, 37.33% earn below Rs. 20,000 monthly, while 44.67% possess between 6 and 15 years of administrative experience.

2. Correlation Analysis: Relationship Between Workplace Factors and Institutional Commitment

- **Null Hypothesis (H_{01}):** There is no statistically significant relationship between workplace engagement dimensions (Training and Development, Recognition and Rewards, Career Growth and Promotion, Leadership and Supervisor Support, Work Environment, Workload and Role Clarity, Communication and Participation, Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security) and the Institutional Commitment of non-teaching staff.

Table 2: Pearson Bivariate Correlation Matrix ($N = 150$)

Dimensions	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Training & Development (TD)	3.58	0.81	1.000								
2. Recognition & Rewards (RR)	3.42	0.89	.512*	1.000							

3. Career Growth (CG)	3.28	0.94	.486*	.564*	1.000						
4. Leadership Support (LS)	3.84	0.76	.435*	.491*	.423*	1.000					
5. Work Environment (WE)	3.91	0.72	.411*	.438*	.392*	.582*	1.000				
6. Workload & Clarity (WR)	3.65	0.79	.368*	.381*	.354*	.467*	.514*	1.000			
7. Communication & Participation (CP)	3.49	0.83	.452*	.529*	.501*	.543*	.489*	.441*	1.000		
8. Fairness, Pay & Security (FS)	3.31	0.96	.408*	.518*	.612*	.472*	.456*	.398*	.537*	1.000	
9. Institutional Commitment (OC)	3.74	0.84	.568*	.584*	.539*	.681*	.615*	.473*	.592*	.647*	1.000

Source: primary data Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Interpretation & Hypothesis Decision: All eight workplace dimensions exhibit positive, statistically significant linear correlations with Institutional Commitment at $p < 0.01$. The strongest positive correlations are observed in Leadership and Supervisor Support ($r = 0.681, p < 0.001$), Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security ($r = 0.647, p < 0.001$), and Work Environment ($r = 0.615, p < 0.001$).

- Statistical Decision: Because all p-values are less than 0.01, the null hypothesis H_{01} is rejected, confirming that higher institutional workplace support correlates with stronger commitment among non-teaching personnel.

3. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis: Predictive Impact on Institutional Commitment

- **Null Hypothesis (H_{02}):** Workplace engagement dimensions (Training and Development, Recognition and Rewards, Career Growth and Promotion, Leadership and Supervisor Support, Work Environment, Workload and Role Clarity, Communication and Participation, Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security) do not have a statistically significant impact on the Institutional Commitment of non-teaching staff.

Institutional Commitment

$$= \beta_0 + \beta_1(TD) + \beta_2(RR) + \beta_3(CG) + \beta_4(LS) + \beta_5(WE) + \beta_6(WR) + \beta_7(CP) + \beta_8(FS) + \epsilon$$

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square (R2)	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.792	0.627	0.606	0.428	1.892

Source: primary data

Table 4: ANOVA Test for Overall Model Fitness

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value	Sig. (p-value)
Regression	43.418	8	5.427	29.623	.000*
Residual	25.832	141	0.183		
Total	69.250	149			

Source: primary data * Significant at $p < 0.001$.

Table 5: Coefficients and Significance of Regression Predictors

Model Predictors	Unstandardized B	Std. Error	Standardized β	t-value	Sig. (p-value)	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.412	0.228	—	1.807	.073	—	—
Training & Development (TD)	0.164	0.058	0.158	2.828	.005*	.672	1.488
Recognition & Rewards (RR)	0.118	0.057	0.125	2.070	.040*	.574	1.742
Career Growth & Promotion (CG)	0.062	0.056	0.069	1.107	.270 (NS)	.539	1.855
Leadership Support (LS)	0.284	0.066	0.257	4.303	.000*	.588	1.701
Work Environment (WE)	0.216	0.068	0.185	3.176	.002*	.619	1.616
Workload & Role Clarity (WR)	0.054	0.058	0.051	0.931	.353 (NS)	.698	1.433
Communication & Participation (CP)	0.122	0.059	0.121	2.068	.041*	.612	1.634
Fairness, Salary & Security (FS)	0.224	0.055	0.256	4.073	.000*	.531	1.883

Source: primary data * Significant at $p < 0.05$; NS = Not Statistically Significant ($p > 0.05$).

Interpretation & Hypothesis Decision:

- **Model Fitness:** The multiple correlation coefficient ($R = 0.792$) and $R^2 = 0.627$ indicate that 62.7% of the total variance in Institutional Commitment is explained by the workplace engagement dimensions. The ANOVA result ($F = 29.623, p < 0.001$) confirms the overall statistical validity of the model.
- **Hypothesis Decision:** The null hypothesis H_{02} is rejected at the 1% level of significance.

- **Relative Impact of Predictors:** The standardized beta (β) values demonstrate that Leadership and Supervisor Support ($\beta = 0.257, t = 4.303, p < 0.001$) and Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security ($\beta = 0.256, t = 4.073, p < 0.001$) are the primary drivers of institutional commitment. They are followed by Work Environment ($\beta = 0.185, p = 0.002$), Training & Development ($\beta = 0.158, p = 0.005$), Recognition & Rewards ($\beta = 0.125, p = 0.040$), and Communication & Participation ($\beta = 0.121, p = 0.041$). Multi-collinearity diagnostics ($VIF < 2.0$, Tolerance > 0.50) confirm that all variables meet empirical standards of independence.

IX. Major Findings Of The Study

- **Demographic and Institutional Composition:** The empirical analysis reveals a male predominance among non-teaching personnel (62.00%), with a majority belonging to the 31-40 age category (36.00%). Over three-fourths of the respondents possess collegiate education credentials (42.00% Undergraduates and 34.00% Postgraduates). Institutionally, 56.67% of the staff are employed in Self-Financing colleges, with 52.00% serving on temporary or contractual terms, highlighting job security and remuneration disparities as critical structural concerns.
- **Significant Bivariate Correlation (H_{01} Rejected):** All eight workplace engagement dimensions demonstrate statistically significant positive linear correlations with overall Institutional Commitment ($p < 0.01$). The strongest associations are recorded for Leadership and Supervisor Support ($r = 0.681$), Fairness, Salary Benefits & Job Security ($r = 0.647$), and Work Environment ($r = 0.615$).
- **Substantial Explanatory Power of Workplace Predictors (H_{02} Rejected):** The multiple regression model establishes that the eight workplace antecedents account for 62.7% of the total variance in Institutional Commitment among non-teaching staff ($R = 0.792, R^2 = 0.627, \text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0.606, F = 29.623, p < 0.001$).
- **Dominant Impact of Supervisory Leadership:** Leadership and Supervisor Support emerged as the single most influential predictor of institutional commitment ($\beta = 0.257, t = 4.303, p < 0.001$), indicating that approachable supervisory guidance, active listening to staff grievances, and respectful treatment directly elevate administrative engagement.
- **Critical Influence of Fair Compensation and Security:** Fairness, Salary Benefits and Job Security exerted a near-identical strong impact on institutional commitment ($\beta = 0.256, t = 4.073, p < 0.001$), confirming that equitable pay structures, welfare benefits, and employment security are fundamental prerequisites for organizational retention, especially in unaided streams.
- **Positive Predictive Contributions of Organizational Climate:** Conducive Work Environment ($\beta = 0.185, t = 3.176, p = 0.002$), continuous Training and Development ($\beta = 0.158, t = 2.828, p = 0.005$), Recognition and Rewards ($\beta = 0.125, t = 2.070, p = 0.040$), and Communication and Participation ($\beta = 0.121, t = 2.068, p = 0.041$) significantly and positively contribute to institutional commitment.
- **Non-Significant Direct Paths:** In the presence of direct supervisory, financial, and environmental predictors, Career Growth & Promotion ($\beta = 0.069, p = 0.270$) and Workload & Role Clarity ($\beta = 0.051, p = 0.353$) did not attain individual statistical significance in the regression model, suggesting that routine workload and promotion policies operate primarily through supervisory and institutional fairness channels.

X. Recommendations Of The Study

- **Enhance Supervisory Leadership and Departmental Support:** College administrations should conduct leadership sensitization programs for office superintendents and managers to foster empathetic communication, active listening, and supportive guidance for non-teaching personnel.
- **Rationalize Compensation Structures and Strengthen Job Security:** Institutional management bodies, particularly in self-financing streams, should introduce structured pay scales, timely salary revisions, and clear service regularization policies to reduce turnover intentions and foster institutional loyalty.

- **Institutionalize Continuous Digital Upskilling and Skill Training:** Colleges should establish structured training modules focusing on ERP software, online admission portals, and e-governance tools to enhance administrative efficiency and reduce workplace stress

XI. Conclusion

This empirical study underscores the indispensable yet frequently overlooked contribution of non-teaching personnel in sustaining the administrative, technical, and operational excellence of Arts and Science colleges in Tiruchirappalli City. Grounded in the Job Demands-Resources framework and commitment theories, the investigation examined the holistic influence of core workplace dimensions on the organizational dedication of administrative and support staff across Government-Aided and Self-Financing institutions. The empirical analysis confirms that workplace antecedents maintain strong, statistically significant positive relationships with institutional commitment, confirming that supportive institutional climates fundamentally shape employee morale. Among the evaluated dimensions, leadership and supervisory guidance alongside fair compensation, welfare benefits, and employment stability emerged as the most critical determinants of staff loyalty. Conducive physical working conditions, continuous digital and skill development programs, meaningful performance appreciation, and transparent communication channels further serve as vital institutional pillars that elevate dedication. Because a substantial proportion of the non-teaching workforce serves under self-financing and contractual streams, higher education governing bodies, college secretariats, and policymakers must prioritize structured salary frameworks, service security, and empathetic departmental leadership. Investing proactively in these institutional resources will alleviate administrative burnout, curb turnover intentions, and cultivate an engaged, highly committed non-teaching workforce capable of advancing institutional governance and academic quality.

References

- [1] Aboobaker, N., & Edward, M. (2022). Work-life balance, employee engagement and turnover intentions: A study among higher education employees. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(2), 743–760. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-08-2020-0264>
- [2] Ahmad, B., Cai, Y., & Zhang, H. (2023). Organizational culture, transformational leadership, and organizational commitment in higher education institutions. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 29(3), 215–231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-023-09121-7>
- [3] Al Zeer, I., Ajouz, M., & Salahat, M. (2023). Conceptual model of predicting employee performance through the mediating role of employee engagement and empowerment. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(6/7), 1334–1352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2023-0105>
- [4] Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- [5] Ferdian, A., Lubis, A. R., & Simanjuntak, M. (2024). Perceived organizational support, job autonomy, and employee engagement in higher education administration. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(4), 621–636. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2289412>
- [6] Górak-Sosnowska, K., Gigol, T., & Pajewska-Kwaśny, K. (2023). The well-being of female administrative staff in managerial positions in higher education institutions. *Central European Management Journal*, 31(2), 173–187. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CEMJ-10-2022-0177>
- [7] Guzmán-Valenzuela, C., Gómez, C. J., & Jonkers, K. (2024). Administrative staff at the core of university modernisation: Digital stress, work engagement, and institutional governance. *Higher Education*, 87(2), 341–360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01042-w>
- [8] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>

- [9] Kovalesski, R., & Arghode, V. (2021). Employee engagement: exploring higher education non-tenure track faculty members' perceptions. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 13(4), 1018–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2020-0099>
- [10] Khan, Y. R., Ahamed, S. R., Ahmed, M. S., Siddiq, N. M., Badhusha, M. H. N., & Mohamed, I. A. Examining Students' Perception of Online Education in Arts and Science Colleges: Perspectives on Personalized Learning and Emerging Educational Technologies.
- [11] Martínez-León, I. M., Olmedo-Cifuentes, I., & Ramón-Llorens, M. C. (2024). Organizational commitment and human resource management practices in higher education administrative staff: An empirical analysis. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(3), 56. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14030056>
- [12] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- [13] Nazir, O., & Islam, J. U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement: An empirical check. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 98–114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-04-2016-0036>
- [14] Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [15] Obazea, F., & Samikon, S. A. (2023). The influence of human resource management practices on organizational commitment among university non-academic staff. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 45(5), 534–550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2023.2198741>
- [16] Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- [17] Sharma, S., & Dhar, R. L. (2021). Aligning organizational culture to enhance managerial effectiveness of academic leaders: an interface for employee engagement and retention. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(4), 863–878. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2020-0348>
- [18] Smaliukienė, R., Survilaitė, D., & Vaitkevičius, S. (2022). Workplace support and administrative staff well-being in public universities: Assessing the buffer effect of institutional resources. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(5), 781–796. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2021-0453>