Cheryl Lim

What’s in It for Me?
Organizational commitment among faculty members in UAE business schools

Academic dissertation to be presented with the assent of The Doctoral Training Committee of Human Sciences, University of Oulu for public defence in Arina-sali (Auditorium TA105), Linnanmaa, on 26 June 2014, at 12 noon
Abstract

The transformation of many universities to corporate-style governance impacts working conditions, work practices, academic work contracts and the autonomy of faculty. Faculty commitment to university business schools is closely associated with faculty members’ perceptions of organizational life and relationships with institutional managers. Commitment oriented behavioral traits of faculty are related to the design of administration structure, workplace setting, job definition and role expectations. It is important to better understand how these factors relate to faculty commitment in business schools, particularly in multicultural and transitional employment economies. This study utilizes the classic 1991 Meyer and Allen three-component model of organizational commitment to understand how expatriate and national faculty perceive their levels of organizational commitment in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The research interprets qualitative data collected through interviews with business school faculty at six institutions across private and public education sectors in UAE. Five factors emerged as central to faculty commitment in the sample group: economic compensation, organizational values, autonomy, organizational support and justice, and leadership. This study makes three important contributions to organizational commitment literature, both augmenting and challenging received notions of faculty commitment: (1) the study introduces a new student-related dimension to account for how organizational failures to support student quality significantly impact faculty commitment; (2) the study determines that academics in a transitional economy tend to commit to profession, area of discipline, or country, rather than to the business school in which they work; and (3) the study finds that economic compensation is a secondary issue for expatriate faculty working in academic institutions characterized by lack of tenure, threats to faculty career futures linked to contradictions between levels of research support and institutional expectations for research productivity, and a divisive environment where faculty are deeply frustrated by unfair treatment by institutional management.
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Executive summary

The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the factors influencing “commitment” in the environment of multicultural and transitional businesslike universities that possess little academic heritage. From a practical perspective, in understanding the influence of organizational life on the faculty experience, university administrators and human resources practitioners will have the information necessary to develop policies that inspire and enhance employees’ loyalty and productivity.

This study sets out to identify commitment by regarding faculty members’ academic experiences in business schools in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Commitment is identified from participants’ experiences of organizational life, rather than from an explicit account of what and how one commits. Organizational life factors are defined here as aspects of employment engagement that influence faculty members’ psychological attachments to their institutions (Mowday et al. 1982, Meyer & Allen 1997). Faculty members’ experiences of different aspects of organizational life in a particular academic environment affect an individual’s inclination to commit or not to commit to an academic institution. However, like any research study, this study has its limitations. In this study, the respondents themselves determined the degree to which they had committed to their institutional employers, and did so on the basis of entirely self-defined measures. The study allowed respondents to express the strength of commitment felt on their own terms without having to define it explicitly. The sample of respondent faculty members was kept intentionally small to enable deep and sustained investigation of selected faculty members experiences and perceptions, a strategy which allowed trust between the researcher and respondent to be developed over an extended interview and follow-up period. However, this practice came at the trade-off cost of limiting the generalizability of the results.

With the transformation of the academic workplace from the traditional research university setting to the corporate university model, changes in administration structure, workplace setting, and definitions of faculty jobs and role expectations affect working conditions, work practices, academic work contracts and the autonomy of academics. The traditional academic mission of fostering and disseminating basic knowledge has changed to a more market-driven academic approach resulting in new commitment traits.

Although the corporate university model may improve a university’s efficiency, as the “profit motif can cause universities to more effectively fulfill
their responsibilities to serve the public” (Markevičienė 2004: 30), the corporate organizational model tends to de-emphasize the traditional academic mission of fostering and disseminating basic knowledge in favor of a more market-driven approach. Faculty members serving in institutions of this type are thus increasingly thrust into a situation where the academic values they hold are no longer as central to their institutional employers as they have been in the past. In many cases, this “past” includes the earlier career experiences of faculty members themselves. This development can be expected to result in the emergence of new commitment traits among faculty members. As institutions continue to move towards the corporate university model, it will be important to establish exactly how faculty members perceive the qualities and modes of their own commitment as they carry out fundamental research and transfer theoretical knowledge to students.

Previous researchers focusing on academic settings in stable economies, where universities are seen to belong to a long academic heritage (Wolverton et al. 1999, Baron 2000, Marchiori & Henkin 2004, Bland et al. 2006, Cohen 2007b, Lawrence et al. 2012) have found organizational commitment to relate to faculty’s behavior, performance, and student achievement. Committed faculty members are likely to remain with their current institutions and put the interests of the institution above their own personal interests. Conversely, a lack of commitment from academics generates high turnover intentions (Neumann & Finaly-Neumann 1990, Adkins et al. 2001, Marchiori & Henkin 2004, Rungruang 2012), and stress (Cohen & Keren 2008). Despite these observations, organizational commitment among academics remains a largely un-researched area. Given current corporatizing trends, an understanding of how organizational life in academic workplaces affects faculty commitment to the institution can offer important contributions to organizational research and can be helpful to higher education administrators, particularly in multicultural and transitional employment economies which have been studied very little.

From the faculty’s perspective, committed faculty feel attached to the institution (Busch et al. 1998), and are likely to put more effort to increase an institution’s reputation (Meyer et al. 1998, Gormley & Kennerly 2010), which in turn benefits the students and the institution. From the institution’s perspective, committed faculty can potentially have a significant impact on institutional effectiveness, as it can lower turnover intentions (Meyer & Allen 1991), lower absenteeism rates (Steers 1977), produce less disruption to the teaching curriculum, decrease the workloads of existing faculty members who are required
to participate in the selection committee and thereby reduce costs and time required to replace qualified faculty (Buck and Watson 2002).

This study has chosen the UAE as a research site because of its unique cultural mix and rapid education sector development. The UAE, like Singapore in Asia, is the first country in the Middle East to position itself as a global hub for foreign institutions (Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola & Lamberg 2013b). The UAE, a developing nation with a population of around 8.2 million, has the world’s largest higher education center for global business, in which 53 international business campuses from 11 countries around the world are located (UEA Interact 2013). The speed at which many foreign academic institutions and business schools are rushing to establish themselves in the country, makes UAE an exceptional site to study faculty commitment. With the demand for higher education and the entrants of dozens of foreign universities, UAE has witnessed an educational gold rush (Lewin 2008, Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola & Kettunen 2013a) and become a worldwide education “hot spot” (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013b: 1). Furthermore, UAE institutions’ structural, and corporate-like, top-down administrative structure, along with the retention of certain Humboldtian university attributes, provides specific insights into faculty commitment that other research sites in more established employment economies may not provide.

To conceptualize commitment, this study adopts the definition of organizational commitment from Meyer and Allen (1991), whereby “commitment” refers to an individual’s emotional attachment to, dedication, and involvement in the institution. Commitment is normally mapped along three dimensions: affective, continuance and normative, because different organizational life factors experienced by academics develop or weaken different components of commitment. This study focuses on understanding commitment from the attitudinal and psychological approach, the first defining commitment as the faculty’s attitude towards the goals and values of the institution, and the second considering commitment as an individual’s attachment to or identification with an academic institution (in this case, a business school).

To understand the perceptions and lived experiences of commitment at this research site, the subject sample consists of eight expatriate and two national faculty members employed by a total of three publically- and three privately-controlled institutions.
Research questions

Based on the study rationale and purpose, the following two questions guide the research:

- What factors of organizational life are related to faculty organizational commitment in UAE business schools?
- Which factors of organizational life differentially relate to organizational commitment of faculty in public institutions compared to faculty in private institutions?

Thematic interpretations of the narrative accounts of respondents, rather than a testing of hypotheses, are used to investigate these questions in the context of respondents’ verbatim discourse relaying their experiences of organizational commitment.

Research strategy

This study adopts a qualitative research design – narrative research with a phenomenological approach – applied to a case-based situation (Denzin & Lincoln 2005). Open-ended questions are used in a semi-structured interview setting. The data for this study are collected in four steps: (1) a pre-interview process and discussions, (2) the main recorded interview session, (3) follow-up questions after the interview, and (4) informal discussions with informants.

In pre-interview discussions, rapport is developed with the participants, followed by demographic questions. In the initial contact with the participants, a few faculty members identified frustration with their institutions, while other participants mentioned that they felt let down, one-way or the other by the institution. Accordingly, I included a question on feeling of disillusion to probe the issue further. The participants were then prompted with three open-ended questions:

- What were you doing prior to joining the current institution?
- What were your experiences with this institution?
- What disillusion, if any, do you have with the institution?

Main interview sessions, averaging an hour in length, were recorded using a microphone to ensure credibility of data. An interview guide and flexible probes were also used. In the interview follow-up stage, after verbatim interview
transcription, participants were sent a set of follow-up questions to resolve ambiguities and to further probe key issues. In the final stage, the study consulted two faculty members (termed as ‘informants’) from other disciplines to either clarify ambiguities from the respondents or to interpret and develop interviewee comments. Effectively, the informants act as a form of internal validity for the study, strengthening the credibility of the results, while also tending to bolster expectations of external validity, suggesting that similar results are likely to emerge in settings beyond the business school context itself.

The analysis stage uses a step-by-step (three-level) process to examine and triangulate the data, whereby through the application of thematic codes, data are reduced and analyzed (Dey 1993). The first level of the analysis phase is to read the interview texts in order to break down and classify the data, and then to make connections between the classifications. The second level of analysis ensures that the proposed themes clearly express the meanings of the domains. In the third level, data are re-analyzed and common or shared concerns emerging from the initial set of themes are grouped to form five broad themes for the study. The final analysis of the data produced three domains, five themes, and 12 categories. Final emergent themes are later woven together to create a coherent pattern of understanding.

Rigorous effort is put into both the data collection and data analysis methods to maintain acceptable standards of scientific inquiry throughout the research process to ensure trustworthiness (Denzin & Lincoln 2005), in terms of confirmability, credibility, dependability and transferability (Lincoln & Guba 1985). Confirmability in this study refers to the degree to which other researchers can confirm or corroborate with the findings in the study. Strategies used to enhance confirmability include documentation of the procedures used to check and re-check the data, electronic recordings, member-check procedure with respondents, and cross-checking themes among cases. Credibility refers to establishing that the results in the study are the truth of the findings, and is established through a data triangulation approach in which respondent conversations are transcribed verbatim, and then independently checked through feedback from respondents on each case narrative. Dependability is the traditional view of reliability, the notion of duplicating the results found. Each thematic code has specific criteria, and data are triangulated as the texts are analyzed. Transferability in this study refers to the degree to which the study results can be generalized to other contexts. To enhance transferability, this study provides a thorough description of the research context, and findings are presented with
dense description of the phenomena found in the cases so that other researchers can apply the study findings to their own contexts or to a wider group of situations.

**Results of the study**

This study finds commitment to be a complex and multi-dimensional construct frequently underscored by a sense of loyalty and work effort. For research question one the study shows five factors of organizational life to be common among faculty in public and private institutions: economic compensation, organizational values, organizational support and justice, autonomy, and leadership. For expatriate faculty members, monetary gains initially act as a recruitment motivator, but do not secure retention. Conversely, this study finds consideration for economic compensation important to UAE national respondents, even with the disparity in employment arrangements in favor of national faculty, this study found claims of dissatisfaction among UAE nationals with their economic compensation, and perceived job turnover intentions.

Faculty members who find consistency between their own values and the institution’s values tend to manifest positive attitudes and behavior towards their jobs. However, data from this study also shows a lack of information shared by national faculty on organizational values. National faculty may be withholding their views on management’s practices as a sign of respect for individuals in authority, as in Arab culture, particularly in the UAE, criticisms of superiors’ actions are generally considered as disrespectful. This reticence to express views on the management of their institutions may also be the result of nationals’ fear, in a country with an absolute power monarchy, of the possible consequences of criticism. Expatriate faculty members seem to hold high values and are not willing to perform tasks that they deem unethical.

Amongst all respondents, a common theme was that the lack of autonomy endowed to faculty members led to their alienation from the institution. Results show that fairness in decision-making draws high institutional commitment from faculty, while non-participative leadership behaviors do not. The collective culture of the UAE, where leaders solicit but do not embrace subordinates’ participation, tends to create negative feelings among all respondents and across all institutional sectors.

For research question two this study result did not show any individual characteristics of organizational life to be significant for only faculty in public or
private institutions. The reason may be due to unusual similarities in operations and governance in both sectors. In the USA, the President of the board in public institutions tends to take on an advisory role, while in private institutions the board president normally takes on a participatory role. In the UAE, for, the Chancellor (President) in both publicly- and privately-controlled institutions has more influence over the university management. Decision-making at these institutions strongly tends to defer to the Chancellor. Unlike the situation in American universities, and elsewhere, state laws and regulations for hiring and firing faculty in UAE are equally applied to both sectors. The result for question two further shows that expectations built on Western experiences will not always be supported in non-Western economies, an outcome which reinforces the need to researchers to do more work of this kind in non-Western contexts.

The study shows that both expatriate and national faculty members in UAE’s transitional employment environment manifest commitment, but such commitment is not invested in the business schools; expatriate academics commit to their profession and research, while UAE national academics commit to the academic world and to their country. Given the nature of the faculty’s role, faculty commitment is therefore not focused on a particular school or institution, but to the academic world at large via faculty members’ professional work, areas of discipline, and research contributions.

**Congruency/incongruency with organizational commitment theory**

The study finds congruency with some previous studies as well as new discoveries based on the UAE context.

Congruent with the theory from Allen and Meyer (1996), the results show that academics who are unable to internalize inner convictions with the perceived unethical institutional values develop turnover intentions. Institutional practices and fairness in decision outcomes foster positive attitudes and behavior from academics (Meyer & Allen 1991, Kinnie et al. 2005). At the same time, opportunity for advancements, degree of autonomy and participative decision-making process enhances affective commitment (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1997, Pfeffer & Viega 1999, McElroy 2001, Lawrence et al. 2012). The top-down administrative culture in the UAE creates negative feelings related to decision-making participation among all respondents and across all institutional sectors. Lack of support from management on student quality also has a widely negative effect on academics’ commitment level. Therefore, congruent with the
findings of previous researchers, this study provides further support for the proposition that the three components of commitment have different implications for work-related attitudes and behaviors.

However, contrary to commitment theory as applied in stable employment economies (Meyer & Smith 2000, McElroy 2001, Meyer et al. 2004, Kipkebut 2010), this study result shows that other intrinsic factors play a more important role in commitment than does economic compensation, since faculty commitment in transitional employment economies is strongly influenced by an employment context in which visa regulations are tight, particularly for expatriates. This condition understandably weakens sincere institutional commitment and strengthens commitment to a faculty member’s own academic discipline used in securing his or her future career. Also contrary to previous studies (Abu Elanain 2009) on organizational commitment in collectivist cultures, both expatriate and national faculty do indeed need autonomy, largely because of the personal nature of their work.

**Study contributions**

This study makes three important contributions to organizational commitment literature, both augmenting and challenging received notions of faculty commitment:

- Introduces a new student-related dimension to account for how organizational failures to support student quality significantly impact faculty commitment.
- Determines that academics in a transitional economy tend to commit to their profession, area of discipline, or in the case of national faculty, commit to their country, rather than to the business school in which they work.
- Finds that economic compensation is a secondary issue for expatriate faculty working in academic institutions characterized by lack of tenure, threats to faculty career futures linked to contradictions between levels of research support and institutional expectations for research productivity, and a divisive environment where faculty are deeply frustrated by unfair institutional treatment.

This study also contributes to the area of research on business schools:

- Unlike most studies on faculty commitment in higher education institutions, this study is carried out in a transitional multicultural economy where
employment arrangements are highly asymmetric between expatriate and ‘local’ (UAE national) academics.

− As the results of the study shows, regardless of nationality, faculty members remain committed to their academic profession, area of discipline, or country rather than to the institution itself.

Theoretical implications

Results suggest modifications to existing theories of commitment: in order to:

− Account for professional rather than organizational commitment among academics.
− Accommodate perceptions of commitment in multicultural, transitional employment economies.
− Reconsider the primacy of economic compensation in multicultural, transitional employment economies.
− Acknowledge that autonomy is crucial even in high uncertainty collective cultures.

Practical implications

This study also provides practical contributions, suggesting that institutions use the realities of professional commitment among transient faculty to identify and create institutional practices serving improved job performance in business schools. At the same time, business school policy makers and administrators in multicultural and transitional economies may use the information from the research findings to enhance commitment in their own business school.

Although the results in this study cannot generalize beyond the stated population – the faculty members of business schools in UAE institutions, the results are pertinent and valuable to the literature on commitment in the UAE business school context, and provide a point of departure for similar work in other contexts.

Conclusions

This study provides evidence of the five components of organizational life: economic compensation, organizational values, autonomy, organizational support
and justice, and leadership that impact organizational commitment and lead to differing perceptions of organizational life. The five factors of organizational life are common among faculty in both publically- and privately-controlled institutions. This study renews attention on the organizational commitment construct and opens new avenues to both organizational study researchers and business school, offering organizational and managerial possibilities for reducing vulnerabilities by being more sensitive to academic commitment.

This study contributes to the existing literature on organizational commitment and the emerging business school research. Although data from this study is technically ‘limited’ to the business school, this research is consistent with general university trends in relation to commitment, organizational life, and the emerging corporate university model. The findings are further strengthened by having informants, faculty from outside the business school discipline, interpret and develop comments made by the interviewees. This research shows that a faculty’s role in the business school can lead to different perceptions of organizational life.

With scarce research on organizational commitment in higher education institutions, particularly in business schools, this study’s research will extend knowledge in the sector.

Overall, this study makes three important contributions to the business school and organizational commitment literature: (1) it introduces a new concept regarding organizational support related to student quality, (2) it demonstrates that academics in a transitional economy commit to profession or country, not primarily to their business school employer, and (3) it shows that in a transitional economy, where there is no tenure, high teaching loads, career threat related to lack of research publication, and tolerance levels tipped by frustrations with the system, economic compensation becomes a secondary issue for expatriate faculty. It shows that lack of participative leadership limits commitment in an autonomous and transitional employment economy such as UAE’s, but that faculty perceptions of their own autonomy are likely to support commitment where more collective cultural attitudes can be fostered.

The organizational commitment construct offers management of business schools a way of organizing and managing that could reduce vulnerabilities to employee dissatisfaction and consequent internal conflicts and faculty retention problems. Given the three-fold implications of this study’s results, in order to rectify the lack of commitment and the high turnover intentions evidenced in the UAE, business schools in multicultural and transitional economies should
consider implementing specific changes in the areas discussed above, while keeping in mind the *sui generis* context of the higher education institutions in the country.
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1 Faculty commitment to business schools in UAE


Organizational commitment has been a topic of interest for many decades because of its relationship with employee outcomes (Mathieu & Zajac 1990, Meyer & Allen 1997), such as prosocial organizational behaviour (O’Reily & Chatman 1986), attendance (Mathieu & Zajac 1990), and is negatively related to turnover intention (Mowday et al. 1982). Particularly in academic settings, organizational commitment has been found to have a relationship with faculty’s behavior and performance, and student achievement (Wolverton et al. 1999, Baron 2000, Bland et al. 2006, Cohen 2007b, Marchiori & Henkin 2004, Lawrence et al. 2012). Researchers (Neumann & Finaly-Neumann 1990, Adkins et al. 2001, Marchiori & Henkin 2004, Rungruang 2012) found a lack of commitment from academics can generate high turnover intentions, and stress (Cohen & Keren 2008).

Despite the number of studies on the organizational commitment theory conducted in the private and public sectors, faculty commitment to the university remains an un-researched area. Academic institutions are moving toward hiring contingent faculty instead of tenure-track faculty to increase their financial flexibility (Bland et al. 2006). Given this trend, knowledge and understanding of how organizational life in an academic workplace affects faculty commitment to the institution can be helpful to higher education administrators. This information can aid institutions in generating strategies to attract faculty and facilitate productivity, thus meeting both institutional and faculty goals.
The following sections in this chapter highlight the background, research problem, purpose of the study, research questions, qualitative research strategy, limitations of the study and the organization of the dissertation.

1.1 Traditional research versus corporate university models

Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola and Siltala (2014), and several authors (Hanley 2005, Muller-Camen & Salzgeber 2005, Baron 2006, Hessels & van Lente 2008, Ehrenberg 2012, Paradeise & Thoenig 2013, Kettunen 2013), have come to similar conclusions that the working environment of academic institutions has in recent years transformed as a result of either internal or external forces. As Baron (2000: 147) stated, “the increasing power of multinational corporations dominating and determining industrial research shifts the position of universities.” Baron also added that this external pressure appears to reinforce some faculty’s belief that they no longer are in control of their work. Thus, coupled with the internal forces on meeting private and public evaluations and audits, the transformation of the academic work environment has affected the working conditions, work practices, academic work contracts and most importantly, the autonomy of academic faculty.

Additionally, the economic climate of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century also resulted in a reduction of state funding and public commitment to higher education. With receding state funding and increasing competition among institutions for external funding, such as grants, contracts, endowment funds, institutional investments, student tuition and fees, to stay competitive, institutions have tended to embrace income generating agendas, such as commercializing the activities and work performed by faculty (Hanley 2005, Hessels & van Lente 2008, Alajoutsijärvi, Kettunen & Tikkanen 2012). The shrinking of funds put pressures on institutions to “boost funding through entrepreneurial activities” (Baron 2000: 147). Thus, essentially as a survival tactic, university administrators are encouraged to think and act like “managers of corporations”, focusing on the bottom line in terms of financial figures than had previously been the case (Progler 2010: 95). International pressures such as institution evaluations, university rankings, and research publications have also driven universities to conform to sometimes highly subjective global “quality” standards. Some observers go as far as to say that as universities are encouraged to compete in international rankings, academics are subject to “increasing bureaucratic and sophisticated system of surveillance”, and treated merely as “knowledge workers”
The new university management style presently adopted by academic institutions has also added to the pressure created by the related and now long-term problem of accommodating increasing number of students and fewer and fewer faculty members.

The traditional research university normally offers two levels of education: undergraduate and postgraduate (that is, graduate education at the masters level, as well as doctoral level study). Both levels offer courses that students may take for one or several years. The traditional research university generally focuses on the transfer of knowledge to its body of students, and does not typically shape this knowledge into a practical medium to be used by the corporate world at large (Vasilache et al. 2011). According to Tjedvoll (2010), in the nineteenth century, research universities that adopted the Humboldtian university model, focused on research, placing high stress on research for national development. In the Humboldtian university model, the academic profession was hierarchical and based on the department chair system. Academics in Humboldtian traditional research universities are usually given tenure positions at some point. Tjedvoll (2010) has also noted that under this model, research formed the very core of education, and faculty members typically had the flexibility to conduct research according to their area of specializations and interests. Research tasks were generally placed hierarchically above and separate from teaching tasks and university community work. Faculty members normally had control over their research priorities and tasks. Academics had full control of three main resources: how they spent their time outside of their established teaching load, the number of temporary faculty and extra personnel, and the resource infrastructure.

However, in the twentieth century many research universities moved to adopt a more American model placing an ever greater emphasis on research (Altbach 2011). As Altbach (2011) points out, American research universities have tended to balance this research emphasis with ongoing service contributions to society. Under the American system, the academic profession is more democratic than hierarchical, institutional governance and university administration are more participative (conducted mainly by the faculty), although Deans and University Presidents are appointed by the board of trustees rather than by peers. Faculty members generally have a great deal of autonomy and academic freedom in the university. By the mid-twentieth century, the American research university had become the international “gold standard” for higher education. (Altbach 2011: 67.)
Up until the emergence of Hitler’s political regime, the German academic system was a role model in the Western world. Since that time, the American research university has no doubt become the predominant global model. With the dawn of the twenty-first century, however, an increasing number of universities are moving towards a more corporatized university model (see Appendix 1. Comparing Traditional Research University with Corporate University).

According to Baron (2000), as higher education institutions incorporate more features of the corporate university, which ends up posing a challenge to the traditional structure of higher education, academics are increasingly put onto part time, casual, and non-tenure track positions. As Ehrenberg (2012) notes, full-time faculty positions in the USA decreased from almost 80 percent since 1970, to 51.3 percent in 2007, and non-tenured track full-time faculty between 1975 and 2007, increased from 18.6 percent to 37.2 percent. In addition, most part-time faculty members in the USA institutions do not have a Ph.D. Academics are losing control over research priorities and assignments, because the university leadership has tended to take primary responsibility for setting the research policy (Tjedvoll 2010).

Markevičienė (2004) stated that corporate universities offer not only undergraduate and postgraduate degrees, but also professional courses tailored to the labor market. These short-term professional-oriented courses are delivered mostly in non-traditional ways. The majority of faculty members in corporate-style universities have part-time or adjunct positions. Unlike the traditional research university, the corporate university does not place research as the core of education. Instead, corporate universities generally claim to consider research and teaching to be equally important, but in reality, as profit is the guiding principle for corporate universities, the aim is provision of a fee-generating service (teaching) rather than the more abstract and inclusive ideas of education (Markevičienė 2004). Unsurprisingly, tuition fees, rather than government funding, have become the main financial source for corporate universities.

The corporate university model also reduces the role of faculty-shared governance (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2014). In traditional research universities, the institutional governance model consists of administrators, trustees and faculty sharing in the decision-making responsibilities to run the university. As universities are pushed to generate more revenues on their own, corporate-style university institutions hire professionals to provide multiple services to a more diverse student population, and to manage a variety of relationships with the corporate world to develop and enhance revenue streams outside public funding.
(Tynjala et al. 2006). This tends to further distance faculty members from sharing in institutional governance.

Some institutions use non-faculty professionals as central academic managers to govern the institutions (Rhoades & Slaughter 2004). One example occurred when the University of Pennsylvania, United States of America (USA) hired John A. Fry, a business consultant who had no work experience at any academic institution, as the executive vice president. Giroux (2004) argues that although Fry saved the university millions of dollars when he eliminated more than 500 jobs, his attention to “efficiency” in the university created many fears among the faculty. Faculty members were afraid to get involved in the political process for fear of losing their jobs, tenure opportunities, and possibly even having their salaries frozen.

In an attempt to fulfill university management’s goal to cut costs to meet the marketplace needs by generating revenue for academic institutions, many universities have been eliminating full-time and tenured positions (Rhoades & Slaughter 2004). These more corporate-style universities use full-time non-tenure track faculty or adjunct faculty, which the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) term “contingent faculty”. Full-time non-tenured track employment status is also referred to as “term” or “contract” appointments. According to Bousquet (2008) corporate universities also use graduate doctoral students to fill other teaching positions as an attempt for the students to gain job-related experiences. The positions that the graduate students hold may be replaced once they graduate for two reasons. First, the employer may find the graduate students too costly to retain. Second, given their outlook, corporates universities are unable to fulfill all their graduate students’ tenure-track expectations when generally “as few as one in every three holders of the Ph.D. can expect to eventually find tenure-track employment” (Bousquet 2008: 16).

Progler (2010) noted that as universities move toward the corporate university model, institutions also undergo managerial restructuring. Institutional hierarchy structure is deemphasized to favor management teams. As bureaucracy expands, faculty’s role in academic governance declines. Institutional governance shifts away from faculty autonomy and towards collective responsibility. For example, as Lewin (2012) stated, in 2011 the Yale University Corporation and the university governing board made the decision to collaborate with the National University of Singapore without giving the faculty members an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. According to Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola and Siltiajoja (2013c: 96), this example is a good illustration of how the "academic
missions have changed and how traditional constituent groups (faculty and students at the home campus) are being neglected in decision-making process”.

Academics increasingly lose control as university administrators determine the faculty’s work, in terms of research, teaching and performance of services to the institution. Management controls the academic workforce “through the type of contract that is concluded with external clients on the purchase of services, either in research, teaching, or consultation” (Tjedvoll 2010: 434). For centuries in the USA, academic employment in traditional research universities used the “ladder-rank tenured professoriate”, whereas nowadays, in corporate universities academics work in “post-tenure” universities (Hanley 2005: 2).

Presently, as Progler (2010) argues, institutional strategies for survival are not only driven by budget constraints, but also by institutional goals in which students are conceptualized as consumers rather than knowledge learners. Students are encouraged to evaluate the faculty’s teaching from a customer standpoint. Furthermore, with static government funding, intense competition for student enrollments and focus on global ranking, leadership in higher education is acting in a similar manner to managers of corporations. These university administrators are focusing almost entirely on the financial bottom line, paying attention to style over substance when attracting students. (Progler 2010.)

Based on the current academic job system, it appears that academic institutions are not looking for the best or most experienced faculty, but rather the “cheapest academics” (Bousquet 2008: 204). Though contingent faculty (adjunct, contract, sessional and part-time professors) may supply cheap labor with few benefits and no job security, they may also be the most committed educators (Doughty 2010). This may well be due primarily to the very precariousness of their employment situation. In addition, campus administrators diverge from the ideals of faculty governance, professional self-determination and collegiality to embrace the corporate management’s values and practices (Paradeise & Thoenig 2013). Related to this, serious tensions have developed between faculty/researchers and managers at corporate universities as the decentralization of individual research gave way to centralized control by university management (Markevičienė 2004).

Although the corporate university model may in fact improve the broad social performance of universities as the “profit motif can cause universities to more effectively fulfill their responsibilities to serve the public” (Markevičienė 2004: 30), corporate organizational model tends to de-emphasize the traditional academic mission of fostering and disseminating the basic knowledge in favor of
a more market-driven academic approach (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2012, Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2014). Faculty members serving in institutions of this type are thus increasingly thrust into a situation where the academic values they hold are no longer as central to their institutional employers as they have been in the past. In many cases, this “past” includes the earlier career experiences of faculty members themselves. This development may well result in the emergence of new commitment traits among faculty members. As institutions continue to move towards the corporate university model, it will be important to establish exactly how faculty members perceive the qualities and modes of their own commitment as they carry out fundamental research and transfer theoretical knowledge to students.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this narrative case study is to examine the faculty members’ experiences of organizational commitment to business schools in the United Arab Emirates. The faculty members’ experiences of different factors of organizational life in a particular academic environment may well affect the individual faculty’s inclination to commit or not to commit to the business school. Thus, the goal of this study is to identify commitment from the faculty member’s experiences of organizational life, instead of having the individual faculty explicitly account for what and how one commits.

Therefore, to conceptualize commitment from the faculty’s experiences, this study adopts the definition of organizational commitment from Meyer and Allen (1991), whereby “commitment” refers to an individual’s emotional attachment to, dedication, and involvement in the employing institution. Commitment is accounted for from three dimensions: affective, continuance and normative. This approach is relevant to the current research because different organizational life factors experienced by academics may develop different components of commitment. An individual faculty may experience either one or all the three dimensions of commitments in different ways. As a result of different experiences in one’s work life in the academic environment in a particular institution, each faculty member may observe different effects of organizational life on the work.

Previous researchers conceptualize the concept of organizational commitment from various perspectives. In this study, the concept of organizational commitment will be discussed from the attitudinal approach and psychological approach. From the psychological approach, organizational commitment is
viewed as the individual’s attachment or identification with the particular business school (Becker 1960, Meyer & Allen 1991, 1997, Porter et al. 1974, Mowday et al. 1979). On the other hand, from the attitudinal approach, organizational commitment is viewed as the faculty’s attitude towards the goals and values of the institution (Busch et al. 1998, Meyer & Allen 1991, 1997, Mowday et al. 1979, Buck & Watson 2002). The organizational commitment theory has also shown commitment to predict various job attitudes, which have relevant outcomes for both the institution and the faculty. This is further addressed by the study in Chapter 3.

This study hoped to provide empirical insight of the aspects of organizational life factors that impact commitment among academics, and fill the research lacuna regarding the lack of studies conducted among business school faculty on organizational commitment experiences. At the same time, the research findings may provide business school policy makers and administrators in transitional economies with useful information to maximize the role of academics by increasing commitment levels. These terms, which are used throughout this study, form the basis for the research and are further explained in the sections below.

1.3 Organizational commitment and organizational life

This section aims to provide readers with clarity with regard to the definitions of key terms used throughout this study. However, a more detailed discussion of these terms is provided in Chapter 3. In the organizational commitment literature, researchers have used the term “commitment” in different ways. Becker (1960) defines organizational commitment as investment that an employee gives to an organization, and the possible results in the event of leaving the employer. Porter (1981) defines organizational commitment as identification with the organization’s values and goals and involvement in the job. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) define commitment as a faculty’s belief and acceptance of the institution’s goals and values, and the strong desire to get involved with the activities in the institution.

Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) define organizational commitment as an individual’s attachment to, dedication, and involvement in the institution. Whereby commitment is viewed as a psychological state linking the employee to the employer in a multifaceted relationship: affective, continuance and normative. Affective commitment may be viewed as employee reflecting affective orientation to the institution. Continuance commitment is mainly derived from an
individual’s calculative attachment to an organization, such as the cost of transferring employer, which poses difficulty for a faculty member to give up one’s experience with the employing institution or not having alternatives when leaving a particular institution. Normative commitment reflects the individual’s feelings of obligations to stay with the current employer, either when the individual feels loyal to the employer or when the individual feels responsible to work for the benefits received from the particular organization. Thus, according to Meyer and Allen (1991), a better understanding of an individual’s relationship with the employing institution can be achieved when taking into considerations all the three dimensions of commitment.

Organizational commitment is distinctly different from the concept of job satisfaction. Commitment is a global construct reflecting a general reaction of affection between the individual and the organizational goals, showing the strength of one’s commitment for the organization, while job satisfaction focuses on the specific activities with emphasis on job-related attitudes (Mowday et al. 1982). Hence, job satisfaction results from an individual’s relation to work while organizational commitment guides and controls the individual in the organization. The difference is that daily events that occur in the workplace may affect an individual’s job satisfaction level, but it should not cause an individual to reevaluate attachment to the institution (Mowday et al. 1979).

For several decades, research conducted on the organizational commitment theory provides a variety of factors that can be used to either strengthen or weaken an individual’s commitment. Work experiences in an academic environment concerning certain employment engagement factors may well influence employees’ psychological attachments to the organization (Mowday et al. 1982, Meyer & Allen 1997). For example, employees who perceive organizational support and justice will form a psychological attachment to the organization. “Experiences that provide support, involve fair treatment, and communicate that one’s contributions are valuable might all increase affective commitment” (Meyer & Allen 1997: 54). Steers (1977) finds organizational support to impact employee commitment level and expectations in the workplace. Moorman, Niehoff and Organ (1993) find commitment to be stronger among employees in organizations where there is fairness in organizational policies and decision-making outcomes. Employee’s experience of supportive supervisors is also found to impact affective commitment (Mathieu & Zajac 1990). Another factor of organizational life that emerges from the commitment literature involves autonomy, the latitude and discretion to perform the job (Gregersen & Black
Meyer and Allen (1997) also find affective commitment to develop when work experiences are either rewarding or fulfilling. Hence, particular work experiences in organizational life may be influential in such a way so as to either strengthen or weaken employee commitment.

As universities are subject to internal and external evaluations and audits, increasing pressures are placed on academics to produce the necessary research. In order for top business schools to gain higher funding for the institution, research work must be published in A-list research journals internationally. The measureable research output determines the future of the faculty’s recruitment, promotion, salary, and job security. Additionally, the widespread introduction of measuring faculty performance leads to further changes in academics’ organizational life. For example, as a result of the grading system in UK universities, a form of university management was introduced, which resulted in loss of autonomy, less job security, disempowerment, more work pressures, and lower salaries for faculty. (Muller-Camen & Salzgeber 2005.)

Hence, academics’ work is further stretched with increasing pressures placed on workload, time and morale to make universities more accountable. Thus, faculty members are torn between teaching, research, and administrative duties.

1.4 Characteristics and problems of business schools

This study has chosen to explore the commitment of academics towards their institution in the business school to provide insights on faculty’s sense of commitment in an environment, which has become increasingly controversial and pressured. The rapid growth of institutions offering business degrees has also caused business schools to become more pressured from several different angles. The relatively growth of the business education sector also lead to a general shortage of faculty (Starkey & Tiratsoo 2007).

As universities move toward the corporate model, the pressures of business schools are first, according to Alajoutsijärvi et al. (2013c), with the on-going effort to create a flexible work force by getting rid of faculty tenure, exercising a top-down university leadership skill, empowering students as consumers, implementing market-driven research, and the education bubbles and bursts have become the realities of business schools worldwide. At the same time, deans in business schools are behaving more like Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) in commerce, and professors are turning into “managed service workers who interact on the front lines with empowered consumer-students” (Alajoutsijärvi et
Second, as Baron (2000) stated, many business school faculty members, particularly in the human resource management specialization (Macfarlane 1998) have the potential to seek more profitable work in the corporate world. Instead, they choose to stay in higher education. Third, some researchers view business schools as an easy source of profit in higher education (Pfeffer & Fong 2004, Wilkins 2010, Berrett 2013) because business school faculty members who provide consultancy work to build links between the commercial world and universities, and are regarded as glorified consultants (Baron 2000). Thus business schools are labeled as the “cash cows” of institutions (Baron 2000: 152). As Macfarlane (1998) stated, with the close links that academics in business schools establish with the industry and commerce, these days, business school lecturers are viewed as delegates for the existing liberal values of universities.

According to Lorenzi (2012), unlike other academic units, business schools do not operate purely as research, teaching or even academic organizations. Business schools are regarded as practical professional schools that possess both an academic and a professional culture. The role of business schools has been to help students develop a useful set of specific skills to succeed in business management. The business school’s tasks are to train and prepare students to be managers, and to develop relevant knowledge for improving business operations (Simon 1967, Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2012, Kettunen 2013). Business school’s formal goals are to impart knowledge and to influence management practices (Pfeffer & Fong 2002). Since the 1950’s business schools have been providing basic, professionally oriented education, but in recent days, the mission of business schools has been scholarship, research and globalization (Besancenot et al. 2009).

According to Whitley (1988: 50) academics in business schools are “less directed to their immediate colleagues than those in other fields because of their dependence upon professional labor markets and employers”. Thus, as Simon (1967) noted, business school researchers direct their research to the professional labor markets and employers instead of influencing their immediate colleagues’ research strategies and priorities. The end result is that business school researchers suffer from access to collegiate reputations for contributions to organized research. In the meantime, business schools are encouraged to allocate resources and reward faculty based on “academic standards” and “research reputations” (Whitley 1988: 52).

Whilst, the business profession shares with other “vocationally oriented sciences” the aim of providing a practical skill base, Whitley’s claim is that the
business school’s distinction from engineering and medical professions lies predominantly in the roots of three accepted characteristics of a business school: 1) the influential nature of the industry on the teaching material, 2) organizations and practical business phenomenon are fluid and thus, 3) consequently so are managerial practices (Whitley 1988: 47). So, business schools, and thus the curricula and the methods of teaching and tackling the educational process must necessarily differ from other subject areas, as its material is less set in stone. In fact, researchers of business schools usually try to first comprehend the business environment, then understand the manager’s tasks and problems, as well as the required skills that successful managers and business organizations need to employ (Whitley 1988).

According to Whitley (1988), in contrast to engineering research for example, management science research is not integrated into college training programs because the nature of managerial skills is not established clearly and are not standardized. Also, in contrast to medical practices, business practice concentrates on how administrative hierarchies and organizations deal with changeable phenomena. Furthermore, the established link between management tasks and enterprises makes business schools strongly dependent on businesses in validating and valuing the skills that are taught and certified in the school. This dependence further restricts the intellectual autonomy of business school researchers. (Whitley 1988.)

Subsequently, as Pfeffer and Fong (2004) noted, business school students tend to be more career oriented and do not place interest in education to gain knowledge or personal development. Therefore, business school students tend to see the business school as a means to their career goal rather than to gain knowledge for learning and personal development, which in turn affects their behavior, values and orientation toward learning. The problem with this student culture may add adverse effects on the business school because students may be more likely to spend less time on their course work while expecting to obtain a credential.

1.5 Researcher’s background

This part of the discussion outlines my background in relation to the research, and conveys my connection to the research interest and the context being studied. The time I spent as a human resources advisor in an educational environment in the UAE, particularly my advice to the business school and my professional contact
with faculty, played an important role in my research field selection. My experiences in the UAE sparked my interest to understand the commitment of individuals, particularly faculty members, in the academic workplace. Although many faculty members initially come to the UAE to work because of the attractive salary and benefits package, it was soon obvious that these were not the only influences as cases of voluntary turnover began to prevail. Literature on organizational commitment constantly claims that attractive salaries and benefits tend to retain employees in stable economies. However, I was not able to find a considerable amount of professional literature on organizational commitment in multicultural, transitional economies. Thus, the experiences of these faculty members in themselves formed the catalyst for my study of commitment in the UAE context. Therefore, this study seeks to understand the conceptualization of commitment in an academic environment characterized with transitional employment engagements, and at its core are the very experiences of these faculty members that were the impetus for my thesis.

1.6 Research questions

Literature from organizational commitment theory, business schools, faculty, expatriate workers, academic workplace, management practices, leadership and cultural influence are drawn upon to buttress any argument for organizational commitment. The objective of this study is to explore the individual faculty members’ experiences of commitment in the academic environment, and within the context of a regional area underscored by transitional employment engagements. Hence, this research examines the beliefs and assumptions surrounding faculty members’ experiences of organizational commitment to their business schools. Based on the study rationale and purpose, the following two questions guide the research:

- What factors of organizational life are related to faculty organizational commitment in UAE business schools?
- Which factors of organizational life differentially relate to organizational commitment of faculty in public institutions compared to faculty in private institutions?

The account of the respondents rather than the testing of hypotheses will be used to explain these questions. This approach allows the study to investigate into the factors of academics’ organizational life. Fig. 1 below shows the rationale for the
1.7 Research strategy for the study

This study adopts the qualitative research strategy to understand faculty commitment to business schools in UAE. The research design uses case-based situations “as inspiration for new ideas to help sharpen existing theory by pointing to gaps” (Siggelkow 2007: 21). The case-based situations place emphasis on the perceptions and lived experiences of the individual to provide rich details of real-life circumstances and the academic settings. Through the vivid description offered by each individual faculty reflecting on their experience there is room for interpretation as to the meaning of his or her experience (Dey 1993). The experience of each individual case is rooted not just in the society and the cultural settings, but also in the academic environment provided by the respective institutions where the participant works. Therefore, the case-based situations are grounded in real-life and offer a better understanding of the phenomenon for how individual faculty members perceive commitment in the UAE context.
UAE business school context. The research strategy uses a constructivist inquiry research paradigm to interview faculty members and to collect their experiences and perceptions of commitment to business schools. The strategy involves inductively gaining an understanding of how faculty in business schools in UAE interpret their environment and experiences (Groat & Wang 2002). This is particularly important in institutions these days, where instead of engaged as academics and rigorous researchers, faculty are treated as contract employees (Giroux 2002).

The principal mode of analysis is mainly through words. Faculty members are asked open-ended questions to elicit their accounts of the experience in the current institution, their initial motivations for joining the institution and their disillusionment as a result of the experience. This discovery will help answer the research questions posed for the study. Appendix 2. Research Process Mapping outlines the research strategy for carrying out this study and Fig. 2 below gives an overview of the research topic to study.

![Fig. 2. Research study.](image-url)
1.8 Process and structure of the study

Fig. 3 below shows the process and organization for this study, highlights the research, and maps the external environment, core phenomenon, base theory and research design used to carry out the study, and organization of the dissertation.

In summary, this chapter highlights the reasons for studying commitment, especially in business schools. The next chapter moves on to introduce the regional area chosen as the context for the research, namely the United Arab Emirates (UAE), a unique transitional economy with a multicultural academic work environment. A detailed outline of the UAE context will enhance the readers’ understanding of the participants’ experiences of the academic environment in the country. Chapter 3 moves on to summarize and synthesize prior literature on business schools, organizational commitment and the influences of factors in organizational life on organizational commitment. It also discusses the conceptual framework for the research. To address the research questions for this study, Chapter 4 outlines the research approach adopted in the present study. It discusses the method of research implementation, theme development, provides information about case selection, and participants’ selection and the way in which they were approached. Finally, it discusses how the study observes the trustworthiness of the research.

![Fig. 3. Process and organization of the study. (source: Diagram adapted from Petri Ahokangas, Oulu Business School).](image-url)
Chapter 5 gives a description of all the cases studied in this research, and highlights the experiences of commitment as reflected in the respondent’s story. The emphasis in this chapter is to narrate how individuals describe their sense of commitment to the institution. The stories identify the multi-dimensionality and complexity that underpin the construct of commitment. It also discusses the respondents’ disillusionments with the institution. Chapter 6 reports and analyses the findings of the cases by reflecting on the respondents’ experiences and sense of commitment. Excerpts from the semi-structured interviews are analyzed and used to validate results for the themes identified from the respondents’ stories. Finally, in chapter 7 the study summarizes the results for each research question, discusses the theoretical implications of the research findings and contributions made by the study, and considers the advancement of knowledge in the area of commitment in a transitional academic environment. This chapter also covers the empirical and managerial implications of the research findings and research limitations. Some possible directions for future research are also addressed in the final chapter.
2 Research setting: United Arab Emirates

The majority of organizational commitment literature tends to focus mainly on organizational commitment in stable economies. A diminutive amount focuses on multi-cultural transitional economies. Therefore, this study seeks to understand the processes of commitment in a multi-cultural, transitional employment environment. In order to achieve this, the research takes into account the experiences of a number of faculty individuals who work and live in the UAE. A detailed discussion of the UAE economy will help link “observations to a set of relevant facts, events, or points of view that make possible research and theory that form part of a larger whole” (Rousseau & Fried 2001: 1). The aim is to add insight to the understanding of the faculty members’ experiences of commitment in the business school environment, to help solve the research problem. Therefore, this chapter discusses the research setting, organizational, cultural, and environmental factors, which are relevant to the phenomena studied.

2.1 UAE education “hot spot”

In 2013, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) with a population of around 8.2 million is host to around 116 higher education universities and colleges (UAE Interact 2013). Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola and Lamberg (2013b: 1) stated that Dubai, an emirate in UAE, is an educational hub for 53 higher education institutes, which are international business schools (IBCs) from 11 different countries, making Dubai the largest IBC “hot spot” in the world. The high demand for education by children of both UAE Nationals and expatriate workers coupled with the country’s vision to develop a knowledge economy and to be less dependent on the country’s oil exports has driven the growth of IBCs (Altbach 2010). In 2007, the UAE government established the Dubai International Academic City as part of the Knowledge Village (a free trade zone) to attract foreign institutions. The Knowledge Village offers funding and support packages to foreign institutions that establish local campuses in UAE. Dubai International Academic City also offers foreign campuses to have 100% foreign ownership, tax exemptions and repatriation of profits (Becker 2010). By 2009, the Academic City housed 32 branches of international universities (Romani 2009). Since the establishment of the free trade zone in 2003, Dubai saw a 77% increase in the number of higher education institutions. In 2010, the UAE led in this area; with 40 IBCs, it held a quarter of all IBCs in the world (Becker 2010).
In addition, UAE has several acclaimed business, technical, vocational and educational centers in Dubai that provide practical training for careers. According to the UAE Interact (2013), there are presently 39,000 students enrolled in 12 higher education systems. The establishment of the IBCs provided several opportunities for the students in the UAE to gain access to higher education and to obtain degrees from highly ranked western universities without travelling overseas, while benefiting from experiencing a smaller class formation (Wilkins 2010). According to Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola and Kettunen (2013a), prior to the IBCs students had to travel to other Arab countries to obtain their education from universities offering US-style business education and curricula.

The UAE, like Singapore in Asia, is the first country in the Middle East to position itself as a global hub for foreign institutions (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013b). Since beginning to chase the country’s long-term vision of becoming a knowledge society in 1990, Dubai has focused on enhancing its educational offerings to support the knowledge clusters by establishing the Knowledge Village. The University of Strathclyde and the University of Bradford were the first two business schools to establish campuses in Dubai in 1995. With the establishment of the free zones in Dubai, the UAE saw a rapid growth in business schools and an increase in the demand for business education, particularly in banking and finance. Although many foreign institutions could charge high tuition fees, faculty research activities were low because faculty working in IBCs mainly consisted of faculty visiting from host countries only intending to deliver intensive courses (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013a) without taking on research responsibilities.

The UAE’s establishment of higher education comprising of 53 IBCs from 11 countries represents a new educational model and set a defining example for developing nations (UAE Interact 2013). As a nation, since the formation of the federation in 1971, UAE initially started with almost no development of tertiary education, but has developed itself, to be the educational hub in the world. Universities from the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada embrace UAE’s IBC model. To contextualize the UAE higher education system for faculty commitment, this study finds it necessary to examine the country’s history and background before examining its academic institutions and business schools.
2.2 Country history and background

The UAE, located between Oman and Saudi Arabia, gained independence in 1971 when Britain withdrew their rule. In February 1972, the seventh sovereign Emirate, Ras Al Khaimah joined the UAE. The seven Emirates of UAE are: Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Fujairah, Ajman, Ras Al Khaimah, Umm Al Qaiwain and Sharjah. Rulers of each Emirate preside over different geographies, populations, and economic goals. For more than 40 years, the global finance from its natural resource oil drove the UAE economy. Religion is an integral part of the national population’s and Muslim workers’ daily life. Values are derived mainly from local traditions, culture, customs, and the teachings of Islam. In the UAE the strongest determinants of work values are religious and cognitive values (Abdulla et al. 2011). With multiple nationalities, languages, religions, and unparalleled diversity in work attitude, the UAE offers an ideal environment for exploring a cultural perspective on organizational commitment (Jones 2006).

UAE’s economy, like that of many Gulf Corporation Council (GCC) states, relies heavily on oil production and expatriate workers, particularly expatriate faculty from a wide range of countries, such as the United States of America, Canada, United Kingdom, Egypt, Pakistan, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Iran, New Zealand, Poland, Germany, Australia, and the Philippines. Many of them are of Arab ethnicity and have studied in North America and Europe. In 2009, the UAE government introduced the Emiratization program to give UAE nationals superior job opportunities with superior salaries (Al Serhan et al. 2010). The Emiratization program was seen as a regulation in human resource management (HRM) (Abdulla et al. 2011), a strategy to integrate change within human resource management’s policies and practices (Rees et al. 2007, Mellahi & Wood 2001). Emiratization is a quota-driven employment policy aimed to ensure employment opportunities for UAE Nationals. Thus, the Emiratization policy poses a threat to expatriate faculty, causing increased job insecurity among expatriate faculty.

The culture in UAE places loyalty first to family, second to clan, third to tribe, and finally to the country. The culture in the UAE relies considerably on complex nonverbal communication (Rice 2003). Society’s cultural values and attributes such as collectivism, holistic thinking, family and religion are deeply rooted in Middle Eastern Islamic and tribal history (Mellahi & Wood 2001). Each employee has his or her own perception, cultural orientation, educational background, and attitude toward people of other nationalities. These multifaceted conditions create a diverse work environment with diverse values, behavior, and
attitudes that influence how individual employees perceive and react to the work environment. Their perception and reaction has a direct effect on employee commitment (Eskildsen & Nussler 2000).

UAE is similar to the United States in that it has a highly pluralistic society consisting of a variety of distinct ethnic and cultural groups with various religions. However, in contrast to the United States, which is a democratic country, authoritarian leadership that includes monarchies and dictatorships governs the Middle East’s Gulf Arab states. From a cross-cultural and cross-national perspective the United States diverges from these Arab states. Arabs value teamwork and collaboration while Americans value completion and reward for personal performances.

The Arab society is a collective culture (Rohm 2010) where individuals are integrated into strong cohesive groups from a very young age (Al Harthi 2005). Therefore, in UAE the work organization structure is composed of collective units: sections, departments, and work groups. This is inherent in a collective culture where organizational and departmental goals are aligned, with members in the group placing emphasis on organizational and group obligations (Rohm 2010). Businesses depend strongly on continual negotiations between employees and employers because of inter-dependence between the two groups. Employers rely on their employees’ skills and employees rely on their employers’ decision-making abilities to create a stable work environment. In contrast, the United States culture stresses achievements and participation of the individual and not of the group (Rohm 2010). This is embedded in the country’s founding principle that an individual should have freedom in economic pursuits, with success being dependent on that individual’s initiative. Hence, in the United States people are respected for their achievements rather than for their job status.

The principles of the Islamic teachings also guide managers in the way they conduct their business affairs. Islamic values and teachings place strong emphasis on obedience to authority. Decisions of superiors are accepted as right and proper and subordinates are not to question decisions made by their superiors (Al Harthi 2005). As such, leaders’ or superiors’ decisions are readily accepted without question. Leaders are often seen as strong and subordinates depend on them to make decisions. Maintaining tradition is often more important than change. Higher education institutions in the UAE operate under autocratic leadership, where processes are bureaucratic, and decisions often involve only pseudo participation. Thus in the UAE, the work environment and society together with the terms and conditions of employment shape faculty members’ interpretations
or perceptions on management practices, role conflict, role ambiguity, and locus of control.

2.3 UAE employment conditions

In the UAE, the employment conditions between UAE Nationals and expatriate workers, especially faculty members are skewed.

“Average pay for Emiratis in both sectors is at least three times that of expatriates. Emiratis cannot be fired except after a very lengthy and tiresome legal procedure while expatriates have very little job security.” (Al Serhan et al. 2010: 45)

According to Fernandes and Awamleh (2006), UAE national faculty members in higher education institutions receive extensive privileges over expatriate faculty. The equity aspect of fairness in terms of workload, work schedules, salary levels, promotions, bonuses, and housing allowances are some of the concerns for faculty working in the UAE. Higher education institutions in the UAE often adopt different and inconsistent procedures for compensation, career paths and performance appraisals between expatriates and UAE nationals. In terms of academics sabbatical benefits, UAE national faculty members are allowed a fully paid one-year sabbatical leave in every five years of work, whilst expatriate faculty receive one-year of unpaid leave without any employment annulation benefits as sabbatical leave. The disparity in employment arrangements in the UAE between UAE nationals and expatriate faculty negatively affects expatriate faculty commitment, thereby causing a lack of commitment (Neal 2010).

Additionally, to maintain this privileged position for the UAE nationals, the government has imposed a number of restrictions. Examples are the sponsorship system, the duration of expatriate employment contracts and the curbing of naturalization and citizenship rights. Expatriate faculty are not entitled to citizenship regardless of their length of stay in the GCC countries. There is also no provision for permanent resident status. Regardless of their length of stay, expatriates are basically temporary workers (Shah 2008), which is only reinforced by the renewal of their contracts for relatively short periods. Expatriate faculty members have restrictive work visas ranging from one to four years with a stipulation for deportation once employment ends.

To expatriate faculty their employment term is constantly in a transient stage due to the possible shifts between a four-year and one-year contractual term.
Intentions to quit jobs are dictated by attitude. Therefore, when expatriates perceive that their economic freedom of choice, as stipulated by the terms of their contract, has decreased, their intention to leave their current employer will accordingly increase. In general, expatriates face a more difficult work environment, and their economic choice freedom is severely constrained. As researchers, such as Shaw et al. (2003) claimed, individuals who receive freedom of economic choice show consistency in their work attitude and behavior, which in turn leads to their organizational commitment and performance. Therefore, differences in work conditions between UAE nationals and expatriate workers suggest that the two work groups may develop different levels of commitment.

2.4 Academic institutions and business schools in UAE

When the UAE was established as a federal state in 1971 there was no tertiary education. Education was delivered through 74 schools (Wilkins 2010). In 1976, the UAE federal government established three higher education institutions (ADEC 2013), which were fully controlled by the federal state and were known as the ‘public’ or ‘federal’ institutions. The first public or federal higher education institution, the UAE University was established in Al Ain in 1976. The Higher Colleges of Technology (HCT) followed in 1988, initially offering vocational and technical programs, but since widening the range of courses for undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. The HCT has 16 campuses throughout the country, with separate campuses catering for female and male students. Last in 1998, Zayed University was established in Abu Dhabi and Dubai. Today, nearly 70% of the students’ enrolment in the UAE is with the federal institutions (ADEC 2013). To demonstrate commitment to education, in 2001, the UAE government allocated federal grants to the three public institutions, enabling them with the ability to offer free education to UAE nationals under the UAE constitution, Article 23. The public institutions catered mainly for students of UAE nationality, with some exceptions for international students.

To solve the educational gap, in the early 1990s a number of non-federal universities operating under the American system began to establish themselves in the UAE and catered to foreign students, children of expatriate workers and UAE national students from the Gulf region who preferred to attend private institutions (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013b). Some private institutions are owned and locally controlled by the individual emirates of the UAE, such as the establishment of American University of Sharjah by the ruler of Sharjah in 1997. While other
private institutions are established by foreign institutions of higher education with a branched campus in the UAE, such as the establishment of the University of Strathclyde in 1995. Depending on the operator and the funding source, non-federal institutions are either classified as private institutions (operated and funded by the private sector), or private institutions in partnership with Abu Dhabi Education Council (ADEC) but mainly operated by the private sector with ADEC funding. Presently, non-federal institutions account for the remaining 30% of the student enrollment, with their student body consisting of 88% UAE national students and 12% international students (ADEC 2013).

2.4.1 Dubai educational gold rush

Around the mid 1990s, the UAE dramatically promoted internationalization as a national policy with the vision that foreign institutions will be a “potentially lucrative option” (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013a: 9). The government placed a strong focus on strategies that encouraged prestigious foreign universities to establish local campuses in the UAE, particularly in Dubai, to expand access of higher education to the local student population and to serve as “higher education hubs” in the region (Altbach et al. 2010: 34). As a result, the UAE, experienced an exceptional growth in the foreign university sector and the establishment of International Branch Campuses (IBCs) in the country that offered mostly American-style education programs and curricula. For instance, in 1993, University of Wollongong from Australia was the first IBC to be established in the UAE. It was followed by two IBCs from the United Kingdom (UK), the Middlesex University and the Heriot-Watt University. In 1995, the University of Bradford also established a business school in the UAE.

According to Becker (2010), the term ‘international branch campus’ is an offshore higher education institution frequently operated by the foreign institution or through a joint venture whereby the institution is a partner but bears the name of the foreign institution. Students graduating from the program will receive degrees from the foreign institution. A branch campus sometimes also has facilities such as a library, recreational facilities, accommodation or residences for students, research facilities, a range of course offering, and provision of full undergraduate and/or postgraduate programs. Some branch campuses transfer faculty from their host country either on a permanent or on a fixed-term basis. The transfer of faculty from the host country helps compensate for the scarcity of qualified academics in the country, in this case UAE, and provided mobility for
faculty in other institutions (Baburajan 2011). The IBCs accept students from both local and surrounding regions. The programs offered are similar to the home campus.

Since the September 11 attacks on the USA in 2001, many UAE National students experienced a higher degree of difficulty in obtaining student visas overseas, particularly in the USA (Nicks-McCaleb 2005). Coupled with the UAE government’s strategic plan to enhance education, together with the increasing demand for higher education from children of the expatriate workforce in the country who do not have access to federal institutions, and to solve the problem of the overcrowded privately controlled universities, a new educational free zone, the Dubai Academic City was built in 2006 (Altbach 2010). The new multi-university complex, Dubai Knowledge Village was established to provide facilities for foreign institutions to establish campuses in the UAE. The vision of the government was to accommodate at least 40,000 students of local and international origins (Godwin 2006).

Fig. 4. International Business Campuses (IBCs) in the United Arab Emirates. (source: Data from Global Higher Education (2014) Branch Campus Listing).

Fig. 4 above shows that dozens of new IBCs from all over the world have established campuses in the UAE, namely in Dubai, Abu Dhabi and Ras Al Khaimah (Knight 2011). Examples of such IBCs that opened campuses in Dubai, to name a few, are the Manchester Business School, Institute of Management Technology, Cass Business School, London Business School, and Duke University. Two years later in 2008, four more IBCs, the Hult International
Business School, Murdoch University, Rochester Institute of Technology and Michigan State University opened their doors at Dubai Academic City. The establishment of IBCs was widespread across the different emirates. The Abu Dhabi Education Council established the Paris-Sorbonne University in Abu Dhabi in 2006. In 2009, the emirate of Ras Al Khaimah established an IBC from India’s top-ranking state university, University of Pune. In 2010, the government of Abu Dhabi formed a partnership with INSEAD to establish a campus in Abu Dhabi, and with the USA’s New York University to create the New York University Abu Dhabi.

The growth of IBCs in UAE was fuelled by the increasing demand for business educations from the population. Especially important was the demand for a Masters of Business Administration (MBA), a postgraduate study that many “believed to hold the promise of greater lifetime earning and opportunities and the needs of the knowledge-based global economy” (Altbach 2011: 66). In 2012, the UAE Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MoHESR) reported a record high of 109,942 students enrolled in higher education in the academic year 2011–2012, a six percent increase from the previous year (see Fig. 5 below). Thus, with the demand for higher education and the entrants of dozens of foreign universities, UAE witnessed an educational gold rush (Lewin 2008, Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013a) and became the education “hot spot” worldwide (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013b: 1).

![Fig. 5. Growth in student enrolment in higher education (2008–2011). (source: Data from UAE MoHESR (2012) Indicators of the UAE higher education.)](image)
The UAE government’s faith in education by simultaneously paving the way for preparing the population for better job opportunities and resolving social inequities is evidence of not just a mere policy issue, but also a promotion of the American’s national belief system, the so-called “Education Gospel” (Grubb & Lazerson 2005: 72). This ideology promised increased equality, enhanced access to education for all who pass the entry requirements of higher education, better education systems, and access to professional education to improve one’s skills and related improvements in economic development and success. With the growth of IBCs in the UAE, the government has provided access to education for everyone who proved capable. The professional courses by IBCs are available to existing college graduates for updating their skills and remaining current to the market’s needs. However, the “gospel” may also create the negative result of increased inequality for the less privileged and poor members in the population in the UAE. Given the high tuition fees that the IBCs charge, UAE nationals from lower-income families who did not qualify for entry to public institutions will not be able to participate in higher education.

2.4.2 UAE institution professional models

The federal institutions in UAE remained as teaching-oriented business schools until the early twenty-first century when global rankings of universities created a worldwide demand for institutions to become research universities. To sustain economic growth and stability, institutions in UAE placed larger emphasis on research publications from faculty in both private and public institutions, thus resembling the Humboldtian university style in some aspects. According to Altbach (2011), Humboldtian style institutions place strong focus on research, stressing on research for national development. For instance, the business school in UAE University first established itself as a teaching-oriented school but has since changed its focus to become a research-oriented business school. In 2008, UAE University placed heavy focus on research to compete in the global rankings and be part of the top 500 universities.

Academic institutions in UAE appear to adopt a dual system combining both the Humboldtian and the corporate university styles. Although academic institutions in UAE adopt the American model and mimic the Humboldtian style in terms of research focus, the institutions are generally operating in an open, straightforward system and managed top-down by the government (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013a). Functions administered by university administrators tend to be
overarching, like corporate organizations. Academic activities, such as research publications have defined criteria and specific norms to follow. Relationships between academics and the institutions are progressively leaning towards the employer/wage earner relationship. University senior management governs faculty’s organizational life. Managerial controls are maximized over faculty and the educational process itself. Full-time expatriate faculty members are hired on a contract basis without tenure, while UAE national faculty members are given tenure upon hire. Both full-time and part-time faculty members do not have a faculty governance process. Full-time faculty live under the constant threat of either being given heavier workloads or having their contracts terminated or not renewed. These factors further impede faculty members’ ability to challenge the corporate-based, top-down administrative structure in the UAE academic institutions. Expatriate faculty holding part-time, full-time or adjunct positions in UAE academic institutions are technically contingent faculty. AAUP (2003) defined contingent faculty to include both full-time, part-time faculty and adjunct faculty who are appointed under a non-tenure track.

2.4.3 Shortage of qualified faculty challenges

Business schools in the UAE face numerous issues common to other business schools in the world; loss of resources and the uncertainty that accompanies the change. In addition, there is a general shortage of qualified faculty members because of the relatively sudden growth of the sector. Qualified faculty members who are also fully prepared to conduct research are few in number. The competitive salaries for faculty members in both public and private institutions have inflated costs significantly. Budget pressures come from different angles coupled with reduction in government funding.

With the increase numbers of private business schools, the demand for qualified faculty members in public business schools has accordingly increased. As universities compete for qualified faculty and offer attractive salary packages, competition escalates, making it harder for public institutions to retain faculty. In comparison to universities in the United States, business schools in the UAE are smaller in size and spend less money and time in research programs, and thus create a value proposition problem in the competitive higher education market (Cornuel 2007). To remain competitive, particularly in business education, business schools have to maintain an adequate number of qualified faculty and appealing curricula.
With a growing shortage of business faculty, existing faculty members take on heavier teaching loads. Faculty members face intense and growing pressures from the school not just in the area of teaching, but also in research and administrative responsibilities. In the UAE, expatriate faculty members in particular, face unique expectations in teaching, research and university community service. According to UAE Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) (2011) the per semester teaching load for faculty comprises of 15 credit hours (one credit hour is equivalent to one teaching hour per week) for non-terminal degree holders teaching in programs for undergraduate certificates, diplomas, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees, 12 credit hours for faculty with terminal degrees teaching in baccalaureate programs, 9 credit hours for faculty only teaching in graduate programs or a mix of baccalaureate and graduate courses, and 6 credit hours for part-time faculty. Although, the AAUP (2012) recommended that the maximum teaching load for faculty teaching undergraduate level should not exceed 12 lecture hours per week and for graduate level instructions should not be more than 9 lecture hours per week. In addition, the AAUP stated that the preferred maximum teaching load for the undergraduate teaching should be 9 lecture hours and for graduate level instructions should be 6 lecture hours. However, faculty in the UAE higher education system teach in mixed sectors, undergraduate, graduate, and in some institutions, doctoral students. In 2002, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that faculty members in the USA have an average teaching load of 7 lecture hours per week for part-time faculty and 11 hours per week for full-time faculty.

Fig. 6 below depicts a recent report published by UAE MoHESR (2012) showing faculty in UAE academic institutions offering Bachelors programs to have an average teaching load of 14.6 hours per week, which is higher than the 12 credit hours established by the UAE Commission of Academic Accreditation (CAA). Additionally, an average teaching load of 12.65 credit hours per week for a mixture of baccalaureate and graduate courses is also higher than the 9 credit hours recommended by the CAA.

Table 1 below shows that the average teaching load for UAE academics reported by the UAE Ministry of Education (2011) is much higher than the numbers recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP 2012).
Fig. 6. UAE academics teaching load. (source: Data from UAE MoHESR (2012) Indicators of UAE higher education).

Table 1. Comparison of UAE teaching hours with AAUP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching sectors</th>
<th>UAE academic institutions credit hours per semester</th>
<th>AAUP recommended credit hours per semester</th>
<th>AAUP preferred recommended credit hours per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix Undergraduate and Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The high teaching load in UAE plays an important part in faculty perceptions of their role in the university, which may well influence the degree of their commitment to the institution. As the struggle with balancing the role dynamics while developing commitment toward the institution continues, faculty members are tempted to move to other institutions that offer better incentives and role balance. This turnover of faculty may be attributed to the lack of organizational commitment, as a committed employee will be less likely to resign voluntarily from the organization. In fact, a committed employee would work harder to achieve organizational excellence, continual improvement, and contribute to an organization’s competitive advantage (Zeffane & Al Zarooni 2008). Pfeffer and Fong (2004) state that as business schools push and pull in different directions, one consequence is a high turnover of faculty. Coupled with the shortage of
qualified business school faculty, many business schools in UAE face the challenge of recruiting quality faculty members and researchers for this region.

IBCs are also concerned with maintaining their host country’s university reputation and recruiting quality faculty to ensure high academic standards. Many of the IBCs failed to transfer faculty from their host country and instead had to recruit new faculty members who either had no affiliation with the home campus or no teaching experience in the home country (Altbach 2010). At the same time, to minimize costs, the smaller IBCs hired a large proportion of part-time faculty, which according to Wilkins (2010), is not an ineffective way to achieve employee commitment or high quality teaching and research standards. As Giroux (2002: 444) stated:

“Creating a permanent underclass of part-time professional workers in higher education is not only demoralizing and exploitative for many faculty who inhabit such jobs, but such policies increasing deskill both partial and full-time faculty by increasing the amount of work they have to do. With less time to prepare, larger class loads, almost no time for research, and excessive grading demands, many adjuncts run the risk of becoming either demoralized, ineffective, or both.”

Top quality faculty are an essential element of a successful business school. Many institutions face the challenge to attract and recruit faculty who display both excellence in research and relevant as well as strong pedagogical and managerial abilities. However, very few researchers have done studies on faculty turnover and organizational commitment. It is particularly important that there is a lacuna of research is this area, because the success of business schools depends on committed faculty who feel encouraged to teach and to develop the business school, rather than leave the current institution (Lorange 2008). Although these challenges with retaining qualified faculty are similar among business schools around the world, these challenges should also be of particular concern to business schools in the UAE.

UAE business schools have become more complex organizations as they continue to compete for student enrolment. Instead of focusing and optimizing time on activities to achieve the mission of the institutions, many administrators in business schools are concentrating their effort on employee and faculty turnover. Administrators expend a large amount of time and effort in personnel recruitment, selection, and training replacements (Buck & Watson 2002). As a result, higher education institutions commit a large portion of their resources in
replacement efforts. These issues may possibly contribute to a high turnover in both UAE national and expatriate faculty members of business schools.

Many business schools also struggle with maintaining experienced faculty members who have the ability and knowledge to bring forward relevant research insight and teach across a portfolio of business programs offered by the institutions. Researchers have highlighted that like all academic institutions, the key to success for business schools is to employ top quality faculty members to enhance value-creation, teach, build strong relationships with students and executives, and most importantly generate cutting-edge research (Lorange 2008). Even with the high turnover in faculty, due to the lack of academics among the UAE national population, faculty of higher education institutions remain predominantly expatriates. These expatriate faculty members are often nationals of New Zealand, America, Canada, Australia, United Kingdom, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Germany.

2.4.4 Student intake challenges

Since 2003, the three public institutions were put under tremendous pressure to expand the capacity of their student intake. This pressure stemmed from the UAE government’s pledge to enroll every UAE national high school graduate who passes university entry requirements. According to Wilkins (2010), as a result of the pledge, the number of students applying to Zayed University increased by 52% between year 2003 and 2008, yet funds from the federal government remained constant, without increase.

In addition, Article 22 of the UAE Constitution to provide education for all UAE nationals who pass the entry requirements created further competition among private institutions to attract students. In 2009, according to the National Media Council (2009) around 95% of female and 80% of male high school graduates applied for admission to higher education. For students who failed the entry requirements to the public institutions, the private institutions were the alternate option to obtain a higher education qualification. For students of expatriate workers, who chose to enter higher education in the UAE, the private institutions were the first choice due to limited admission possibilities public institutions held. Public institutions cater mainly to UAE national students.

Most IBCs in the UAE offer a limited range of courses, specializing in the same disciplines, such as information technology and business courses, because these courses are cheaper to establish and attract more students (Wilkins 2010).
Since the IBCs are both highly ranked and internationally accredited institutions, tuition fees are high and the faculty recruitment and student admission process is selective (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013a). As a result, many private institutions fail to attract enough students. For example, the George Mason University in Ras Al Khaimah opened its campus for only three years, before closing in May 2009 owing to its low student enrollment of only 180 undergraduates. Other IBCs such as Michigan State University had only 85 undergraduate students in 2008/2009. Rochester Institute of Technology had 50 students in the academic year 2008/2009. An Australian University, Murdoch University reported a 30% drop in student enrollment during its second year of operation.

Subsequently, institutions also face challenges with student quality levels. Most students enrolled in higher education have only average skills in English writing and Mathematics (Gerson 2010). As student enrollment dropped at private institutions, many of the private IBCs were forced to lower entry requirements and accept students who would not have been qualified to enter the program in the institutions’ host countries (Altbach 2010). Some institutions in the UAE faced difficulty differentiating themselves from other institutions as they competed for students yet ensured the standard and quality of the applicants. For example, as Lewin (2009) stated, Michigan State University reduced tuition fees by 50% to lure applicants. To ensure that the institution maintained its academic quality, although Michigan State received close to 200 transfer applications, 30% of the applicants were rejected. Hence Michigan State in Dubai had to scale back significantly, affecting faculty in five schools, including business (Swan 2010).

2.4.5 Students as consumers

Due to the common worldwide phenomenon of commercializing higher education, students are treated like consumers. Considerable pressures are put on faculty to satisfy students (Wilkins 2010). This may be one of the reasons why academic institutions in the UAE incorporate students’ evaluation of faculty’s teaching in the faculty performance evaluation. In some institutions, students’ evaluations of faculty account for as much as 50% of the total evaluation. For instance, according to Badri et al. (2006), in the College of Business and Economics of the UAE University, student evaluations are one of the criteria used in assessing faculty promotions in the UAE University. Faculty’s promotion opportunities, merit increases, contract renewals, and long-term contract considerations are dependent on the outcome of the students’ evaluations of the faculty’s teaching.
Therefore, as a result of complaints from students, students’ parental pressures on the faculty, fear of poor course evaluations from students, or fear of losing their jobs, many faculty members tend to inflate students’ grades (Gerson 2010).

2.5 Justification for research site selection

The UAE was chosen as a research site for this study because of its unique and distinctive definition and effective innovation with the education center strategies. The UAE, a developing nation with a population of around 8.2 million, has the largest higher education center for global IBCs, 53 of which are from 11 countries around the world. The IBCs offer many business programs, and the speed at which many foreign academic institutions and business schools are rushing to establish themselves in the country, makes UAE an exceptional site to study faculty commitment. Furthermore, the structural, and ideological factors of the corporate-based, top-down administrative structure along with the dual Humboldtian and corporate university system adopted by the UAE academic institutions will provide specific insight into faculty commitment that other research sites may not provide (Siggelkow 2007).

Like most business schools around the world, business schools in the UAE initially developed as a result of high fluctuations in demand for business educations in the region. Furthermore, with the economic downturn, business schools compete as they have never before for students as well as for faculty members. As business schools alter their strategies and outlook in order to remain fiercely competitive, the rate of faculty turnover increases. Nevertheless, with the economic downturn in 2008 and as government funding to the tertiary education sector remains static, like many other similar institutions across the globe, business schools in the UAE have decided to seriously factor in commercial performance. Like many business schools in the United States, business schools in UAE institutions, instead of placing emphasis on enhancing careers, they turn the teaching profession into an organizational management profession in pursuit of intrinsic interests (Pfeffer & Fong 2004). Hence courses offered in UAE institutions are assessed in both their intrinsic worth and their value for money (Starkey & Tiratsoo 2007).

In an effort to stay competitive internationally, many higher education institution administrators, especially in the UAE, are demanding of research work from faculty members with high teaching loads. Business schools not only place emphasis on faculty research but also on academic administrative duties and
strong teaching abilities. Thus faculty members are forced to switch their commitment from a particular institution to their own research, their academic disciplines, hence becoming less committed to their colleges (Lorange 2008). Therefore, business schools in many universities in the UAE are finding difficulty in maintaining a committed pool of business faculty members even though there is a tremendous opportunity to influence the lives of future business leaders.

The organizational life created by academic institutions in UAE may shape faculty members’ perceptions of commitment as they experience the leadership, management practices, standard setting, design of the organization structure and job expectations present in their own institutions. The multicultural and transitional academic employment economy in the UAE business schools offers “particular insights that allow one to draw inferences” (Siggelkow 2007: 21) on commitment that other institutions with a stable employment economy would not be able to provide. The UAE, as a research site will aid in the study to understand individual faculty member’s experiences of commitment in this academic work environment.
3 Organizational commitment literature review

This chapter reviews the relevant research on the topic of the study in order to establish a conceptual framework to convey the importance of the research. The literature review examines the relevant research on faculty commitment in academic institutions, particularly in business schools. This chapter has six major sections. The first section reviews the importance of faculty commitment from both the individual and the institutional perspectives. The second section defines and examines the relevant literature on faculty commitment in academic institutions. Section three presents a brief history of the transformation of the academic job market to a job system. Section four discusses and compares the job market to the prevailing job system. The fifth section reviews and examines the influence of organizational life (factors of work practices, work conditions, and academic autonomy) in an academic workplace on faculty commitment. Section six explores the concept of organizational commitment by presenting previous literature on commitment, and discusses the theories, approaches, and models developed by previous researchers. The seventh and final section synthesizes the information in the preceding sections to present a conceptual framework to carry out the study.

3.1 Importance of faculty commitment

This section discusses previous researchers’ established norms for good commitment situations, which can be used as a guideline against which any appropriate case situation (such as the cases in this study) can be judged.

Research using the educational setting finds faculty commitment to link positively with job performance and turnover (Buck & Watson 2002, Bland et al. 2006, Smeenk et al. 2006, Kipkebut 2010, Meyer & Maltin 2010). Commitment has a strong influence on turnover intentions (Porter et al. 1974). Allen and Meyer (1990) conclude that a committed employee tends to remain with the current employer. Committed faculty are likely to put more effort into teaching, contributing towards research and are more willing to participate in academic administrative activities, which in turn benefits the students and the institution (Busch et al. 1998).

By contrast, according to Buck and Watson (2002), high faculty turnover can disrupt the teaching curriculum, increase the workloads of existing faculty members who have to participate in the selection committee, and incur costs and
time to replace qualified faculty. Many institutions are unable to estimate or accurately comprehend the actual cost associated with faculty turnover because the expenses associated with replacing an academic are widespread. The repercussions range from associated time and costs to fill faculty positions, curricula discontinuity, to the problem of maintaining a cohesive teaching environment. Buck and Watson also added that the implications of faculty commitment are important for both faculty members and universities. Organizations with unwanted turnover usually see a drain in valuable resources and inefficient operations. Employee turnover forces administrators to exert effort and costs on recruiting, selecting, and training replacements. Specifically in higher education institutions, the time and effort expended by faculty members on the replacement process could be more beneficial if used in a different manner. (Buck & Watson 2002.)

A growing number of researchers (Downs et al. 1996, Mowday 1998, Iqbal et al. 2011) acknowledge that turnover is reduced among committed employees. Over the decades, as universities and colleges grow into complex organizations, societal demands on business schools cause faculty roles to evolve. As universities’ administrations strive to create a work environment to support academic excellence, faculty members continue to struggle with balancing teaching, researching, institutional community service, and developing commitment to the institution (Gormley & Kennerly 2010).

Unlike administrative staff, faculty members have different beliefs; they assign a different value to their research than they do to their university (Busch et al. 1998). Faculty with a weaker educational background commit more to their university than highly educated faculty because education is an investment for faculty members (Iqbal et al. 2011). Therefore, highly educated faculty tend to search for better jobs in order to find a better return on the time and money investment they have made in their own education (Mowday et al. 1982). Thus, through commitment, their contributions are enhanced, as the underlying assumption is that the consequence of lack of commitment in faculty members is seen in their research and lecturing contributions (Busch et al. 1998). Therefore, business schools will have a better knowledge of faculty recruitment and retention when they know what factors in organizational life influence faculty members’ commitment.

The degree of commitment from faculty affects both the institution and the individual faculty (Mowday et al. 1982, Meyer & Allen 1997). From the institution’s perspective, commitment can potentially have a significant
consequence on institutional effectiveness. Committed faculty members have less intent to leave, lowering faculty turnover (Meyer & Allen, 1991), lower absenteeism rates (Steers 1977) and performance increases, as the employees perceive greater rewards (Porter et al. 1974, Steers 1977). Thus, both the institution and faculty members can derive benefits from commitment (Mowday et al. 1982, Meyer & Allen 1997). Meyer et al. (1998) study shows that commitment is a positive determinant of low turnover, and organizational performance and effectiveness. Committed employees generally perceive that they will receive greater rewards and are less inclined to leave the organization. Turnover intention reduces when an employee feels a strong attachment to the organization either because the individual wants to or feels the need to stay. Committed employees not only identify with the employers’ goals and values but also feel attached to their organizations (Busch et al. 1998). An employee who feels obligated to the organization will be willing to work the extra hours, sacrificing personal and family time (Meyer & Smith 2000), and will engage in innovative and creative work to achieve a competitive advantage for the organization (Gormley & Kennerly 2010).

From the faculty’s perspective, commitment positively relates to individual outcomes such as sense of belonging, positive feelings of self-image and efficacy (Mowday et al. 1982, Blau & Boal 1987). High faculty turnover tends to indicate a poor working environment and reflects a loss of qualified academics. Additionally, faculty members feeling responsibility for organizational outcomes will only increase with the length of service at an institution (Iqbal et al. 2011). According to Becker’s (1960) behavioral theory, lengths of service are investments made. Personal investments in terms of effort, time, salary, benefits, promotion opportunities, and social networks accumulate over the employment period at the organization. If these factors contribute to the level of commitment, as they accrue, they would eventually make it more difficult for the faculty member to consider leaving the institution.

### 3.2 Faculty commitment in academic institutions

Several researchers have examined organizational commitment in staff employees. The few research studies covering organizational commitment of faculty tends to focus on antecedents of commitment (Neumann & Finally-Neumann 1990). Organizational commitment has been a topic of interest for many researchers over the past few decades, and remains to be an important construct in the workplace.
because of its integral linkage with employee’s behavior and attitude. Commitment develops naturally, and it is able to positively contribute to the organization through the creation of “attachment, allegiance, dedication, devotion, engagement and responsibility” (Marchiori & Henkin 2004: 353). Table 2 below summarizes some of the studies and results conducted by previous researchers on faculty commitment in academic institutions.

Table 2. Faculty commitment in academic institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors of faculty organizational commitment</th>
<th>Research samples</th>
<th>Factors affecting commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adkins et al. (2001)</td>
<td>371 full-time faculty in major state university, USA</td>
<td>Job insecurity (tenure) correlate with NC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameen et al. (1995)</td>
<td>72 faculty from doctoral and non-doctoral universities in USA.</td>
<td>Perceptions of distributive justice regarding tenure correlated slightly with AC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Uses the NSOPF 1999 dataset on full-time faculty.</td>
<td>Appointment type (tenure, non-tenure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller et al. (2006)</td>
<td>325 participants (157 faculty, 31 administrators, and 137 university staff from a medium-sized university, Southern USA.</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support correlates with AC and turnover intentions. Perceived external prestige strongly related to AC and turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence et al. (2012)</td>
<td>4,550 faculty holding department chair positions in 15 institutions across disciplines, USA.</td>
<td>Incongruence in institutional values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rungruang (2012)</td>
<td>407 full-time academics from three private and three public universities in Bangkok.</td>
<td>Relationship with and support from coworkers, university support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchiori &amp; Henkin (2004)</td>
<td>609 full- and part-time faculty in medicine, USA, and Canada.</td>
<td>Tenure correlates with AC. Appointment type and tenure correlate with CC. Gender correlate with NC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neumann &amp; Finaly-Neumann (1990)</td>
<td>380 faculty from Research universities, USA.</td>
<td>Organizational support (Chair, co-workers), distributive justice (equitable reward system) and work significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverton et al. (1999)</td>
<td>1370 Deans across 360 public and private institutions in the USA.</td>
<td>The less the role ambiguity and role conflict, the greater the commitment. The greater the role ambiguity and role conflict, the higher the stress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1997, Meyer and Allen discovered a positive relationship between affective commitment and perceived organizational support. Based on research studies of academic participants, it was deduced that when faculty members perceive support from the institution, they are less likely to leave their employer. A study in 1990 conducted by Neumann and Finaly-Neumann focused on the impact of perceived organizational support and distributive justice (equitable rewards) on faculty commitment among various faculty disciplines in higher education. The researchers found that the antecedents of organizational commitment varies across disciplinary fields and the reward-support framework plays a significant role in academic’s commitment, but only has a small and insignificant effect with research productivity.

A study by Fuller et al. (2006) with 325 participants comprising of 157 faculty, 31 university administrators and 137 university staff from a medium-sized university in Southern USA, also reflected that there was a correlation between affective commitment, perceived organization support and external prestige. Conversely, it showed that a lack of support from the organization generates withdrawal cognitions. Similarly, Rungruang (2012) also found organizational support and support from co-workers to help in retaining 407 full-time academics at three private and three public universities in Bangkok. Cohen (2007b) examined social interactions effect on shaping faculty commitment. Relationships with department chairs were found to strengthen perceptions of organizational procedural justice (fairness) and support because it fulfilled the individual faculty member’s psychological needs and helped to build trust and faith in the individual’s institution (affective and normative commitment).

Some higher education researchers view commitment to be more a general attitude toward the institution, as commitment is believed to be the basis of an exchange-based relationship between the faculty and the institution. Therefore, commitment is assumed to form as a result of the expectations and dispositions of the individual, and the different job features (Cohen 2007b). The role expectations and work-related values that an individual brings upon entry to the organization and the various rewards offered in the job eventually enhance commitment from the employee to the organization. Neumann and Finaly-Neumann (1990) used the exchange framework to explain why organization commitment develops when an individual perceives that the institution has fulfilled its obligation to the employee. Commitment develops when: (1) a bond between the individual and the organization results when the employee perceives congruence between his or her own values and the organization’s (affective commitment), (2) when the
individual perceives the costs of leaving the employer to outweigh the costs of
remaining in the organization (continuance commitment), and (3) when the
individual feels a sense of obligation to maintain membership (normative
commitment) (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001).

Organizational life factors such as, work practices, work conditions,
academic autonomy, role ambiguity and job insecurity are found by higher
education researchers to have an impact on organizational commitment. The
organization and management literature show a general support for the notion that
job tenure has a positive relationship with organizational commitment (Mathieu &
business school faculty from both doctoral and non-doctoral universities in the
USA, and the research claims that role ambiguity and job insecurity (denial of
tenure) cause faculty to develop turnover intentions. Moreover, decreases in
government funding have contributed to negative changes in work factors, such as
fewer opportunities for promotions, fewer pay increments, and yet high teaching
loads. From their study of 609 full and part time academics, Marchiori and
Henkin (2004) claim tenure correlates with affective commitment, while
appointment type and tenure correlate with continuance commitment. A study of
371 full-time faculty in a major state university researched by Adkins et al. (2001)
discovered job insecurity to cause high turnover intentions in a public university
even though most state (public) universities have a low probability closing down.

Role conflict also creates withdrawal cognitions among faculty. Wolverton et
al. (1999) examined the effect of role ambiguity and role conflict on commitment
among 1370 deans in public and private institutions in the USA. Work
environment was found to have an impact on role conflict. On the other hand, the
number of students and departments in each academic disciplines was found to
have no effect on the deans’ role conflict levels. However, the sizes of tenured
faculty, associate deans, and adjunct faculty in the college were said to have a
significant impact on the dean’s role conflict level, which in turn affected the
deans’ perceptions of effectiveness and overall commitment to the institutions.

Several organizational life factors experienced in higher education, such as
salaries, benefits, job statuses and bureaucratic demands also contribute to faculty
turnover, and performance. In 2000, Baron conducted a study on 13 full-time
business school academics from higher education institutions in the United
Kingdom (UK) and found low salary, low job status and high bureaucratic
demands to affect academics’ organizational commitment to the institutions.
Marchiori and Henkin (2004) found senior full-time faculty members likely to
remain with the current institution and place the interest of the institution above personal interests, in exchange for salary increases and other benefits (continuance commitment). Rewards, such as salary increments, benefits, promotions, and institutional research support were revealed to help promote continuance commitment (Cohen 2007b).

Other researchers on faculty commitment in higher education (Bland et al. 2006, Buck & Watson 2002) claim that an institution that has a good mix of appointment types for faculty will achieve higher commitment and lower attrition rates and turnover intentions among faculty. As research (Buck & Watson 2002) shows, a committed individual has lower turnover intentions. Subsequently, for faculty, if the type of appointment incorporates a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic benefits and rewards, the individual is more likely to feel more committed to the institution (Bland et al. 2006). Recently, Lawrence et al. (2012) carried out a study on 4,550 department chairs from 15 institutions across all disciplines and found social interactions to promote perceptions of support and responsiveness among coworkers, creating a strong effect on campus leaders’ commitment. On the other hand, when an institution’s values are not congruent to an individual’s values, withdrawal intentions develop.

Previous research on academics (Porter et al. 1974, Steers 1977) finds positive relationships between faculty commitment and organizational productivity, effectiveness and job performance. Researchers (Steers 1977, Mathieu & Zajac 1990, Kim et al. 2008, Allen & Meyer 1996) have shown that there is a positive correlation between an employee’s level of commitment to the institution, and turnover intentions. Research findings claim that organizational commitment improves performance (Mowday et al. 1974, Steers 1977), absenteeism (Steers 1977) and turnover (Mathieu & Zajac 1990, Kim et al. 2008). The consequences of an unstable workforce not only affect organizational effectiveness and productivity, but also have cost consequences on the institution. There will be costs incurred for recruiting and training new faculty to acclimatize to the department and the institution, costs of workflow disruptions, and costs in relation to reduced integration and demoralization of the remaining workforce (Mowday et al. 1982, Kim et al. 2008).

The benefit to institutions and business schools of having committed faculty is that committed individuals tend to manifest behavior that is associated with contributing an effort beyond the job requirements. Faculty members with high affective commitment are more inclined to join job activities that relate to good organizational citizenship (Shore & Wayne 1993). In general, the literature review
on organizational commitment in academic institutions shows individuals with strong commitment to contribute significantly to institutional effectiveness.

### 3.3 Academic job system

The job market for the profession of academics has evolved into a job system (Bousquet 2008). Nelson (1998: 12) stated that the job system:

“... is an interlocking structure of employment patterns, job definitions, salary constraints, hierarchized reward systems, training programs, institutional classifications, economic struggles, ideological mystifications, differential allotments of prestige, and social or political forces.”

Over the years, higher education institutions worldwide have diversified and the academic workplaces have changed. The missions of institutions worldwide vary, depending on the level of academic quality that they provide. The traditional idea of full-time permanent employment for academics has also become increasingly rare. To overcome the reduced state funding, institutions have shifted the financial burden to the students in terms of higher tuition fees and also replaced tenure-track full-time academic jobs with temporary and part-time jobs.

![Fig. 7. Trends in academic appointments 1975 to 2011. (source: data from AAUP (2012) Results of the Spring 2011 Contingent Faculty Survey).](image)
According to the AAUP (2012), the trend of academic appointments since 1975 shows an increasing number of contingent faculty (part-time, full-time non-tenured, adjunct, and graduate employees). Fig. 7 above highlights the trends of contingent appointments from 1975 to 2011 as reported by the AAUP. In 2012, 76% of the academics were contingent faculty members, a 300% increase between 1975 and 2011 (AAUP 2013). While the tenured and full-time tenure faculty represented less than 25% of all academic appointments. With the dramatic transformation of the academic labor market, universities have

“created a two-tier labor system, with a shrinking pool of tenure-stream positions at the top and a massive sea of contingent, low-or no-benefit jobs at the bottom.” (Entin 2005: 3)

Nowadays, several institutions employ part-time and adjunct faculty because of budgetary constraints, in attempt to save costs (Johnson 2011). Most full-time faculty do not have long-term appointments. Contingent faculty do not have job security and frequently lack adequate institutional support, no office space, minimal benefits, no professional development opportunities and lower pay than tenure-track faculty (Johnson 2011). With the changes in the missions of universities nowadays, academics’ term of employment and conditions vary among different countries. As Altbach (2000: 9) stated,

“Academics are affected by the major trends evident in universities worldwide – accountability, massification, managerial controls, deteriorating financial support from public sources, and others. Research funds are scarcer, and are often tied to applied outcomes and increasingly linked to private interest. These factors have, not surprisingly, negatively affected the working conditions of the academic profession.”

Traditionally, the higher education institution system’s role in a global economy is to deliver excellence in teaching and learning and combine liberal education with professional qualifications (Starkey & Tiratsoo 2007). Faculty members in these institution settings typically perform three roles: teaching, contributing meaningful research, and participating in academic administrative activities. Faculty have to be good lecturers, conduct useful research and contribute actively in academic and university community services (Gormley & Kennerly 2010).

As Busch et al. (1998) stated, unlike administrative staff in higher education, faculty members have different beliefs, and they assign different values to their research field than they do to their universities. Many academics join the
profession due to their passion for teaching and research, looking for intrinsic rewards, such as to educate students, teach effectively, and contribute to the intellectual world. Busch et al. (1998) further added that with the nature of their work, academics are accustomed to having autonomy to control how they use their time, control over their classroom in terms of how and what to teach and the focus of their research disciplines. Academics need substantial independence and autonomy to work closely with their peers and with their students. However, as institutions grow more bureaucratic, professional autonomy decreases. (Busch et al. 1998.)

As universities around the world expand to respond to the increase in student demand and economic needs, Bousquet (2008: 1) stated that the higher education administration diverges from the traditional “ideals of faculty governance, collegiality and professional self-determination” to corporate management values and practices. Bousquet (2008) added that the intended change to the academic workplace is to induce faculty members to relinquish traditional academics’ values and practices, particularly autonomy on research direction and teaching, and instead, embrace the corporate managerial initiatives. Tuchman (2011: 6) claimed that administrators and faculty members see the world differently. Administrators believe that “their activities define the essence of the university,” while faculty believe that the activities in which they take part should advance knowledge to serve successful “core academic values”. Take for example, research grants. Corporate managerial administrators treat research grants as revenue to the institution, while faculty members see research grants as funds to support research and teaching.

According to Fralinger and Olson (2007) conflicting issues sometimes exists between higher education administrators and faculty regarding the interpretation of the corporate managerial intended values and practices. For example, autonomy and academic freedom is of the utmost importance to faculty while administrators place importance on the value of systematic and procedural processes. This in turn may result in repression and influence faculty commitment to the institution as values and beliefs can influence the decision-making processes at institutions (Tierney 1988) and shape individual behavior in the academic workplace (Fralinger & Olson 2007).

Subsequently, according to Ginsberg (2011) university presidents and senior administrations at most universities weaken or dispense with involving faculty in complex matters. Many professors have no power in many areas, such as appointment of senior academic administrators, setting priorities for budgets and
curricula, and new program developments. Research shows that academic workplaces that embrace involvement and participation in the decision-making process reinforce positive faculty relationships, and elevate work performance (Neumann & Finaly-Neumann 1990). University administrators and faculty have different perspectives on teaching and research activities. Faculty members view scholarship and teaching to be an important part of academic life while university administrators view research and teaching activities as a means of generating revenues (Ginsberg 2011). Bousquet (2008) noted that as corporate managers in the academic workplace aim to accumulate capital and conserve academics’ labor costs, management gives less support to academics on research-related expenses. Many faculty members in institutions where research contribution is necessary for tenure tend to fund their own research and conference travel expenses.

Additionally, corporate managerial initiatives in institutions conserve labor costs by hiring part-time faculty members over full-time academics (Altbach 2000). Some institutions hire doctoral students as “administered labor” to teach (Bousquet 2008: 71). The use of part-time faculty members and doctoral students to save costs has severe implications for a research-oriented institution. Part-time faculty and doctoral students are only responsible for teaching they do not take on academic administrative duties and are not expected to produce research, which means that they will not be able to provide new knowledge to the teaching pedagogy and to the research community (Bousquet 2008).

With the increase in competition among institutions, nationally and internationally, the academic workplace conditions continue to change. Traditionally, although institutions do keep track of academics’ teaching and research contributions, “very little accountability was built into academics work” (Altbach 2000: 13). Nowadays, in the academic workplace not only do academics teach and do research they are also held accountable for their participation in academic administrative duties. This appears to affect the academic profession tremendously as the working conditions deteriorate. Coupled with the increasing workload, larger student class sizes, lack of research support, and diminishing autonomy, academics’ remuneration continues to be symbolic of faculty rank and seniority instead of productivity (Altbach 2000). Even with the change in job expectations and the increase in workload, academics’ remuneration does not keep up with inflation and is far lower than employees with other “professional” degrees (Bousquet 2008: 70). Literature shows “faculty will respond in kind to those activities and behaviors for which they are reinforced,” such as tenure, promotion or salary increases (Amey 1999: 59).
With the economic crisis in 2008, business schools experienced funding cuts, which entailed large cutbacks and restructuring (Thomas & Thomas 2011). This further intensified the student enrolment competition, as institutions use tuition fees as a source of funding. Coupled with the increase in demand for Masters of Business Administration (MBA) education, business school establishment “transformed to a cash-generating engine” (Clarke 2008: 52). With the market’s increasing demand for the MBA program, business schools face a further challenge to increase program offerings in this field, making staffing decisions difficult.

In addition, with the increased trend in the last 10 years to attain accreditation on curricula, business schools compete to develop and differentiate themselves from their competitors. The activities involved with the accreditation requirements demand continual data collection and documentation activities, adding extra burden to the existing staffing problems (Joshua et al. 2001). Critics suggests that to develop a distinctive competence, business schools have to redesign their visions (Almog-Bareket 2012), and to face a competitive environment, business schools are required to initiate changes (Lorange 2008). As a result of the increasing turbulent nature of their environments, business schools experienced a shortage in faculty, increased competition, decline in resources, and rapid technology changes. In response to the decline in resources, many business schools developed a stronger connection with private donors and local business communities, which resulted in more curriculum innovation (Joshua et al. 2001), and more pressure on faculty.

The problems experienced by business schools are to some extent an aspect of problems faced by institutions globally that have experienced a decline in public financial support and an escalation in costs. According to Pfeffer and Fong (2004: 1510), to overcome the decline in financial support from the government and to supplement the cost increase, both the business schools and the universities seek the majority of their funds from voluntary contributions through performing their role in the community as “independent critics and observers of society”. In return, the voluntary contributors control how the funding is spent. As a result, academic administrators struggle to respond to business pressures on cost control.

From the academics’ standpoint the changes in the academic workplace are negative: diminishing remuneration and working conditions, business schools and universities are becoming more bureaucratic, while academics’ professional autonomy perishes (Altbach 2000). Institutions are asking faculty to contribute more over the years. Higher education administrators’ attitude toward economic
gains has altered academics’ life. The bureaucratic structure of universities and business schools implementing traditional managerial control over academics behavior reduces motivation and commitment among academics (Busch et al. 1998). Bush et al. (1998) further added that many faculty members working full-time but not on a tenure-track are dissatisfied with their inability to keep up with relevant knowledge because of the insufficient research support. Thus, a high turnover tendency develops. With the changes in the academic workplace, business schools, and institutions are finding it difficult to retain faculty as the number of contingent academic appointments undermines the three major benefits of the academic profession: tenure, faculty governance, and academic freedom.

3.4 Job market versus job system

According to Bland et al. (2006), universities and colleges in the past 50 years have shared the same faculty appointment system. Traditionally, in the academic job market faculty members are normally hired on a full-time basis toward tenure-track. Their performances are judged against the institution’s established promotion criteria, which usually lead to tenure over time. As Bland et al. (2006) stated, this traditional appointment not only helps motivate faculty to perform but also encourages faculty in their teaching, research, and participation in institution community services. In return, as part of the institution’s appointment commitment to academics, the institution rewards the top-performing faculty members with tenure. (Bland et al. 2006.)

However, in the current job system, academics appointment types consist of contingent faculty (mainly part-time, non-tenured track, adjunct, graduate students, and a small percentage of tenure-track individuals). Contingent faculty members are mainly hired on a fixed term with less favorable benefits than full-time faculty (Johnson 2011). The NCES (2002) reported that in 1993, 60% of faculty members were working on term-by-term contracts; by comparison 13% of faculty members were full-time employees. According to Wolverton (2008), contingent faculty members are increasingly hired on contract terms, for a fixed period with no due process on contract termination, and have to teach, research, and participate in institutional service activities. As Nelson (1998) noted, faculty members in the job system work for an exploitative wage and have poor work conditions. Some academics were pressured to take on extra work outside the institution to supplement their income. Graduate students provide cheap teaching
labor for the academic institutions, but have miniscule hopes of future job prospects upon graduation (Bousquet 2008).

NCES (2002) report shows that the majority of part-time faculty is not tenured nor are they in tenure-track positions. Only three to seven percent of the part-time faculty are in tenure-track positions or tenured at four-year institutions, particularly in humanities, natural sciences, engineering disciplines, and vocational training programs. Faculty members regard tenure as a sign of acceptance by the institution and therefore it fosters productivity and stability in academic institutions. According to Allen (2000), tenure for faculty accentuates autonomy and academic freedom, with the opportunity of shared governance in the institution. Tenure acts to codify a permanent professional relationship between the faculty and the institution. More importantly, tenure provides a shield for academic freedom, and an instrument to maintain faculty’s morale and culture while bringing cohesion to the academic institution. Meyer and Allen (1991) identified the faculty tenure system as invoking all the three dimensions of commitment. Tenure or tenure-track faculty tend to be more highly involved in institutional governance because tenure provides a sense of job security, and therefore faculty feel an obligation to the institution. Also commitment facilitates productivity (Bland et al. 2006).

Organizational commitment researchers have shown that “employees with strong affective commitment to the organization work harder at their jobs and perform them better than do those with weak commitment” (Meyer & Allen 1997: 28). As research shows, tenured faculty members direct more effort to teaching, research, administration and public service (Allen 2000). Bland et al. (2006) concluded in their study that the full-time tenured faculty members in research universities are more productive in research. They are also more effective in their teaching, and are committed to staying in their profession with their present employer. In fact, full-time tenured faculty members tend to put in more hours of work than non-tenure faculty. For example, across institution types, with faculty in research and doctoral universities, when compared with faculty in 4-year liberal arts institutions, data showed that tenured faculty produce more research and spend more time at their work. Allen (2000) reported that in 1993 in comparison with non-tenured faculty, faculty with tenured positions published three times more refereed articles within a two-year period. Tenured faculty on average have 27 refereed and eight non-refereed articles while non-tenured faculty have only eight refereed and three non-refereed articles.
In comparing the job market with the job system the major difference is that faculty members in the job system are merely contingent, temporary workers with no academic freedom, no job security, no possibility to participate in shared governance, and in receipt of minimal research support. With the job system structure, academics’ relationships to key decision makers, outside and inside the campus, have drastically changed (Tjedvoll 2010). In the past faculty used to enjoy a strong role in institutions’ policy decisions. However, these days, academics have essentially become mere “support staff” to the university administrators, who controls the decision-making (Tjedvoll 2010: 425).

3.5 Organizational life and organizational commitment


Work-related factors such as leadership, salary, promotional opportunities, supervision, beliefs, and values are found to be antecedents of the organizational climate based on the attitude of the group and their personal impact (Steers 1977). This stream of research reports several important classifications of factors such as psychological characteristics (identification), role-related elements (role conflict, role ambiguity and degree of job challenge), and various organizational life factors. Several other factors of organizational life, namely the degree of autonomy, job challenge, role conflict, variety of skills used, role ambiguity, fairness of policies, decision-making participation and involvement, and feeling of fair treatment by the organization have also been discovered as antecedents of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen 1997). Perceptions of management practices on pay satisfaction, promotional opportunities, training opportunities,
job security, performance assessment, decision-making participation and professional development affects university employees’ organizational commitment (Kipkebut 2010).

Commitment can take different forms, and management practices can influence commitment in different ways (Meyer & Smith 2000). Employee attitude is associated with management practices. According to Guest (1999) commitment is a result of well-designed management practices. Buck and Watson (2002) claim that management practices influence employees’ level of commitment to the institution. Bowen and Ostroff (2004) state that employees interpret management practices idiosyncratically according to the individual’s psychological state and experience of work situations. Meyer and Smith (2000) find individual’s interpretations of the management practices exercised in the organization to influence commitment. Messages sent by management practices can be ambiguous and subject to interpretation by different individuals (Bowen & Ostroff 2004). Individuals create their own interpretations of the message communicated by the management practices to guide them in their behavior (Guzzo & Noonan 1994). Thus, the nature, and strength of management practices implemented is very much determined by how employees perceive these practices. However, these interpretations or perceptions drawn by the employees may not always necessarily align with the organization’s intentions.

Implementation of innovative management practices have a significant influence on employee commitment because the working conditions created by the practices can help motivate employees, and encourage the individual to accomplish organizational goals. Innovative management practices are found to increase employee commitment, and commitment in turn affects critical behavior, such as performance (Becker et al. 1996). Effective management practices can stimulate and maximize corporate investment through employees’ affective commitment (Yousef 1998b). Committed faculty members also possess “a willingness” to put in extra energy to support the organization and develop a “strong desire to maintain membership with the organization” (Mowday et al. 1982: 27).

3.5.1 Factors of organizational life

Most researchers on commitment focus on the predictors and antecedents of organizational commitment, that is, the effects of commitment on job performance and employee turnover (Steers 1977, Becker et al. 1996, Eskildsen
Several empirical studies find autonomy to be related to organizational commitment. According to Gellatly et al. (2009) management practices that create feelings of autonomy and competence will influence the employees’ desire to stay. The degree of freedom, discretion, and independence that an employee receives to carry out the job responsibilities, fosters a sense of responsibility and a feeling of commitment (Abu Elanain 2009). Empowered faculty members respond with commitment (Witham & Glover 1987). The main reason that faculty members choose to stay with a university is the freedom that they receive in terms of choosing the course to teach, the topic of research and how to plan for the day (Adriaenessens et al. 2006). Faculty members who resent their loss of autonomy will react by restricting behavior to the minimum (Meyer et al. 2004). Faculty members rate freedom as one of the top four satisfactions of their jobs, and the other satisfactions are intrinsic motivators such as interpersonal relations, the nature of academic work and teaching (Lechuga & Lechuga 2012). The perceptions of autonomy influence the faculty member’s attitude, which in turn impacts the individual’s behavior toward the business school because perceived freedom is a strong attribute of faculty work (Lechuga & Lechuga 2012). Thus autonomy appears to foster affective and normative commitment.

Researchers have shown that congruence of individual values with organizational values generates commitment. Hunt et al. (1989: 79) defines values as “the standards that guide the external adaptation and internal integration of organizations.” An employee’s belief in the organization’s values helps develop a positive attitude toward the institution (Porter et al. 1974, Mowday et al. 1982, Shepherd & Mathews 2000). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) claim that affective commitment develops when an employee identifies with the organization’s values and gets more involved with the job in order to achieve organizational effectiveness. As a result of the internalization of socialization, normative commitment develops. Thus both affective and normative commitment dimensions appear to be fostered. Faculty members hold different beliefs and values in their role mainly because they are academics, and they align themselves with the teaching and research values to strengthen the knowledge of students (Busch et al. 1998). Thus, ethical behavior of management has a direct effect on the employee’s behavior (Ruiz et al. 2011), as it affects the individual’s perception of management’s values, and in turn affects the individual’s affective and normative commitment profiles.
Studies from several researchers (Porter 1981, Mowday et al. 1979, Scholl 1981, Reichers 1985, Meyer & Allen 1991, O’Reilly & Chatman 1991, Busch et al. 1998, Mowday 1998) confirm that faculty perceptions of the institution’s organizational values influence commitment to the employer. Faculty members with a strong belief in the values of the institution will be willing to deploy effort in the way of institution effectiveness and will be eager to be a member of the business school (Porter et al. 1974). Thus faculty members who believe strongly and accept the institution’s goals and values develop commitment (Mowday et al. 1979). Hence, organizational values appear to foster affective and normative commitment.

Attractive pay and benefits are related to affective commitment (Meyer et al. 2004). Employees who receive special remunerations or benefits will feel affectively committed to the organization because pay satisfaction denotes organizational support and dependability (Meyer & Smith 2000). Therefore, according to Street (2009) employees who receive attractive benefit packages tend to (a) see the organization demonstrates care and support and thus enhance their affective commitment, (b) perceive losing the attractive benefit package, and thus enhance continuance commitment, and (c) develop stronger normative commitment, as they feel indebted to the organization. In general, obligations to work hard develop when employees perceive compensation from the organization as fair. As Meyer and Smith (2000) claim, attractive remuneration fosters affective and normative commitment, and remuneration is one of the criteria included in calculating the perceived costs of turnover intentions (Meyer & Allen 1991, Becker 1960). Hence, salary and benefits appear to foster all three of affective, continuance and normative commitment.

A perception of high quality and responsive leadership fosters faculty organizational commitment (Lawrence et al. 2011). Therefore, the leadership style exercised in any institution needs to match the level of commitment that the institution expects from the faculty members. When employees participate in the decision-making process and are kept aware of the organization’s affairs, a sense of obligation and feeling of trust is created (McElroy 2001). Thus, organizational commitment develops when faculty perceives that the institution is fulfilling its obligations (Neumann & Finaly-Neumann 1990).

Work environments that encourage participation in decision-making are positively linked to faculty members’ organizational commitment (Gormley & Kennerly 2010). Management systems that encourage participation are a factor for successfully bundling management practices (Brown et al. 2008).
Management practices on social interactions, job level factors, and employee participation are important for academic staff with different identities (Smeenk et al. 2006). Adopting participative decision-making with academics helps attain faculty members’ affective and normative commitment (McElroy 2001). Implementation of a strong decision-making process can positively influence employee commitment (Dany et al. 2008). Faculty members favor minimalist leadership processes over autocracy, as Thomas and Thomas (2011: 530) states,

“Academics expect to find a range of supportive management features: the maintenance of autonomy, consultation over important decisions, the fostering of collegiality (both democratic decision making and mutual cooperation) and fighting the school’s corner with senior university administrators.”

Both researchers in educational settings and non-educational settings claim that organizational commitment largely mediates with employees’ perceptions of distributive, procedural and interactional justices. The importance placed on justice, equity, and fairness varies among individuals (Jones 2000). The perception of fairness is dependent on the treatment received from the institution’s administration (Meyer & Allen 1997). Organization management practices can shape and influence employee’s attitudes and behavior (Bhatnagar 2007). An employee who perceives that management practices are just and fair will in turn reciprocate back to the organization through positive attitudes and behavior (Kinnie et al. 2005). Therefore, organizational commitment depends on the employee’s favourable attitude toward the institution (Porter et al. 1974, Mowday et al. 1979). Work-related policies and procedures perceived to be fair promote both affective and normative organizational commitment (Lawrence et al. 2012).

Employees view management practices positively if the method by which decision outcomes are made is fair (Bowen & Ostroff 2004) and the process used to determine the decision outcomes are just (Fernandes & Awamleh 2006). Several researchers claim that fairness of the management system is an influencing factor in an employee’s perception of management practices. Management practices perceived to deliver justice might well affect the individual’s views of management activities and might in turn determine the ability of the system to influence employee attitudes and behaviors (Bowen & Ostroff 2004). According to Abu Elanain (2009) perception of unfair treatment from the organization will increase turnover cognitions. Whereas, commitment
levels increase when employees perceive fair treatment from the organization (Meyer & Smith 2000). Therefore, fairness plays an important role in employee’s performance and commitment (Suliman 2007), and enhances the individual’s feeling and sentiment toward the organization (Simard et al. 2005). In return, the employee is inclined to stay with their current employer. Since attitudes and behaviors toward the employer are reflected by the employee’s perceptions and expectations of fairness, the employee is likely to commit to the organization if the organization commits to the employee (Meyer & Smith 2000).

Several other researchers affirm that organizational commitment mediates employee’s perceptions of justice in the decision outcomes that management makes (Bowen & Ostroff 2004, Kinnie et al. 2005, Fernandes & Awamleh 2006, Lawrence et al. 2012). Organizational commitment increases when faculty members perceive fair treatment from the institution (Meyer & Smith 2000). It enhances the faculty’s feeling and sentiment for the business school (Simard et al. 2005). Job characteristics and tasks also influence organizational commitment for task content is crucial for the fulfillment of the employee needs (Felfe et al. 2008). Employees will commit to organizations if they believe that the organization treats them fairly. Thus perceived organizational support and justice appear to foster affective and normative commitment.

Perceived procedural support and justice refers to the processes and procedures used by the institution’s administration to determine decision outcomes in the business school. Fairness in allocation of outcomes in terms of promotion and rewards for performance is crucial in fostering faculty commitment (Iles et al. 1990, McElroy 2001). In a transitional employment environment, procedural justice in terms of employment security is of particular concern for many faculty members. The study by Yousef (1998b) finds job security to correlate positively with organizational commitment. Continuance commitment is generated from rewards of role performance, such as salary increases, benefits, promotions, and research facilities (Cohen 2007a). Fairness in allocation of outcomes for promotions, pay, and rewards are crucial to maintaining organizational commitment. An employee’s perceptions of fairness in management practice activities, such as justice in decisions when determining rewards significantly influences the individual’s commitment to the organization. Perceptions of management activities also depend on the management’s openness to communicate and clarify the distribution formula used (Bowen & Ostroff 2004) in salary increments and promotion criteria for academics.
Unlike administrative staff, the promotion procedures for faculty members are cumbersome, extensive, and stressful because the promotion criteria take into consideration not just performance in teaching but also contributions to research and participation in academic administrative duties. Studies by Iles et al. (1990) and McElroy (2001) find positive relationships between organizational commitment, and promotion practices and opportunities. Promotions provide opportunities for personal growth and increased social status. Employees who receive promotion opportunities tend to perceive the promotion processes to be fair, and as a result, develop strong attachment, remain loyal to the institutions, and give great weight to the cost of changing employment (Kipkebut 2010). Therefore, the employee will commit if the individual feels that the organization shows care and support (Zeffane & Al Zarooni 2008). Organizations showing care and concern for employees foster affective commitment (Meyer & Smith 2000). Thus, management practices appear to play an important role in the degree of employee commitment in achieving organizational goals and objectives.

A study by Meyer and Smith (2000) found career development to be a powerful predictor of organizational commitment. When organizations actively help employees to advance in their career training, employers are fostering a stronger bond with employees to the organization. Training activities develop employees, improve skills and abilities, strengthen motivation and enhance organizational commitment (Harel & Tzafir 1999, Bhatnagar 2007). Employees tend to perceive training and professional development activities as a demonstration of the organization’s commitment to the workforce. Thus a strong psychological bond is created, and the individual will be more willing to work strenuously to help the organization succeed (McElroy 2001). Additionally, when an employee feels that the employer has made extensive investments for career development, the individual will feel obligated and less inclined to leave the organization (Ostroff & Bowen 2004). Therefore, perceptions of good career opportunities are likely to enhance strong emotional attachment (Kipkebut 2010). Individuals who receive favourable treatment in terms of professional training feel more obligated to the organization, and more committed even when other more attractive opportunities arise in different organizations (Blau & Boal 1987).

Researchers find affective and normative commitments are cultivated through strong interactions with supervisors as employees’ perceptions of procedural justice and social support are strengthened (Cohen 2007b). Perceived interactional support and justice refers to the faculty’s perceptions regarding the quality of the communication and treatment received from management when enacting the
institution’s procedures, for example, faculty perceptions of respectful and dignified treatment from the department chairs and deans. Perceptions of justice in interactions and encounters depend very much on the interpersonal treatment received (Skarlicki & Folgler 1997). As Downs et al. (1996) claim organizational commitment is enhanced through a good relationship with supervisors. Individuals who perceive trust from the employer will develop obligations toward the employer (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991, McElroy 2001). An employee’s desire to continue employment with the organization may also be because of perceptions of fair and supportive management practices, which is positively related with organizational commitment (Meyer & Smith 2000). Conversely, perceived unfairness can also lead to frustrations and resentment (Kipkebut 2010). Perceptions of supportive management practices and fairness in decision outcomes encourage a sense of obligation to reciprocate (Meyer & Allen 1991) through increased efforts towards organizational effectiveness (Mowday et al. 1982).

3.5.2 Cultural Influence on Organizational Life

As indicated by previous researchers, some factors in organizational life are generalized across populations of employees but the influence differs, depending on the types and cultural background of the individuals. Consultative or participative leadership styles as opposed to, authoritative leadership enhances employee commitment to the organization and contributes toward organizational effectiveness (Yousef 2000b). The influence of culture is manifested in the reactions of individuals, which in turn affects the employee’s appraisal of the practices exercised in the organization (Downs et al. 1996, Meyer & Smith 2000, Mellahi & Wood 2001, Jones 2006, Street 2009).

Street (2009) states that there are two types of cultural values: individualism and collectivism. Individualism defines an individual as independent of others in terms of choice, self-determination and autonomy. The social ties between individual employees are not strong, and individuals are expected to look after themselves. Countries like the United Kingdom, United States of America, Finland, France, Australia, and Germany emphasize individualism. Collectivism on the other hand, refers to an individual who defines him or herself with the particular group that he or she belongs. The individual’s goals are aligned with the group, and the emphasis is on group achievements. Countries like China, Hong Kong, Japan, India, Brazil, and Mexico are collective society. The Arab society is
also a collective culture (Rohm 2010) whereby Arabs are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups (Al Harthi 2005). Hence, organizational commitment is promoted by the culture and society in which the organization conducts business for culture originates through religion, families, schools, and social clubs (Jones 2006). In socialization with a particular cultural group, an employee learns to perceive him or herself as part of the group (Meyer & Smith 2000).

3.6 Conceptualizing organizational commitment

The organizational commitment concept has been extensively researched, measured and defined since the 1960s. Several researchers have already compiled an exhaustive review on the organizational commitment research. Mowday et al. (1982) compiled an extensive review of the commitment concept. Meyer and Allen (1997) compiled a research review of the commitment theory in a book titled, Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application. This section will review some of the definitions of organizational commitment offered by previous researchers and discuss the different schools of thought on organizational commitment.

3.6.1 Previous research on organizational commitment

With the numerous studies on organizational commitment theory there is still a variation in the definition of commitment. The varied definitions of commitment offered by the researchers in the last few decades have contributed significantly to understanding commitment to organizations. Organizational commitment has been of interest to researchers because of its relationship with numerous work outcomes (Mathieu & Zajac 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991, 1997). Becker (1960) defines commitment as the individual’s calculative costs to stay or leave the employer. The individual commits to organizational activities because of the awareness of the associated costs in changing employer. The perceived costs for academics may be seniority with the institution, the loss of attractive remuneration, and disruption of personal relations with fellow faculty members when moving to another institution.

Porter (1981) defines organizational commitment as an attitude that identifies with the organization’s values and goals, which results in more involvement with the activities of the particular organization. Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) characterizes the organizational commitment concept to at least three
factors: (1) having a strong belief in and accepting the employer’s goals and values, (2) developing a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the institution, and (3) generating a strong desire to maintain membership in the institution. Steers (1977) views organizational commitment as a psychological bond defined by the degree that an individual identifies and gets involved. Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) focus on organizational commitment from the employee’s attitudes instead of behavior. Scholl (1981) defines commitment as a stable force acting to maintain behavioral direction through adherence to certain norms or values, such as showing loyalty even when equity or expectancy conditions are not met. Reichers (1985) holds the same view as Porter (1981), claiming organizational commitment as an individual’s relative strength in identifying and getting involved with a particular organization. Commitment is the extent by which an individual accepts the organization’s goals and wants to retain membership in the organization (Blau & Boal 1987).

Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) define commitment as emotion that systemizes the employee’s relationship with the employer in three different aspects: normative, continuance and affective commitment. Affective commitment develops when an employee becomes emotionally attached to the organization by getting more involved and identifies with the organization’s values. Continuance commitment develops as a result of the perceived consequences associated with turnover intentions. This reflects the view drawn by Becker (1960) that commitment is a behavior based on calculative aspects. Normative commitment generates from the individual’s feelings of obligation toward management, co-workers and the organization as a whole. Meyer and Allen (1997) find a strong relationship between employee retention and the commitment constructs. Employees who demonstrate high levels of affective commitment are more often recommended for promotion (Meyer et al., 1989). However, Allen and Meyer (1996) in their research find that although continuance commitment has a strong correlation with an individual’s retention, it does not appear to relate to work performance.

In the last 15 years, other researchers such as Busch et al. (1998) agree with Porter et al. (1974) and Reichers (1985) that commitment occurs when an individual identifies with the employer’s goals and values and wants to be attached to the institution. Organizational commitment pertains to the psychological force experienced in the mind that directs the individual toward a particular action (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001). Jones (2006) defines commitment as a psychological relationship between the individual and the value proposition.
of the employment situation. Cohen (2007a) defines commitment to be the state of mind that ties an individual to an action that achieves one or more targets. Zeffane and Al Zarooni (2008) define commitment as the extent to which an individual is willing to remain in the organization. Abu Elanain (2010) views organizational commitment as the extent of loyalty to the organization.

Some studies on the organizational commitment theory conceptualize commitment as uni-dimensional (Becker 1960, Porter et al. 1974, Mowday et al. 1982) and other studies show organizational commitment as a multi-dimensional construct (Reichers 1985, Allen & Meyer 1990). Wasti (2005) claims that the uni-dimensional construct of organizational commitment defines commitment as a line of consistent activities because of the calculated costs as a result of leaving the organization (Becker 1960). The multi-dimensional construct develops from varying antecedent factors and poses distinct ramifications on relevant work behaviors (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991). Therefore, the dimensionalities of commitment add confusion to the definitions and conceptualizations of commitment (Meyer & Allen 1997, Meyer & Herscovitch 2001). See Table 3 below for a representative variation in the definition of the term commitment, from previous organizational commitment researchers.

Table 3. Variable definitions of the organizational commitment term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of the term commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steers (1977)</td>
<td>Degree of identification and involvement in current employing organization, a psychological bond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowday et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Identification and involvement: beliefs and accepts the organization’s goals and values, willing to put enough energy to help the organization succeed, and wants to maintain organizational membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholl (1981)</td>
<td>Adherence to organizational norms or values, for example, remain loyal even when expectancy conditions are not met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer and Allen (1984)</td>
<td>Identify with organization’s goals, and willing to work toward them or getting involved with the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen and Meyer (1991)</td>
<td>Affective commitment is based on feelings of loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Identifies with organization goals and values, and feel attached to the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeffane and Al Zarooni (2008)</td>
<td>Extent to which an individual is willing to remain in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Elanain (2010)</td>
<td>Degree of loyalty to the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.2 Organizational commitment approaches and models

Researchers in organizational commitment make a distinction between two schools of thought: behavioral and attitudinal commitment. The behavioral perspective of organizational commitment implies that individuals commit to the organization because of the benefits received by staying with the organization. Therefore as long as the individual holds the job position and continues to accumulate better benefits compared to the costs incurred by leaving, turnover decisions will decrease. Thus, commitment develops as a result of the incentives offered by the organization to foster organizational commitment (Blau & Boal 1987). Whereas the attitudinal perspective of organizational commitment focuses on the psychological mind set whereby the individual develops a willingness to work as a result of affection for the organization. When the organization stimulates in the employee feelings of commitment, the individual will reciprocate with identification of the organization’s goals and show involvement in the job, and thus develop a strong passion for organizational membership (Porter et al. 1974, Reichers 1985, Busch et al. 1998). Researchers on organizational commitment either conceptualize the commitment perspectives in uni-dimensional or multi-dimensional constructs.

Behavioral commitment originates in the work of Becker (1960). The behavioral approach views commitment as the concept of investments binding the individual to behavioral acts. In contrast, attitudinal commitment emphasizes the individual’s psychological bond with a particular organization as affective commitment and identification (Steers 1977). In the behavioral school of thought, the uni-dimensional construct developed by Becker (1960) defines commitment by using the side-bet theory. According to this school of thought, an employee commits because of some hidden investments, and based on the calculated costs associated with turnover intentions the individual makes the decision to remain with the employer. Becker’s (1960) argument is based on the premise that as the employee accumulates certain investments over the employment the accumulated costs will make it harder for the employee to disengage from the institution. Therefore, the employee is likely to stay with the organization when the side-bets increase the costs associated with discontinuing a related action (Allen & Meyer 1990). Becker (1960) further argues that an individual turns down a better job opportunity when the associated costs of leaving the current employer are higher than the perceived alternative job opportunities. Thus, the individual’s calculative
costs to stay or leave the employer are viewed as commitment (continuance commitment).

The behavioral school of thought views organizational commitment from a behavioral perspective by using the concept of investments to direct the individual’s behavior. Scholl (1981) views organizational commitment as a stabilizing force that ties the employee to the organization, and acts to maintain behavioral direction. Shepherd and Mathews (2000) view organizational commitment as a function of the costs and rewards associated with an employer, thus, as in Becker’s (1960) view, commitment is a calculative term and is a behavioral trait. Some of the potential investments made during the course of employment may include seniority, years-of-experience on the job, education and training received-on-the job, relationship with coworkers, and embedded social identification with the particular organization (Busch et al. 1998). Perceived costs may include loss of attractive compensation and benefits, disruption of work relationships, and the effort expended in the search of a new job.

Employees make calculated decisions to remain with an organization by comparing the investments made to the employment and the perceived costs of leaving current employment. As an employee’s experiences become specific to the particular organization, the individual may find it difficult to move to another organization. These costs act as a binding mechanism for the individual to remain with the current organization because of the accrued costs over the employment period with the current organization. The force that ties individuals to behavioral acts when organizations make side-bets for employees through management practices is regarded as behavioral commitment (Reichers 1985). However, Meyer et al. (2007) report that commitment changes with the level of behavioral support experienced by the employee. Becker et al. (1996) argue that the relationship between commitment and behavior is strong when the focus of the commitment and behavior are consistent. Thus, the foci with the greatest psychological effect on behavior, fosters commitment.

Organizational commitment viewed as a uni-dimensional construct focuses only on employees’ affective attachment to the organization. In the behavioral school of thought, Becker (1960) argues that when offered a better alternative from other organizations, the individual employee will choose to decline because of the desire to retain the sets of rewards from the present job. Thus, the individual’s decision to remain with his or her current employing institution is to secure some types of investments. Alternatively, an employee may choose to stay with the organization either because of the perception of a lack of alternative
employment, or a calculation of an emotional side-bet (Torka 2004) such as lost of prestige through separation with the current institution. In general, behavioral commitment researchers appear to link employment conditions to the behavioral pattern of the employee and the effect of the behavior patterns on the employee’s attitude toward the organization.

Another school of thought views organizational commitment as an employee’s rational or attitudinal behavior. Attitudinal commitment originates from the studies of Porter (1981), and Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997). The three-dimensional scales of normative, continuance and affective commitment developed by Meyer and Allen in 1991 views commitment to bind an individual to the organization and thereby reduces turnover. The three components bear some relation to each other but are also distinguishable from each other. As Meyer and Allen (1997) claim, an employee’s relationship with the organization reflects diverse degrees in all three dimensions.

Affective commitment is reflected in the individual’s identification with the employer’s goals and values (Meyer & Smith 2000). Allen and Meyer (1990) believe that workplaces that encourage comfort and self-efficacy significantly enhance affective commitment. Certain organizational life factors such as job challenge, goal difficulty, role clarity, goal clarity, peer cohesion, equity, management, participation, feedback, and dependability cultivate affective commitment (Meyer & Allen 1997). Thus an employee with stronger affective commitment tends to form a stronger identification with the organization and becomes more involved with the particular firm (Buck & Watson 2002). Unlike continuance commitment, an individual who develops affective commitment component will stay in the organization because of the desire to, as he or she identifies with the goals and values of the organization. Continuance commitment is also seen as a behavioral view of commitment describing a faculty member’s behavior in terms of making a calculation on certain investments made in the business school (Becker 1960). Alternative employment opportunities may also develop continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen 1991). Thus continuance commitment is calculative, because of the individual’s perception of weighing the risks and costs associated with changing employer (Meyer & Allen 1997). Therefore, continuance commitment is a result of the calculative cost that ties an employee to the organization (Meyer & Allen 1991). Normative commitment reflects the faculty member’s feeling of obligation and sense of responsibility to continue employment with the current employer (Meyer & Allen 1997). The internalized feeling of responsibility and commitment helps the faculty member to
maintain membership with the particular organization (Allen & Meyer 1990). Employees may also feel the need to remain with the organization because of work culture and other acceptable social norms experienced (Wasti 2005, Yao & Wang 2008).

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) develop a multidimensional framework, almost similar to Meyer and Allen (1991) multidimensional constructs of commitment, assuming organizational commitment to be attitudinal. Their framework categorizes commitment as compliance, identification and internalization. Compliance reflects the way that an individual designs his or her behavior to reap certain rewards from the organization. Identification occurs when an individual, influenced by the organization’s attractive values and goals, designs his or her behavior to maintain the relationship with the organization, although the individual may not personally adopt the values and goals. Internalization occurs when the individual adapts his or her behavior to meet the organization’s values and goals. The attitude guides the behavior.

The attitudinal school of thought views organizational commitment as an employee’s attitude. An employee, who desires to remain with the organization, will accept organizational goals and values, exert higher levels of effort to achieve the goals, decrease absenteeism, turnover intentions discouraged, and increase organizational performance. Researchers in this school of thought broaden the focus of organizational commitment to encompass different aspects of attachment that influence behavior and attitudes. Several researchers under organization commitment theory consider commitment to be a force that directs behavior and draws the individual to a course of action (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001). Hence, organizational commitment depends on the strength of the employee’s personal obligation.

Employees with strong affective commitment and feelings of obligation (normative commitment) are more willing to do what it takes to support the organization’s goal (Meyer & Smith 2000, Mowday 1998). In contrast, employees with strong continuance commitment stay with the employer because the cost of leaving the firm is higher, and thus may only perform the minimum requirements to retain employment (Meyer et al. 2004). Although an employee with both affective and continuance commitment components may be less likely to leave the organization, attitudes toward work may be quite different. Mowday (1998) claims that employees tend to bond with the organization when organizational values and cultures are strong. Despite the varied definitions of commitment to the organization, the common theme of commitment is the binding force between
the employee and the employer (Abu Elanain 2010) or an attitude associating the employee to the organization. This attitude displays behaviors such as absenteeism, turnover, and job satisfaction (Iqbal et al. 2011).

Both attitudinal and behavioral schools of thought assume calculative motivations. Behavioral commitment targets mainly the calculation of the perceived costs of leaving, while attitudinal commitment focuses on the long-term rewards of staying with the organization. Mowday et al. (1982) suggest that behavioral and attitudinal commitments interconnect. Attitudinal commitment creates favourable behavior, and behavioral commitment in turn reinforces the attitudes of commitment. For instance, in the three bases of commitment to the organization (Meyer & Allen 1991), the component of affective commitment is compatible with the attitudinal perspective of organizational commitment, while the continuance and normative components represent the behavioral aspects of organizational commitment.

Many studies highlight the benefits of a committed workforce and the role of management practice in encouraging and enhancing commitment to the organization (Iles et al. 1990, Meyer & Smith 2000). However, management practices implemented in the academic sector should also consider the specific character of academics (Adriaensens et al. 2006) because, unlike administrative staff, faculty members have to balance their time amongst teaching, doing research, participating in community activities and doing institutional community administrative duties (Busch et al. 1998).

3.7 Conceptualizing commitment of business school faculty

The review of the literature provided an analysis of faculty commitment, which is the key aspect of this study. The normative consensus from previous literature seems to be that faculty commitment in higher education, particularly business schools, is beneficial to both the individual and to the institution. From the institution’s perspective, faculty commitment has potentially significant consequences on institutional effectiveness. From the faculty’s perspective, commitment relates to positive individual outcomes, such as self-efficacy and an enhanced sense of belonging. Based on the theoretical and empirical support of organizational commitment, this research’s preliminary framework focuses on faculty perceptions of organizational life factors experienced in business schools of publicly (federal) and privately controlled (owed and locally controlled by individual emirates or local organizations) institutions. This study takes only an
account of the perceptions shared by the respondents and therefore does not provide scientific measures of faculty commitment. This section aims to provide a conceptual model to better understand the experiences of a number of participants in business schools. The argument and conceptualization presented holds practical relevance for business school faculty and administration.

The review of the literature provides an analysis of faculty commitment in current academic institutions, where the job market has been transformed into a job system. According to Schultz (2005), the corporate university model adopted by many academic institutions is exploiting their contingent faculty. In an attempt to increase financial flexibility, contingent faculty members (part-time, non-tenured, adjunct, and graduate students) flood the academic job system. Institutions exploit contingent faculty in both salary compensation and teaching load. According to Entin (2005), along with the flexible employment nature of the appointment, contingent faculty also have to live with low pay, low chances of participation in institutional governance, high job turnover, minimal funding for research and professional development, and increased individual attention to students in terms of mentoring and advising. A decrease in reciprocal trust and commitment accompanies the change in employment type from the traditional long-term based psychological contract to short-term reciprocal interests between business schools and academics (Petriglieri & Petriglieri 2010). In such an employment condition, contingent faculty members suffer from a lack of pedagogical innovation and scholarly growth. Contingent faculty members lack the academic freedom that tenured faculty members have and are vulnerable to both “student complaint and the slightest administrative disapproval” (Entin 2005: 9).

The traditional academics shared governance model in research universities has transformed into a typical business corporation, in which course curriculum and institutional activities are managed by a top-down pyramid style of authority (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013b) governing the faculty. This transformation places challenges on faculty to commit to the institution. Since contingent faculty members are on fixed-term appointments they will be less dependent on the institution and will therefore switch employers more easily whenever faculty members’ professional and personal expectations are not fulfilled (Cohen 2007b). Hence, with the new job system, the academic institutions nowadays are not genuinely looking for commitment as they increasingly employ contingent faculty instead of tenure-track faculty. With increased managerial controls and a lack of shared governance in institutional activities, what benefits do faculty members
receive by committing to the institution? Furthermore, contingent faculty are frequently not involved in institutional governance, therefore there is not much loss to the institution when contingent individuals leave. These observations seem paradoxical in regard to faculty organizational commitment.

As research has shown, faculty tenure can be a form of job security for tenured faculty. By contrast, contingent appointment types are temporary, usually on a fixed term. Faculty can be terminated anytime without due process, and contracts may not be renewed. Contingent faculty members are expected to conduct high teaching loads and to do research, with few or no research support from the institution. If institutions aspire to compete in the university ranking systems that consider research publications to be important then why are institutions not providing faculty members with enough time to pursue research? Time as a limited resource can create tension between teaching and research for faculty with higher teaching loads, which in turn lead to lower research productivity (Hardré et al. 2011). Furthermore, teaching and research are the two principal activities of academic institutions and the principal elements of the faculty’s profession (Ginsberg 2011). How is this paradox explained?

Faculty’s affiliation to the institution is progressively transformed into a work relationship (Musselin 2007). Therefore, academics’ duties and responsibilities are not just defined by their profession but also by the work arrangements offered by the institution. In addition, the appointment type and the employment contract that institutions offer to faculty may influence the individual’s closeness and work relationship in the institution. With a high-demand in teaching and a similar push for research publications, and with treatment as subservient workers, what are faculty members’ perceptions of organizational commitment to the institution? Ultimately, these issues deal with the paradox related to the institutions: expecting faculty to fulfill organizational goals and values and produce quality research publications for their research university while employing contingent faculty who have high teaching loads and no tenure.

In view of the paradoxical situations facing contingent faculty, this study draws from the work of Meyer and Allen’s (1991) the three-component model of organizational commitment: affective, continuance and normative commitment. The first component, affective commitment is defined as "positive feelings of identification with attachment to, and involvement in the work organization" (Meyer & Allen 1984: 375). The second component, continuance commitment is defined as "the extent to which employees feel committed to their organizations by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving (for example,
The third component, normative commitment is defined as the faculty’s feelings of obligation to stay with the institution.

Faculty’s affective commitment will be assessed by the perceptions of attachment to the institution in return for the rewards that they received for their contributions, and the support that the institution provides. Continuance commitment will be assessed by the faculty’s perceptions on the calculated costs associated with leaving the institution (Meyer & Allen 1997). Faculty normative commitment will be assessed by the perceptions of obligations to maintain membership with the institution. This study uses data from the interviews collected from participants to identify interconnections among faculty members’ perceptions and beliefs on the evolvement of organizational commitment, adapting the commitment constructs to faculty’s experience of organization life in academic institutions. The following section discusses the justification used by this study for selecting the three-component model to examine commitment.

### 3.7.1 Choice of the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment

The 1991 Meyer and Allen’s three-component model of commitment underwent the most extensive empirical evaluation and became widely recognized in organizational commitment literature (Allen & Meyer 1996). With the multicultural workforce of faculty members and a transitional employment environment in UAE institutions, the model can be beneficial to discern if the multidimensional concepts developed in North America and in stable employment environments are applicable to the culture and environment in the UAE (Allen & Meyer 1996). “The models of commitment have been developed and tested in Western countries. There is a need for more systematic research to determine whether these models apply elsewhere” (Meyer & Allen 1997: 218).

Commitment as a psychological bond that characterizes the faculty’s attitudes to the business school has an effect on individuals’ behavior in maintaining their position as a member of the institution (Meyer & Allen 1991). Organizational commitment is an attitude because it relates to the faculty member’s mind-set (Allen & Meyer 1990). Organizational commitment refers to the attitude that directs behavior as the faculty member identifies with the institution’s goals and becomes involved with the particular business school (Meyer & Allen 1991, 1997, Porter 1981). The level of commitment therefore, depends on the degree to which...
a faculty member identifies with the employer’s goals and the inclination to retain membership (Blau & Boal 1987). Commitment also reflects the extent to which the faculty member is willing to remain in the organization (Zeffane & Al Zarooni 2008).

According to the three-component model, faculty may experience three dimensions of commitment. Each commitment dimension may be experienced as an outcome of different experiences in the business school environment. Each dimension of the commitment ties the individual in different ways to the business school, and will have different effects on the faculty’s attitude in the academic environment (Meyer et al. 2002). For example, the implication of personal investments in organizational commitment reflects a three-dimensional scale of commitment. Faculty who are attached to the business school (affective commitment), value the investments made to the school (continuance commitment) and may feel a moral obligation to maintain membership (normative commitment) with the business school and show higher performance. At the same time, if business schools continue only to reward faculty on research based solely on scientific rigor instead of contributions to business ‘best practices’, faculty may not be as committed to produce research that contributes to the professional labor markets and employers (affective, normative).

3.7.2 Affective commitment component

Affective commitment is drawn from an employee’s emotion and attachment to a particular group (business school) in the institution (Meyer & Smith 2000, Jones 2006), whereby the employee expresses feelings of warmth, affection, loyalty, and belongingness (Shaffer & Harrison 1998). The faculty member’s emotional attachment to the business school, characterized by a strong identification with the department and an inclination to get involved (Meyer & Allen 1991) so as to contribute to the accomplishment of the goals in the business school, signifies affective commitment (Meyer & Allen 1997). Allen & Meyer (1990) believes that organizational life experiences at business school academic workplaces that encourage comfort and self-efficacy significantly enhance affective commitment. Thus work experiences that meet faculty expectations and provide individual goal attainment, such as feelings of fairness, rewards (Neumann & Finaly-Neumann 1990) for research, trust (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991, McElroy 2001), advancement opportunities, degree of autonomy (Meyer & Allen 1997, Pfeffer & Viega 1999) in task and intellectual work, and participation in decision-
making (McElroy 2001) can cultivate affective commitment. Felfe et al. (2008) claims that faculty will be more willing to accept any disadvantages, costs and compromises with the form of employment if the individual’s values are fulfilled or personal needs are satisfied. Thus, faculty members with higher affective commitment will adhere more to the business school’s policies and will want to remain in employment (Mowday et al. 1982). This sense of attachment constitutes a sense of shared identity between the faculty and the business school. Quite often, this shared identity includes shared values and provide motivation for the faculty to contribute to the work process. Mowday et al. (1982) claim that faculty with high affective commitment adheres to the department’s policy and results in lower turnover rate.

3.7.3 Continuance commitment component

Continuance commitment refers to a need to stay with the current employer (Allen & Meyer 1990) as a result of the faculty’s insight of the costs (expenses and consequences) associated with leaving the business school (Meyer & Allen 1997). The perceived costs associated with turnover intentions include the work-related elements. Work-related elements that satisfy the faculty’s needs include attractive economic compensation, years of service at the business school and promotion opportunities, perceived organizational support (Kipkebut 2010), job security (Fernandes & Awamleh 2006) and role clarity (Meyer & Allen 1997). When an individual gains insight into the loss of investments associated with turnover intentions, continuance commitment generates (Becker 1960, Meyer & Allen 1997). These investments can be financial or non-financial, such as lack of skill transferability, organizational tenure, and retirement payments (Becker 1960). The continuance commitment component focuses on the employee’s decision to stay because of the perceived costs and benefits accompanying the intentions to leave (Meyer & Smith 2000, Jones 2006) or rather, the need to remain (Smeenk et al. 2006). An employee calculates the extraneous interests lost in leaving the business school, in terms of salary, pensions, tax savings, job stability, seniority, employment continuity, family concerns, job security, results of previous job search attempts, degree of the marketable skills, and perceptions of alternative employment opportunities (Meyer & Allen 1997). Meyer and Allen (1991) believes that unlike individuals with affective commitment, individuals with high continuance commitment stay with the business school because of the accumulated investments with the current institution, not because they want to
and will expend energy on behalf of the business school, but because they believe it is in their interest to do so. Therefore, based on this view, faculty with continuance commitment may remain with the organization but may not necessarily be productive (Reichers 1985).

### 3.7.4 Normative commitment component

Normative commitment component pertains to the employee’s obligation to be part of the business school (Bergman 2006). Normative commitment occurs when the faculty member feels that he ought to stay because of social responsibility (Meyer & Allen 1997). An individual identifies with the organization’s values based on one’s own moral standards, organizational socialization or cultural influence (Kipkebut 2010). Normative commitment also develops when employees experience cultural or organizational socialization (Scholl 1981, Meyer & Allen 1991). For example, a good relationship with supervisors encourages commitment from faculty members (Downs et al. 1996). The obligation to remain emphasizes that the individual is remaining loyal to the organization (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001). McElroy (2001) believes that perceptions of organizational support and justice, and participation in decision-making could create a sense of obligation. Individuals with strong normative commitment are more willing to expend their energy on behalf of the business school because they feel they ought to do so. They feel morally obliged either “through a process of socialization within the society or the organization” (Meyer & Allen 1991: 88). Reichers (1985) believes that even if employees stay but resent their obligation, they are more productive than those who stay out of continuance commitment.

### 3.7.5 Integration of the commitment components

The distinctive difference among the three commitment components is the nature of the underlying mind-set (Allen & Meyer 1990). The three commitment components are dimensions of organizational commitment because the employee-employer relationship reflects varying degrees in all three (Meyer & Allen 1991). Therefore, commitment links the faculty member to the institution in a multifaceted relationship. Enhancement of both normative and affective commitment benefits both the faculty member and the business school. Attainment of affective commitment will decrease absenteeism and turnover, and
in turn increase both, organizational citizenship as the faculty member’s motivation increases and the inclination to contribute to the organization’s effectiveness (Meyer & Allen 1991). However, faculty members developing normative commitment will experience an increase in job performance and organizational membership, a decrease in absenteeism (Allen & Meyer 1996) but may also increase resentment (Reichers 1985). Conversely, institutions do not benefit from the faculty member’s continuance commitment because continuance commitment will eventually lead to a decrease in motivation as frustration increases (Reichers 1985), resulting in more absenteeism and fewer incentives for career progression (Allen & Meyer 1996).

This study’s focus is on organizational commitment as a multidimensional construct developed by faculty from their experiences of the organizational life in the business school. Many researchers agree that the multidimensional commitment construct demonstrates different correlations with different factors of organizational life. Fig. 8 below depicts the conceptual model for this study.

Fig. 8. Conceptual model.
4 Methodology

This chapter provides a theoretical rationale for the selection of the central concepts used in this study. Discussions will include details regarding the population of interest, selection of research subjects, and the units of analysis. Also included are the details of the data collection methods and instruments, techniques and procedures for analysing the data, and trustworthiness of the research process adopted.

4.1 Qualitative research design

As opposed to using quantitative research, this study uses a qualitative research design to place emphasis on the socially constructed nature of reality by seeking answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning (Denzin & Lincoln 2005). The qualitative research design enables this study to use inductive analysis to understand, describe, and interpret questions about the nature of the phenomena from the participants’ views (Leedy & Omrod 2005). Conversely, a quantitative research design uses close-ended questions and adopts the deductive process using statistical procedures to analyze and measure the variables while developing hypotheses from the data (Leedy & Omrod 2005).

![Fig. 9. Qualitative research approach.](image)
This study chose the qualitative design. Based on the research problem, the goal of the research, the audience for the study, the background, my experience, and the scholarly contribution, the selected research design for this study (Denzin & Lincoln 2005) is as shown in Fig. 9 above. With the focus on this study placed on understanding the perceptions and lived experiences of commitment from business school faculty members in UAE institutions, there are no numerical data to analyze, variables, or statistical procedures. Besides, the researcher’s experiences and training in research design has an influence on the chosen research design.

“An individual trained in technical, scientific writing, statistics, and computer statistical programs and familiar with quantitative journals in the library would most likely choose the quantitative design. On the other hand, individuals who enjoy writing in a literary way or conducting personal interviews or making up-close observations may gravitate to the qualitative approach.” (Creswell 2009: 19.)

The chosen qualitative research design enables this study to use open-ended questions and reports the results gathered from participants, through words, represented either “in visual displays or through narrative devices” (Miles & Huberman 1994: 7). The open-ended questions provide this study with the opportunity to collect rich details of real-life circumstances and settings as the researcher “sustained interaction with the people being studied in their own language and on their own turf” (Tashakkori & Teddlie 2003: 12). Results of the findings contain thorough descriptions that interpret the meanings of how participants make sense of their experiences (Dey 1993). Besides, interactions with the research subjects can be more personal, and respondents will feel comfortable to tell their stories and reflect on their experiences. Reflections from participants are useful data for the study to understand the participants’ actions (Baxter & Jack 2008).

4.1.1 Research paradigm

Qualitative research design facilitates this study to use the constructivist research paradigm in viewing the complex, real-world phenomena occurring in a natural setting (Leedy & Omrod 2005) in order to gain an understanding of how individuals “make sense” of their environment and experiences (Groat & Wang 2002: 177). Each story told has a different viewpoint as the participants perceive
and define the situations and their own intentions, according to their perceptions and understanding of their own motivations, and the contexts in which they act. The experiences of each participant also occur in different settings and are bounded by the time and activity of the participant with the employing institution. Their experiences are rooted in the society and the cultural settings in which they live. As experiences are both relative and dependent on the individual’s perspective, the meanings, and the views reported by the participants are also varied and subjective. The background and experiences of the faculty members may affect the interpretation and impression of the circumstances that they describe (Denzin & Lincoln 2005). At the same time, the participants may also present their experiences to confirm the researcher’s expected outcome.

The strength of qualitative research design strategy facilitates “exploration of a phenomenon within its context” (Baxter & Jack 2008: 544) and enables this study to yield data that provide details and depth to create an understanding of the phenomena (organizational commitment) and lived experiences. This study is not looking for the participants’ rational account of their intentions in the experiences nor to infer intentions from their behavior (Groat & Wang 2002). Therefore, this study narrates the participants’ experiences as told without any analysis made to the meaning of a particular phenomenon. With the flexibility in the design and procedures of qualitative method the research process can easily be adjusted if necessary (Blessing & Chakrabarti 2009).

4.1.2 Strategy of inquiry

A qualitative research design provides several strategies of inquiry research method to give specific direction for design procedure. This study considers the narrative research strategy of inquiry with a phenomenological angle, using in-depth interview sessions to focus on the concepts and the experiences of multiple individuals about the phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, Creswell 2007). This study commits to case-based situations that direct attention to the specifics of the cases (Denzin & Lincoln 2005).

The multiple case-based approach to studying a number of faculty members gives a better understanding of the phenomenon and how faculty members perceive commitment in the UAE business school context. The focus of this study is to answer “how” and “why” questions without manipulating the behavior of those involved and to cover contextual conditions relevant to the phenomenon studied (Baxter & Jack 2008). Though the use of multiple case-based situations
The approach is extremely time-consuming and expensive, the evidence drawn from the multiple case-based situations are robust and reliable (Yin 2009).

The multiple cases used in this study are grounded in real-life situations and are therefore the ideal mode to motivate the research questions. By applying the inductive research strategy, the rich descriptions from each case offer inspirations for new ideas and therefore “sharpen existing theory by pointing to gaps.” Consequently, the study can also employ the ideas from each case to provide illustrations when making a conceptual contribution to the theory. Although the individual cases do not provide enough evidence to prove a theory, a single case can however “sometimes suffice to falsify theories, as a single counterexample is enough.” (Siggelkow 2007: 21.)

With the nature of this study being exploratory in some way, the process of facilitating the data to speak for itself further supports a qualitative method of inquiry. The use of in-depth interview sessions is appropriate for this study because the interviews help in the understanding of lived experiences and perceptions, as recurring themes occur. The emergent themes from the participants’ experiences are relevant to the phenomenon and are used for comparing the experiences. Thus, the process of interviewing can provide rich insight for the study. The collected data are read and analyzed using narrative strategy to “describe the case in sufficient descriptive narrative so that readers can experience these happenings vicariously and draw their own conclusions” (Denzin & Lincoln 2005: 450).

Qualitative narrative strategy facilitates this study to narrate what the participants experienced and how they experienced it, instead of interpreting the meaning of their lived experiences and describing the essence of their experiences about the organizational commitment phenomenon (Creswell 2007). The focus of this study in using the narrative approach is to give meaning to the participants’ experiences by narrating their stories to understand a concept or an experience as well as to communicate a point of view and why the narrative is worth telling. As Denzin & Lincoln (2005) claimed, there are two parts in a narrative research. First is the story, the chain of events namely, the what, in a narrative. Second, there is a discourse, the how, in a narrative whereby the reader gains awareness of what happened in the course of the events.
4.2 Selection of cases

This study uses a cross-sectional study of academic teaching employees from three public- and three private-controlled universities in UAE. Public-controlled universities are also known as federal institutions, and funded by the UAE Federal Government through the MoHESR. Private-controlled universities fall under two categories: either owned and locally controlled by individual emirates, local organizations or from abroad by foreign institutions that established branch campuses in the UAE. For the purpose of this study, the cases selected are from public-controlled, and private-controlled universities that are owned and locally controlled by individual emirates or local organizations.

Owing to the corporate governance of institutions in the UAE, where permission to collect data on a business school requires an extensive bureaucratic process, this study selects the unit of analysis to focus on individual faculty members instead of the business school itself. Fig. 10 below shows the unit of analysis and purposeful sampling this study uses.

![Fig. 10. Purposeful sampling.](image)

4.2.1 Unit of analysis

The population of interest or the unit of analysis in this study is individual faculty members. The participants for this study consist of both expatriate and UAE
national faculty (teaching employees) drawn from the business schools of public- and private-controlled institutions in UAE. The reason for including UAE national faculty is to help put the expatriate faculty members’ comments into perspective. The two institution sectors may have different contexts, which is key to the meaning conveyed by the participants. During the systematic selection of participants, this study considers the following characteristics: faculty, employment, nationality, and institution.

Faculty members must hold the academic rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Instructors, Lecturers, or Senior Lecturers. Participants must serve as faculty in public- or private-controlled institutions in UAE. Each faculty member must be a full-time academic and teaching employee or an ex-faculty of an institution. The nationality characteristic is split between faculty members who have the UAE citizenship status and expatriates (of any nationalities). The institution is by sector: publicly or privately controlled universities (UAE Interact 2013). The sample considers the number of faculty members to select within each group, the quantity of representation within each institution sector, and the faculty representation within one particular institution. Each participant is the subject of a case for this study. The rationale for choosing 12 case-based situations for this study is to ensure certainty of the results.

4.2.2 Identification of participants

This study makes purposeful sampling to select faculty from both sectors, publicly and privately controlled institutions, because organizational life may differ between sectors. The goal of doing a purposeful sample is to ensure that the cases obtained are rich in information for the study (Sandelowski 2000). This study targets faculty members from six institutions: three from publicly and three from privately controlled universities. This study initially sent a research invitation (see Appendix 3. Invitation to Participate in Research) to 60 faculty members in the six institutions. With a zero population of UAE national faculty members in privately controlled institutions, and the lack of participation from those in publicly controlled institutions, only four UAE national faculty members responded. One UAE national, previously a faculty member at a publicly controlled university initially agreed but later declined. Another UAE national faculty who is a full-time faculty at a publicly controlled university graciously apologized. The participants who consented to take part in the research are located in four cities in UAE: Abu Dhabi, Dubai, Al Ain, and Sharjah.
Table 4. Participant faculty by institution types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Expatriate Faculty</th>
<th>UAE National Faculty</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public-controlled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private-controlled</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4 above, the sample is mostly composed of expatriate faculty members. The sample is also heavily weighted with faculty members from publicly controlled institutions. The sample consists of 12 faculty members, of which 10 are expatriates and two are UAE nationals. Of the 10 expatriate faculty members, six are from public-controlled and four from private-controlled institutions. Both UAE national faculty members are from publicly controlled institutions. Out of the 10 expatriate participants four are ex-faculty members. Out of the 12 participants, three are female faculty (two are from public-controlled, and one from private-controlled institutions) and nine are male faculty (four from public-controlled, and three from private-controlled institutions). The 12 participants are distributed between the two sectors, of which eight faculty members are from public-controlled and four faculty members from private-controlled institutions. To protect the participants’ confidentiality and identity, this study uses pseudonyms for both the participants’ and the universities’ names. Thus, in the public sector, four participants are from Large National University, three from National Satellite Campus, and one from Small Public University. In the private sector, two participants are from Small Private University, one from Private American University, and one from Small Local University. To overcome the lack of participants from UAE national faculty, expatriate faculty members answered an additional set of questions to identify their perceptions of the differences found in employment conditions between expatriates and national academic labor. At the same time two informants from outside the business school disciplines provided further information on the employment conditions in UAE to strengthen the research.

All participants either hold a doctoral degree or are currently doing a doctoral degree. Both expatriate and UAE national participants have academic experiences outside the UAE, in countries such as North America, Europe, and Asia. The length of service at a particular institution in the UAE for all participants range from one to 12 years, while the total time in academia ranges from two to 20 years. The participants are in the age range of 30 to 60 years. Each participant undergoes either a face-to-face or Internet-based (email) interview. A detailed list of the participants by institution is shown in Appendix 4. List of Participants.
two informants who are used in this study to help understand, interpret or develop interviewee comments are excluded from the list because they did not undergo formal interviews.

4.3 Data Collection

Data collection based on interviews is both extensive and time-consuming, but it is the main data-gathering method for this study. Fig. 11 below shows the interview techniques, protocols, and instruments that this study uses when collecting data.

![Data collection techniques table]

To best capture the detailed experiences and perceptions of organizational commitment, this study employs interviewing techniques to gather information from the participants. Interviews provide a framework for the respondents to express their own understandings in their own terms on the thoughts, opinions, beliefs, and events. However, any data that cannot be observed in the interviews pose a challenge for the interviewer. The interviewer also faces the challenge of keeping the interviewee focused on relevant issues to discuss.

The data for this study are collected in four steps: a pre-interview process and discussions, followed by the main recorded interview session, some follow-up questions at a later stage after the interview, several informal discussions with informants to help interpret or develop interviewee comments.
4.3.1 Pre-interview process and discussions

This study adheres to the regulations and guidelines prescribed by Oulu University concerning maintenance of ethical standards, consent, and agreement to carry out face-to-face interviews with the participants. Interviews are pre-arranged (see Appendix 3. Invitation to Participate in Research). To ensure effective consent and to maximize the scheduling process, electronic mail and telephone are the communication techniques used to schedule interviews with participants. The interview locations and timings are agreed at the convenience of the participants. In general, all chosen interview settings are comfortable and the participants freely share their experiences.

This study duly ensures the research protocols on confidentiality and permission for doing the interviews. At the time of inviting participants, and prior to the start of each interview, the participants are given a brief description of the nature of the study and the purpose of the interview. Additionally, at the interview session, the participants are asked to sign an interview release agreement (see Appendix 5. Interview Release Agreement) confirming his or her consent to doing the interview, the recording of the conversation, use of the information, and protection of the respondent’s identity. To develop a rapport with the participant at the onset of the interview sessions, I (the interviewer) begin with some social talk, pre-interview conversations/discussions followed by demographic questions. Demographic and background questions include: age, nationality, years of service as faculty in current institution, total years of service in the faculty role, previous education taken, faculty positions in other universities, and country issuing the doctoral degree. Some of the demographic data are not shared in the study for confidentiality purpose. The minimal demographic data of the participants is in anticipation, of making an interpretation in trend if deemed necessary.

In the initial contact, a few participants mentioned some frustration with their institutions, while some other participants mentioned in the pre-interview discussions that they felt let down, one-way or the other, by the institution. As previous researchers note, disillusionment in contexts like this is generally related to unfairness in distribution of benefits created by high performance individual (Pfeffer 1998, Sayli & Görmüş 2009), change in organizational culture or goal displacement (Blau & Boal 1987), poor working conditions and unsatisfactory pay (Kipkebut 2010), or unfair management practices, such as downsizing (Meyer & Allen 1997), which in turn produces negative reactions among employees (Bowen & Ostroff 2004). Since it has been well established that institutional or
corporate environments can drive feelings of disillusion, and since almost all participants mentioned the issue unprompted prior to interviews, I included a question on disillusion to probe the issue further. In the interviews, the participants were prompted with three open-ended questions, the first two seeking general background and experiential reflections, and the last one explicitly opening up the question of disappointment and disillusionment:

- What were you doing prior to joining the current institution?
- What were your experiences with this institution?
- What disillusion, if any, do you have with the institution?

The open-ended questions also make the participants feel free to share what they want to tell. To focus on the respondents’ lived experiences and perceptions rather than theory, this study also allows the interviewees to talk freely with minimal interval prompting.

4.3.2 Main interview session

In the main interview session, I was the interviewer at all the interviews. In a couple of interviews, a participant observer is present. At the interview session, I sit across the table from the interviewee with the microphone placed in the center of the table for maximum recording. The microphone records the conversations to the computer. The recorded interviews capture the thoughts and intonation of the respondents. The use of the recording equipment during the interview enables me to concentrate on the interviewee and the direction of the interview. The audio recordings provide an accurate rendition of the conversation made (Yin 2009), thus ensuring credibility of data. In each interview I also take some field notes: notes to ask for clarifications or to delve into deeper detail on the issues brought forth by the respondents, and notes of the main issues shared by the respondents in case the recording for the session fails.

In this study, I use semi-structured, face-to-face interviews with open-ended questions and an interview guide for 10 participants, and two Internet-based participants. The interview guide is a list of questions generated prior to the interview to explore some issues during the interviews. The list of questions ensures that each interview covers consistent topics (Blessing & Chakrabarti 2009). This study finds the interview guide to facilitate a smooth flow of conversation and draws detailed information from the respondents. The very essence of using semi-structured interviewing technique in this study is to
establish a “human-to-human” relationship with the participants and to understand rather than to impose any a priori categorization that may limit their views. The semi-structured interview style also facilitates participants to keep talking. Throughout each interview, I adhered to two important principles from Groat and Wang (2002): understand the dynamics of the conceptualization of organizational commitment from the participant’s point of view, and balance the respondents’ insider’s perspectives with existing literature and theory.

The face-to-face interviews help to create a rapport with the participants and to gain their trust so they may share their experiences (Denzin & Lincoln 2005). I also use probes in the face-to-face interview session to either interpose to get a better clarification of a point made, or to encourage the respondent to keep talking (Zeisel 2006). The interview sessions use a number of probes: reflective, situational and emotion. For instance, to gain more detail and depth about an issue and to stimulate the respondents to express themselves more fully, I apply reflective probes. To help the participants remember more details, and to specify a particular stimulus situation, I use situational probes. To explore in-depth the respondent’s expressed feeling and to determine how strongly the participant feels about the answer given, I use emotion probes.

In comparison to face-to-face interviews, there is a definite saving in the cost and time involved in Internet-based interviews. While there is a saving in travel time and time transcribing the recording, the focus is on getting results instead of establishing a rapport with the participants. Internet-based interviews fail to establish the interviewer-interviewee “relationship” and “living the moment” while gathering the information (Denzin & Lincoln 2005: 721). However, Internet-based interviews do allow me more time to phrase follow-up questions properly. Responses in Internet-based interviews tend to be brief, despite additional follow-up questions to elaborate. Thus, the Internet-based responses have a weak contribution to the thick descriptions of the participant’s subjective experiences. Nevertheless, the responses are accurately captured and recorded.

At the end of each interview, I thank the participants for their time and request permissions for future follow-up communications.

4.3.3 Interview follow-up

At the end of each interview, the recorded interviews are transcribed verbatim. Upon review of all the interview transcripts, the participants are sent, via electronic mail, a set of follow-up questions to resolve ambiguities or to probe
key issues further. The set of follow-up questions can be seen in Appendix 6. Follow-up Questions.

4.3.4 Informant comments

According to several researchers (Seidler 1974, Bagozzi et al. 1991, Kumar et al. 1993), the informant technique relies on a small number of knowledgeable representatives who observe and articulate social relationships for the researcher. In contrast, case respondents are reacting participants who report their personal feelings, behaviors and reflections. The informant accounts are appropriate when in-depth information about an inquiry cannot be completely expected from case participants. According to Bagozzi et al. (1991: 423), informant methodologies are frequently used “for examining construct validity of concepts in organizational research”. Unlike the respondent approach, in the informant approach, the subject informants do not need to represent all members of each segment of the organization because the sampling of informants considers only “informant perceptions and expertise” rather than whether or not they are part of “a simple universe of members” (Seidler 1974: 817). Kumar et al. (1993) support this view, noting that researchers choose informants because of their knowledge about the issues being researched and their ability and willingness to communicate about them, rather than their function as representatives of the institution under study.

However, the guidelines for selecting the informants must be observed to ensure that the selected informants have thorough knowledge and abilities to articulate the institutional structural pattern (Seidler 1974). Therefore, Seidler (1974) recommended that to ensure appropriate sample on which to test the credibility and confirmability of informant responses, the characteristics of the informants are as follows:

- To ensure representativeness, informants must belong to the social category of inquiry in order to represent the appropriate structure.
- To ensure standardization, informants must have thorough knowledge and the ability to articulate it.
- To eliminate the potential factor relating to difficulty of observation, length of time in the structure is important.
- Informants must have some participatory role in institutional policy decisions in order to reduce the possibility of knowledge deficiencies.
This study uses the informant technique instead of participant observers because of both the sensitivity of the information shared by the respondents, and to protect the respondents’ anonymity. Seidler (1974: 823) states that, “fewer informants and a less rigid return rate are required when informants are known to be objective and questions are not bias-producing”. As Kumar et al. (1993: 1636) clearly noted, it is an enormous effort “to obtain even just a single organizational informant to discuss delicate matters” and excessive time is required to formally assess competency or search for additional knowledgeable informants. Given this difficulty, and since the informants’ role in this study is to supply structural pattern rather than personal attitudes and behaviors, this study selected two informants: one from public- and the other, from private-controlled institutions in order to articulate structural patterns from each sector.

In the present case, the selection of a small number of informants for the analysis is based on the following qualifications:

– To ensure representativeness, the informants chosen must be academics in the UAE institutions, but in a different school discipline from the case participants so that the informants can provide a more wider knowledge of the institutional structure other than the business school.

– To ensure standardization in the selection, the informants are academics with at least six years of experience in the UAE institutions because it will mean that the representatives have more than one employment contractual terms (the first contractual terms for most academics in the UAE institutions are either three or four years) experience and will be more knowledgeable about institutional policy changes as well.

– The chosen informants must have experience in a participatory role in institutional policy decisions (such as chairing or member in university committees) in order to minimize the possibility of knowledge deficiencies.

Both informants have the specific selection qualifications and are knowledgeable about the areas covered in the research, and most important, they are accessible to me, the researcher (Seidler 1974). Thus, this study consults with two faculty members from other disciplines. These two faculty members are assigned pseudonyms, “Informant I” and “Informant II”. The reason for assigning them different pseudonym type from the 12 participants is to make a distinction that the informants, unlike the participants, did not undergo formal interviews. The informants’ role are mainly to help me help clarify ambiguities shared by the 12 participants, interpret or develop interviewee comments, and to shed more light
from a non-business school perspective. The consultation sessions with the informants are conducted informally through some form of discussions and conversations, without disclosure of the source of the subject matter.

4.3.5 Data management

The data collection occurs over a period of four months from 1st March 2012, and ending June 30th 2012. The length of each interview session ranges between 40 minutes and one and a half hours. On average, each interview is typically around one-hour long. Some participants share more than one story; they share experiences with their current institution and experiences with prior institutions. The complete interview schedule for this study is shown in Appendix 4. List of Participants.

The recorded interviews are transcribed verbatim into a Word document at a later date by a third party. The names and organizations in the transcribed interview texts are in pseudonyms. An Excel spreadsheet maintains the identity of each participant with the pseudonyms. The interview transcripts together with responses to follow-up questions amounted to at least 161 pages of text at font 12 size and single line spacing. Additional data collection methods are non-participant observations in the interview session, discussion notes with informants, and a review of information related to the institutions. The files for this research are maintained as follows and shown in Table 5 below:

Table 5. Research files documenting the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File 1 – Field notes</td>
<td>Interview release agreement; participant demographics; roughly written interview notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 2 – Data summaries</td>
<td>Researcher summaries of File 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 3 – Verbatim transcripts of each interview</td>
<td>Transcripts with references made to participant’s name, date, time of interview, and location of interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 4 – Interview transcripts in pseudonyms</td>
<td>Names and organizations in each interview are coded in pseudonyms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 5 – Follow-up questions</td>
<td>Referenced with the sent and response dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File 6 – Data reconstruction</td>
<td>Key points within a single theme for all cases/interviews, interpretations, meanings, relationship across cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the data set for this study comprises of the audio recordings, interview transcripts, field notes, follow-up responses, demographic data, and archival research. The set of data for each respondent includes: when the data was collected, the respondent’s name, and where the interview was recorded.
4.4 Data analysis techniques and procedures

Two approaches for analyzing the text were considered, and the decision was taken to analyze the text manually by thoroughly combing through the data in order to maximize insights to make sense of the participants’ experiences in relation to the context. Software-based analysis was initially considered for reasons of thoroughness and time efficiency, but was ultimately decided against because of its lack of sensitivity to context. Atherton and Elsmore (2007: 68) point out that software tools create their

“... own contexts for the data, via their internal ordering and classification protocols, place extracted data in a next context; that of the software and how it relates to the research question asked by the researcher. The result of extracting data and placing it into the routinized data management system is to remove these data from their contexts, and hence remove much of their meaning. Without an understanding of, and empathy with, this context, researchers risk coming to conclusions and findings that lack “verisimilitude” (the appearance of being true) and “validity”, because they do not make sufficient reference to the context from which the data originated.”

Take for instance, the following chunk of data, transcribed from the recording of an interview with a business school faculty member in UAE:

“... Administrative management was flexible and willing to bend rules to get what needs to be done.” (Dr. Jake)

De-contextualized, the data could easily appear to represent management as cooperative and accommodating, possibly even submissive, and eager to comply with given institutional priorities. There is in fact some ambiguity in this statement. When the data was analyzed with the context in mind – a highly autocratic environment beset with counter-productive bureaucratic processes – the data could instead be understood to mean that management were strong, and were willing both to take risks and to go against the status quo of a rigid bureaucratic environment. The meaning of the statement cannot be correctly conveyed if the data was not analyzed with the institutional context in mind. Overall, the loss of meaning and context accompanying the data reduction process as done by the computer software can easily distance the researcher from the data, something which goes against the grain of the closely observed meaning-centricity at the heart of qualitative research.
Computational tools, such as the standard software packages marketed for data analysis have a tendency to focus on quantity measures rather than on the overall texture of meaning that the data can provide (St. John & Johnson 2000). Computer software also requires that the data entered be structured, thus tending to make the analysis more rigid and inflexible than it might be otherwise, in an attempt to overcome a perceived lack of rigor in qualitative data analysis (Atherton & Elsmore 2007). A particular statement may have two decisions governing the analysis: characterizing a link to be causal or explanatory. Take the following statement from one of the respondent, for instance, from the present study:

“The university used different polices to justify their decisions because the policies for promotions are both conflicting and subjective.” (Dr. Jake)

The researcher took the decision to characterize the link as explanatory rather than causal taking into consideration the context, while the computer-assisted content analysis software would likely have treated the link as causal based on the conjunction “because”.

Other problems with computational methods involve categorization protocols, thematic assignment, and weaknesses in cross-text linkage. These methods also have a tendency to weaken the link between the researcher and the data/analysis. Although the use of software applications may reduce the time that spent on tedious manual tasks, flexibility and thoroughness in data handling, and provide a more visible audit trial in data analysis, the use of standardized software packages for qualitative research “does not stimulate, or drive, consideration of where the researcher is ‘coming from’ and so does not provide a means of dealing with the subjectivity and agenda of the researcher in a reflexive way” (Atherton & Elsmore 2007: 67). As St. John and Johnson (2000: 397) note, “the intellect and integrity that a researcher must bring to research should also be brought to the choice and use of tools and analytical processes.”

Given the foregoing, it was decided that manual researched-specific analysis of the narrative interview data would be, on balance, the best choice in this research context, giving the analysis both the ability to accommodate nuanced context-specific interview statements and the desired interpretative flexibility to accommodate the researcher’s investigative interests and background in human resource management.

Thus, this study adopts the inductive approach to analyze the interview transcripts and field notes to identify patterns in the data by means of thematic
codes. Analysis of data involves more than just describing the data itself, it involves describing the events to which the data refers. The intention of this study is mainly to describe the participants’ discourse of words regarding their experiences of organizational commitment. This study makes no attempts to interpret, explain, understand, or perhaps even predict what the data meant. Based on the research question, this study initially develops three domains: motivations, experiences, and disillusions. The data analysis phase places special attention on the language in the interview texts because the language itself constructs what the study narrates. The context is referenced constantly to help convey the meanings of the participants’ views (Dey 1993). Fig. 12 below shows the approach and steps that this study takes to analyze the qualitative data.

![Fig. 12. Data analysis techniques and procedures.](image)

Upon achieving an understanding of the whole story that develops out of each interview text, this study begins to address each singular excerpt, by writing summaries, coding, writing memos on which data chunks to code or to pull out, and which patterns best summarizes the chunk of code. At the end of each interview, the preliminary interpretations record ideas and notes to initiate the process of analysis and to guide in the development of the next interview. For each interview transcription, the data are assimilated into the narrative outline
(see Appendix 7. Case Narrative Outline Template). Data from each narrative outline are then compiled into a single excel sheet to provide a means to link respondents’ thoughts, and to aid in drawing conclusions on the data. Prior to assigning thematic codes to the text, each case is described in detail using the narrative outline. The case narratives (seen in Chapter 5) are sent to the individuals for feedback, as a form of member check to ensure trustworthiness for the study.

This study uses the data classification method to summarize the volume of data collected in the qualitative study. This study commences with a theoretical framework to provide a structure and give pre-existing specification of categories into which data can be fitted (Hussey & Hussey 1997). To gain an understanding of the pattern of the participants’ views, this study deductively generates themes. Themes are codes assigned to a group of data identified as a “potentially unlimited series of similar observations” (Dey 1993: 20). Each emergent theme has a set of criteria for distinguishing one observation from another to enable comparison of the data within each theme. Each theme is also tightly defined to differentiate the observations, and to distinguish easily the chunks of data from one another. The themes also bring together observations that have similarities or differences. The emergent themes from the data analysis stage make logical associations with the interview questions, the conceptual framework, and the literature review (in Chapter 3).

The analysis stage uses a step-by-step (three-level) process to examine the qualitative data, whereby through the application of thematic codes, data are reduced and analyzed. The first stage of the analysis phase is to read the interview texts and break down the data to classify and later make connections between the classifications.

"Without classifying the data, we have no way of knowing what it is that we are analyzing. Nor can we make meaningful comparisons between different bits of data." (Dey 1993: 40.)

Data from the descriptive responses are analyzed by constantly comparing the line, sentence, and paragraph segments of the interview transcripts to determine a theme that fits the concepts suggested by the data. To identify general patterns, differences, and similarities each theme is constantly compared to all other themes. As a result of the comparison process some themes are renamed. As Miles and Huberman (2005: 67) stated, "If you are being alert about what you are doing, ideas and reactions to the meaning of what you are seeing will well up
steadily.” Comparison of the coding helps to clarify that the assumptions are both implicit to the data and the researcher’s reaction to the information. Therefore, in moving between individual themes and common themes, this study ensures that the case narrations account for the meanings participants attribute to their experiences (Moen 2006). Based on the interview questions, the three domains for the study include motivation to join the institution, experience in the business school that induces commitment or non-commitment, and disillusionments. An initial set of themes emerged from the interview texts with no specific criteria assigned (see Table 6 below).

Table 6. Initial themes developed from the interview transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to join the institution</td>
<td>Salary/Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research funding and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where commitment is experienced</td>
<td>Bureaucratic autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unethical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction with supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision/Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work environment/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusions</td>
<td>Unethical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The initial set of themes is unduly long, making it difficult for distinguishing relevant distinctions between the themes. Therefore, another analysis of the texts is necessary to capture the depth of the data. The second stage of the data analysis ensures that the proposed themes clearly express the meanings of the domains. In this stage, the data are re-analyzed with reference to the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the questions in the interview guide. To avoid bias from the researcher’s own experiences in the UAE, which potentially can lead to identification with the participants’ experiences, in some instances the respondents themselves or a non-participant faculty member is contacted to help verify the generated themes and thus confirm the respondents’ intention of the data. Themes from each case are then cross-checked with all the other cases.

In the third stage, the data are re-analyzed, and common or shared themes from the initial set of themes are grouped to form five broad themes for this study. Categories are assigned to each theme to help make the comparison of themes manageable (Dey 1993). The final analysis of the data produced three domains, five themes, and 12 categories. The established aforementioned final emergent themes in Table 7 below are later woven together to create a pattern for this study to understand.
Table 7. Final emergent themes developed from the interview transcripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to join the</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Salary and benefits</td>
<td>Monetary incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas where commitment is</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Ethical practices</td>
<td>Policy and process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>values</td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Subjective/Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty standards</td>
<td>Quality of faculty in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student standards</td>
<td>Academic level of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Freedom, independence, discretion</td>
<td></td>
<td>In teaching, research, courses taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support and</td>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Distribution of</td>
<td>Procedure used to determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>resources: in</td>
<td>decisions: in promotions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching assignments, teaching loads, salary package, and research contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Procedure used to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>determine decisions: in promotions, academic appointments, research contributions, salary increments, and job security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>How decisions are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communicated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transparency of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Bureaucratic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Participation in decision-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disillusion</td>
<td>Redirection of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commitment focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Soundness in qualitative research process

Based on the qualitative research process, this study frames a descriptive paradigm. As opposed to the traditional criteria of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity, this study considers trustworthiness in the research
process (Denzin & Lincoln 2005) in terms of confirmability, credibility, dependability, and transferability (Lincoln & Guba 1985). By using the qualitative approach, this study maintains acceptable standards of scientific inquiry throughout the research process to ensure trustworthiness. Rigorous effort is put into both the data collection and data analysis methods. Fig. 13 below shows the criteria that this study uses to ensure trustworthiness of the research process.

4.5.1 Confirmability

Confirmability in this study refers to the degree to which other researchers can confirm or corroborate with the findings in this study. To create an understanding of the research phenomenon instead of establishing explanations and causal relations, the individual respondents’ experiences of commitment are used to establish this study’s findings and conclusions. This study uses a number of strategies to enhance confirmability. The procedures for checking and rechecking the data are documented. To ensure that the characteristics of the emergent themes are applicable to all cases, the developed themes in each case are compared and reexamined with every other case in the study. This also ensures that there is no disconfirming evidence in the analysis. All records are maintained in the form of
detailed notes or electronic recordings. At the same time, respondents are contacted via telephone and electronic mail to check the accuracy of the facts taken to maintain reflexivity by encouraging self-awareness and self-correction.

4.5.2 Credibility

Credibility refers to establishing that the results in the study are the truth of the findings as established by using various methods. This study ensures credibility through using multiple sources of information while collecting the data. Data from the interview guide, interview transcripts, case narratives, field notes, non-participant observer’s feedback, and member checks go through the triangulation process. The interview guide ensures that consistent topics are covered in each interview. To increase the credibility of this research, conversations in each interview are transcribed verbatim. Each interview is constructed as a case narrative. Through member checking, that is, by getting feedback from the respondents on each case narrative prior to analyzing, the text credibility is further fostered. This process ensures participants’ validation of the findings, and avoids the researcher’s bias upon the participants’ intention of the data. The triangulation of the data provides a means of corroboration to bring confidence to this study’s conclusions.

4.5.3 Dependability

Dependability is the traditional view of reliability for quantitative research design. The logical, traceable, and documented research process discussed above ensures dependability for this study (Lincoln & Guba 1985). Therefore, this study’s qualitative research design based on the notion of duplicating the results found ensures dependability. Each of the thematic codes used for analyzing the data has specific criteria. Upon comparison with other cases in the study the codes are checked and recoded. Triangulation of data while analyzing the text also provides dependability in the research process used in this study.

4.5.4 Transferability

Transferability in qualitative design refers to the degree to which the results from the study can be generalized to other contexts. This study enhances transferability by providing a thorough description of the research context (see Chapter 2) and
the assumptions central to the research. This study uses case-based situations to compare and correlate and to draw analytical generalizations. Each case has its own uniqueness in comparison to other cases. The findings are presented with dense description of the phenomena found in the cases to provide for transferability. Thus, other researchers can apply the findings of this study to their own or to a wider group of situations.

4.6 Summary

This chapter has outlined and defended the reason for the choice of a qualitative case-based research study. Fig. 14 below depicts the empirical method for this study.

![Fig. 14. Empirical method.](image)

The underlying empirical investigation uses a qualitative research design encompassing case-based situations with semi-structured interviews. The research method uses a purposeful sampling of 12 faculty members from six business schools in two sectors of institutions in UAE. Data from the 12 cases through face-to-face and Internet interviews is compiled in a semi-structured interview setting observing the appropriate interview protocols to preserve confidentiality and anonymity for the respondents. The types of questions used in this study and the method used to report the findings suits the qualitative approach (Creswell
In the end, it is the particular purpose of the research and the predilections of the researcher that determines the relevance and applicability of the chosen research method (Dey 1993). The qualitative inquiry that is applied to this study offers some measure of credibility, as the researcher and the participants co-create the data as they explore how experiences of organizational commitment change. However, the ability to generalize the findings in this study is not intended, nor foreseeable. With the use of context, individual experiences, and subjective interpretations, the results of this study using qualitative methodology have the limitation of generalizability. The uniqueness in the selection of participants makes the research outcomes unique to these groups. The prospect of bias by the researcher is inevitable because the data is collected through interaction with the participants in the form of face-to-face semi-structured interviews, not reported in a scientifically acceptable measure.
5 Empirical case narratives

This chapter narrates the cases interviewed for the study. The aim of this study is to understand more fully faculty’s perceptions of organizational commitment. The study’s research goal is to give an understanding of the stories as told by the participating faculty members regarding their experiences and perceptions of commitment to the business schools in UAE. The stories as told by each participant faculty in the interviews describe their experiences and perceptions of commitment in the business schools. The participants share in the interviews their initial motivation to join the institution, their experiences of the university and any disillusionments that they face, which may have led them to rethink their initial motivations for joining the institution, or affected their present and future commitment to the institution. Therefore, through narrative inquiry this study explores the participant faculty members’ particular experiences – feelings, ideas, events, and outcomes – as narrated by them.

The organization and narration of the cases is chronological, linking the events and perceptions for each individual respondent. The narrative inquiry method anticipates that each of the participants uses the context of the UAE to connect and situate particular experiences to cohere and structure their time in UAE business schools. Therefore, for each case narration, this study takes into consideration the social, cultural, and political context of the setting to understand the participants’ experiences more clearly. Thus by reflecting, structuring, and narrating the stories as told by the participants, this study makes the disparate events more meaningful.

The role of narrative inquiry is to give a clear account of each participant’s experiences, structured in a story form to constitute a meaningful story. Each case study contextualizes explicitly the particular lived experiences of each faculty member to help the audience understand more fully. The objective of the narration is not to explain the experiences or the events as told by the participating faculty. This study’s research goal is to understand and describe the lived experiences and events relating to commitment as told by each faculty member. It is significant in the study is to understand and determine the meaning of a particular experience or event on organizational commitment, and to tell about it in a story rather than to merely gather information about it. The initial aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of how faculty members from publicly and privately controlled business schools perceive commitment. The value of this study will not lie in the generalizability or replication of the findings, for generalizations will not capture
what the participants’ stories speak to the readers. Therefore, future research needs to understand well enough what the experiences or events mean to gain an awareness of the alternative meanings that can be attached to the situations.

The cases described are interviews with business school expatriate and UAE national faculty, either working with their current institutions or who have left or taken action to leave the current employer at the time of the interview. Each case description shall begin with general demographic information about the faculty participant and his or her initial motivation to join the institution. Each description covers the meanings that events hold for the faculty, and the perceptions of commitment during the course of employment at the institution. Each description also includes events that caused disillusion of the participant’s perception of commitment. Each case identifies the time and relates the sequence of the events, happenings, and experiences as told by the participants while conveying a sense of meaning and significance in the context of the UAE. The details of each participant interviewed are shown in Appendix 4. List of Participants, with the date, interview time duration, and pseudo names of the participants. Also included are the participants’ demographic details, such as gender, years of service in the relevant institution and the total years of service in academia.

This chapter reports the cases chronologically by interview date as shown in Appendix 4. List of Participants. As agreed with the participants, to protect confidentiality the participants’ names used in this study are pseudonyms. The narration covers the story as told by the participants in relation to the three open-ended questions prompted at each interview:

- What were you doing prior to joining the current institution?
- What were your experiences with the institution?
- What disillusion, if any, do you have with the institution?

### 5.1 Participant Dr. Jake

Dr. Jake participated in two face-to-face interviews and two sets of follow-up questions. Dr. Jake was formerly a faculty at Large National University. As agreed with the participant, both interviews took place at a mutual ground in UAE: the interview on 10th March 2012 lasted for 35 minutes, and a second interview as a continuation of the first interview took place on 25th May 2012 lasted approximately 48 minutes. Dr. Jake, a male faculty member has 12 years of
academic teaching in Australia and North Europe. His experience at Large National University lasted for three years and he is sharing his experience in this interview as a former faculty at Large National University. Prior to joining the Large National University, Dr. Jake held a faculty position in Australia. He was motivated to join the university for two reasons: (1) the salary and benefits package was attractive, and (2) as shown in the job interview, the willingness of the university administrators to push boundaries to achieve goals.

Dr. Jake finds the family-oriented atmosphere of the country and the diversifications of the faculty body at Large National University to be important. He particularly enjoyed the high aspirations of the university to compete globally in the academic rankings as a research university. His initial commitment level to the business school was high for he identified with the institution’s vision for expansion and willingness to take risks.

“… Administrative management was flexible and willing to bend rules to get what needs to be done.” (Dr. Jake)

However, the attractive salary and benefits added incentive to stay.

“… The primary motive for most people to come here is money, better disposable income, tax-free and other opportunities. All these factors are purely monetary, or opportunistic, or self-driven, including myself when I came here in the beginning.” (Dr. Jake)

Dr. Jake had concerns with several of the university’s policies and management practices. He particularly disliked the bureaucratic process at the university. For example,

“… To get a small budget of a few hundred dirhams, I have to fill 10 or 15 paperwork.” (Dr. Jake)

Dr. Jake reports that the lack of transparency in information regarding policy and process changes was a concern shared by many faculty members.

“… Be transparent. It is about how information is communicated from management... Most of the colleagues that I talked to are quite frustrated and sometimes that frustration leads to lower quality of performance and intentions to leave.” (Dr. Jake)

Additionally, management did not encourage participative decision-making.
“… Participation is merely pseudo because decisions are already made.” (Dr. Jake)

Dr. Jake reports that the equity unfairness situation made several expatriate faculty members unhappy to be working at the institution.

“… The general feeling is that most people are unhappy even though they are getting good money... getting much better money than in their home countries.” (Dr. Jake)

The degree of disparity in economic compensation between expatriate and national faculty was high.

“… UAE national faculty are paid at two to three times more for doing the same job... They are taking home benefits around five to six times more,” not including the “...other environmental allowances such as free land, and cap in the maximum amount to pay for monthly use of electricity.” (Dr. Jake)

Dr. Jake states that he experienced a constant battle with changes to the administrative processes because modifications to processes often were not communicated to faculty. Dr. Jake reported that the work environment grew intolerable around late 2008 and early 2009. He observed several faculty and executive management terminations during the economic downturn. He also noticed deterioration in the administration at the business school after a change of management, and he began to have doubts about staying committed to the job.

“... New management came in and things started to become quite different in terms of the way the Business School was led. And that was coming from outside as well. .... I do not enjoy the counter-productive sub-cultures perhaps created and controlled by traditional ethnic-centered groups who do not really add any real value to ... future progress, yet they also block any others in aspiring toward that. So, I would say at that time my feelings started to change as well.” (Dr. Jake)

The work environment eventually grew hostile. The unfairness in salary compensation created unhappiness and dissatisfaction among UAE national and expatriate faculty members.

“... There are two kinds of discriminations. There is an unspoken rule that you have to be Anglo-Saxon white to be in the senior positions... Then there
is the passport issue. My salary package is different; the way I am treated is different... this is very direct, very in your face in this university.” (Dr. Jake)

At the same time, faculty members continued to suffer from the high teaching loads and research contribution expectations from the university.

“... I was on average teaching six, seven courses every semester, which was more than double.... While some UAE national faculty have almost no teaching load or institutional administrative duties.” (Dr. Jake)

In addition, the institution provided very little support in research effort, in terms of time and funding, particularly for the expatriate faculty members. Dr, Jake noted that “grant proposals are cumbersome and near impossible”, because the success rate is “... almost zero”. Furthermore, Dr. Jake indicated,

“... Research awards are non-existent for expatriate faculty.” (Dr. Jake)

“... Research funds are readily available to UAE national faculty even when their grant proposals are not that good.” (Dr. Jake)

Promotion decisions were more subjective than objective. Promotions for UAE national faculty were seniority-based rather than merit-based. Many cases of promotions in the business school occurred as an outcome of good interaction with the department chair.

“... Out of four people applying for promotions the faculty who has a chance is simply the one who gets along well with the department chair. The university used different polices to justify their decisions because the policies for promotions are both conflicting and subjective... in comparison to my current employer, promotion process are clear-cut and measureable. Policies and procedures can be monitored... unlike the Large National University.” (Dr. Jake)

Dr. Jake claims that it was almost impossible for expatriate faculty to develop good interactions with the department chair because faculty were not encouraged to go to the Chair for advise, without first going through the Cluster Head or Committee Head. On the contrary, UAE National faculty members normally went directly to the Dean for advice and to socialize. As such, these frustrations affected faculty’s attitudes and contributions toward the institution. Many faculty members were forced to fit in to avoid losing their jobs, while some developed turnover intentions. Dr. Jake also questions the leadership style at the university.
He did not like the micro-managing style of leadership exercised at the Large National University. He claims that management placed more interest on faculty’s compliance with the work hours rather than on productivity.

“... We have to go through so strict compliance to certain things like, how many hours you are supposed to be there.” (Dr. Jake)

Management tended to view suggestions and ideas as a threat to the system. Dr. Jake reports that refusal to comply with unethical instructions from higher management had negative consequences for faculty members. For example, he was terminated from his position at the university for pointing out the wrongdoings of the administration.

Dr. Jake expressed concern for the university’s future. He believes that the current management group is not compatible with the culture and competency of the institution. The unethical behavior of higher management was definitely a disillusion for Dr. Jake. He claims that he was uncomfortable with the method by which he had to gain recognition from the university: breaking rules. Although, he had on many occasions succumbed to requests from higher management that required him to bend rules. However, in one particular instance, when Dr. Jake refused, for ethical reasons, to comply with breaking rules, he was punished. This incident changed his feelings for the Large National University. Dr. Jake feels that management completely ignored and disregarded his previous hard work and contributions. Thus, Dr. Jake does not feel a sense of belonging to the university. In fact, he reports that he “felt used and abused, and taken for granted in good times, and then thrown out and rejected in bad times”.

Dr. Jake stated that the reasons for the university’s difficulty in attracting high-level academics were because of the students, academics contractual terms and appointments, high teaching loads and lack of research support.

“... The student pedagogy is embedded to route learning memory-based practices.” (Dr. Jake)

“... There are no tenure-track positions for faculty.” (Dr. Jake)

“... Research is in real sense discouraged ... at least teaching is encouraged.” (Dr. Jake)

“... Heavy teaching hours cannibalize research contributing efforts.” (Dr. Jake)

Dr. Jake attributes the problem with faculty autonomy to the work environment.
“... I am currently in a university where they give me complete free hand to do whatever I like whenever I like... This could never happen in Large National University because the context restricts people like me to grow.... So, in terms of commitment levels, they will always end up with people who are average or who will give average commitment. They will never be able to keep strong talent for too long.” (Dr. Jake)

Although Dr. Jake has already left the institution, he continues to care for his employer and the students.

“... I am attached to the students. I stayed as friends to many students even after leaving the institution.” (Dr. Jake)

At the end of his experience at the university, Dr. Jake believes that his commitment to the business school has, transferred to his profession.

5.2 Participant Dr. Karen

As agreed with Dr. Karen, faculty from the business school in National Satellite Campus, the 70 minutes interview took place at a mutual ground in UAE on 6th April, 2012. Dr. Karen also completed some follow-up questions at a later date. Dr. Karen, female faculty at National Satellite Campus for three years. She came to the UAE to start her faculty career at the National Satellite Campus. According to Dr. Karen, her motivation to join the institution is due to a “... lack of alternative job opportunity” in academia.

Without a doctoral qualification, to maintain a faculty role, Dr. Karen was only able to join the National Satellite Campus. Her previous teaching experience as a high school teacher in the UAE contributed to the positive encouragement to take on a faculty role in the country. Though Dr. Karen embraces the attractive salary and benefits package offered by the university, she expressed disappointment with the quality of her supervisor and fellow faculty colleagues.

“... I was surprised of the very low level of the colleagues... my supervisor did not have a PhD (doctoral degree).” (Dr. Karen)

Dr. Karen also finds the level of the student to be below average.

“... We get the lowest level students from high school. And the high school level is so low, their English is so low. So during the three or four years at
National Satellite Campus we cannot do anything because all the better nationals go to... So we know that we get the worst lot...” (Dr. Karen)

Not only did Dr. Karen find the standard of the faculty to be low, she also noticed that the student’s academic level is low. She feels that the institution is adding to the students’ low level of academic knowledge, especially when the curriculum offered at the institution is also low. The student level at the university, according to Dr. Karen

“... was at the lowest in the country, which makes our lives very difficult.” (Dr. Karen)

Dr. Karen finds the level of teaching to be both low and frustrating.

“... I do not understand how they are willing to teach such low level curriculum. I understand it perfectly that we are having such low students with low English abilities. On the other hand, I have seen places like ...... those students don’t get away with it. They do not get away with the absentees, they have to study in order to graduate. And they can put higher requirements with their programs as well. I mean what we teach is the introduction to the courses. So, it is a bit frustrating.” (Dr. Karen)

Dr. Karen finds her institution lacking focus on research. The business school itself, and the institution did not encourage research nor appreciate faculty with research capabilities. The business school places emphasis on teaching and classroom management rather than research. Faculty teaches minimum of nine lecture hours per week.

“... If you want to do research, you have to ask for permission from higher management.” (Dr. Karen)

At the same time, faculty suffers from role ambiguity. Dr. Karen fails to understand why the institution assigns faculty members courses, which are frequently outside their specialized discipline without offering explanations.

“... There was not really a rational reason given [as to] why the courses were allocated... People who are teaching human resources for example are specialized in marketing, while people who are teaching marketing are specialized in management... everybody is teaching something other than what they are specialized in.” (Dr. Karen)
Unfairness in course assignment seems to occur among new hires in the business school. Dr. Karen notices that faculty members who develop strong interactions with the supervisor tend to receive teaching assignments of their choice regardless of knowledge and expertise in the area.

“... Newcomers are always given the lower level courses to teach... regardless of their expertise and knowledge. Another factor is who is friends with the supervisor gets to choose the courses that they teach.” (Dr. Karen)

Dr. Karen finds such work environment in the business school to be discouraging, coupled with unfriendly and uncooperative fellow faculty members who use very harsh language toward each other. Dr. Karen made comparisons of her employer with Northern European universities. Unlike universities in Northern Europe, she finds institutions in UAE to be intolerable to freedom of expression. Dr. Karen reports that faculty members are not empowered to perform or make decisions. Management controls faculty member’s actions and decisions at all times. Therefore, only those

“... faculty members who have turnover intentions can feel free to express their concerns.” (Dr. Karen)

Dr. Karen reported that to date, many faculty members who leave employment with the National Satellite Campus depart with negative feelings for the institution. She observes that

“... everybody is complaining. One hundred percent of the faculty are complaining. However, nobody speaks, everybody is very scared to speak... Everybody cared about losing the job. So we put up with whatever comes.”

(Dr. Karen)

Dr. Karen particularly dislikes the policies and management practices carried out in National Satellite Campus. She does not agree with the university for showing more support for the students than the faculty. For instance, the university supports the students’ complains regarding grades, instead of showing support to the faculty members’ credibility in assigning the given grades. The business school puts pressure on the faculty to change the grades to suit the students’ requests.

“... The problem is with ethics... On my first year after having put the marks into our system... my supervisor gave me a printed sheet with the last semester’s marks which had all been changed, and I was told to sign it... I
Dr. Karen noted that in some instances, the student grades were adjusted without approval from the assigning faculty. Most faculty members were afraid to question the grade changes for fear of losing their jobs and to avoid confrontations with higher management. Dr. Karen views such institutional practices to be an unethical behavior for the institution. She claims that several faculty members share her view regarding this unethical management practice in grade adjustments. In addition, university management also controls faculty’s activities.

“… Micro management and lack of trust are the two keywords for the management practices in this university. One needs permissions to do even the smallest task. This creates fear among employees as everyone is scared (including middle management) to make decisions as everyone fears for their jobs.” (Dr. Karen)

University management has also failed to respect faculty’s personal time. She quoted an incident when the university management had forced her to use up her vacation days so that the institution does not have to reimburse her for unused vacation time, even though she was in the middle of managing a critical project. Dr. Karen finds the university management’s practice to be intolerable,

“… such unethical decision, I could never take.” (Dr. Karen)

Therefore, the attractive salary and benefits package that Dr. Karen receives in her job is not enough to motivate her to stay with National Satellite Campus. She is not prepared to work under the conditions experienced at the National Satellite Campus. However, Dr. Karen also states that although she cares for some of the students in the institution, she does not feel attached to the institution. She will continue to recommend the university, but with an awareness of the work practices exercised by the institution.

5.3 Participant Dr. Sunil

In agreement with the participant, Dr. Sunil, faculty at the business school in Small Private University, the 59 minutes interview occurred on 7th May 2012 at a mutual ground in UAE. Dr. Sunil also completed some follow-up questions. Dr.
Sunil, male faculty, has at least 20 years of academic teaching. His previous experiences include administrative executive role at a university in one of the Emirates in UAE, and a faculty role for two years at another university in the country. Before venturing to the UAE, Dr. Sunil worked in academia for around 17 years at several universities in Australia.

Dr. Sunil was motivated to join Small Private University because of vague contractual promises.

“... The promises that were made were quite good. They promised research funding, they promised access to databases, downtime for research, that is, reduction of teaching loads, travelling time and opportunity for conference presentations, availability of research grants. So, this is one of the reasons why I chose the university... ” (Dr. Sunil)

Although he was also motivated by the attractive pay package, he indicated that if a UAE national faculty were to take the same role, the individual would be paid 3.5 times his salary. Work arrangements are different for expatriate and UAE national faculty. Academic duties are also minimized for Emiratis, to about 33% less than expatriates.

Dr. Sunil particularly likes the vision and mission of the university. He admires the way the university distinguished itself from other universities in the UAE by producing graduates with a high regard for ethics and corporate social responsibilities. He reports that the number of students attending the university improved dramatically over the last seven years. He believes that he has gone beyond his call of duty to help the university achieve a competitive advantage,

“... I have worked long hours to get a document together which is acceptable to the ... authority.” (Dr. Sunil)

He states that though he is fairly happy with the institution, he does have some disillusion with the employer and the students. He finds the standard of the students in the UAE to be low compared to students in countries like Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, and India. He attributes the low academic standard of the students to the quality of education in tertiary, secondary, and high schools. The students’ low academic standard creates difficulty for faculty trying to deliver university courses effectively at the university level.

“... The quality of students here, in the UAE are nowhere near as good as or as high as in some other countries... there seems to be a linkage to the poor
quality of education received before coming to the university, and this is a key problem. The students are poor in English and they are poor in quantitative skills, which makes it very difficult to deliver courses at the level we expected in our own countries.” (Dr. Sunil)

Dr. Sunil is also disappointed with the institution for failing to fulfill the promise of research funding and support, which is one factor that motivated him to join the business school. He reports that

“... The teaching load is too high for a university that aspires towards accreditation... faculty are committed to their research, funding much of the research activities themselves through spending time and money on books, databases, computer programs that they need for research, which was unfortunately promised to them but not delivered.” (Dr. Sunil)

Furthermore, he finds the leadership at the Small Private University too autocratic and decisions centralized in the bureaucracy. College administrators do not empower Deans. Hence, Deans in the university have no impact on strategies. In fact,

“... Deans are merely figure heads set out to do what the Chancellor’s office decides. The type of decisions that the Deans make are independent but at a very low level and do not have any impact on strategy.” (Dr. Sunil)

In comparison to the USA university model Dr. Sunil finds faculty and Deans in UAE institutions lacking autonomy.

“... Deans do not have the power to make decisions without taking advice from the top. So it is much more centralized at the top at Small Private University than at my previous university in the United States. Freedom of action is non-existent here. You are certainly free to take action but freedom can get you into trouble so you really need to seek advice from the top about what you are doing and whether it is right or wrong.” (Dr. Sunil)

Contrary to universities in America, Dr. Sunil notes that his institution does not welcome suggestions and ideas. In comparison, one of his previous employers, an American modeled university, managed under the headquarter institution in the United States, encouraged suggestions to policy. Therefore, Dr. Sunil states that on average, on a scale of one to 10, his satisfaction with the university is at the rate of five, particularly when advice and open criticisms are often not welcome.
However, given the current economic conditions, Dr. Sunil finds difficulty to change jobs, but that does not mean that he has no turnover intentions.

“... Obviously, if a better offer were to come to me I would certainly consider it very hard.” (Dr. Sunil)

At the same time, Dr. Sunil claims that information within the university does not flow freely. As a result, faculty members are either looking for other job opportunities or remain dissatisfied. Dr. Sunil believes that executive management places very little value on intellectual capital. He states that the university has lost time and money spent in inducting and training new faculty members. At the same time, remaining faculty members have to allocate time to help in the candidate selection process instead of concentrating on their research. Dr. Sunil feels that many expatriate faculty members do not feel attached to their institutions because of the current employment conditions in business schools. He also believes that faculty members make the choice to remain in the employing institution because of visa constraints.

“... I have got to pay my mortgage in America and I have got to do it quickly so I will go and work in the Middle East for three years, earn some tax-free money and leave because I know I may not want to stay there or they would not give me a visa. So yes, it does curtail the organizational effectiveness because of the visa situation.” (Dr. Sunil)

Therefore, with the visa situation, Dr. Sunil regards, “tenure in a job in this country, is as good as how good your visa is”.

Dr. Sunil remains committed to the university and will complete the task that he was hired to do. Professionally, he feels attached to the university. During his course of employment at the university, Dr. Sunil claims that he has turned down many good job offers. However, the temporary employment conditions in the UAE, and the lack of tenure for faculty poses a problem, especially since residency in the country is tied to the employer. He believes that faculty members will continue to stay committed to their research. In fact, many faculty members have already funded their own research activities in terms of personal time, books, databases, and computer programs. However, he believes that commitment is a two-way street. For the faculty to commit to the institution, university management must also display commitment to the faculty. Dr. Sunil confirms that he is attached to the university because of his professional responsibilities. Even
with the disappointments and disillusions he still aims to fulfill his contract with the university.

“... I was hired for a job, and I will stay here for at least until the job is done.”
(Dr. Sunil)

5.4 Participant Dr. Arjun

In agreement with Dr. Arjun, faculty member at the business school in Private American University, the 43 minutes interview occurred on 11th May 2012 on mutual ground in UAE. Dr. Arjun also completed some follow-up questions at a later date. Dr. Arjun, a male faculty member, prior to joining Private American University, has academic and management experience outside the UAE. He was motivated to join the university because of the American program and environment offered at the university.

Dr. Arjun finds the environment at Private American University to be similar to universities in the USA. Unlike other institutions in the UAE, he finds the environment to be conducive for teaching because of the co-education classroom approach. He particularly likes the prestige of his department and the university. His department has a strong identity in the business school, and the university itself has a high ranking in the country. He does not experience any culture shock with the new university and the country. He finds the students to be polite, and faculty members in the business school friendly. However, Dr. Arjun’s disillusion of the university happened during the change of leadership at the business school in Private American University. Prior to the change in leadership, Dr. Arjun took pride in discussions about the university with people outside the institution. He took pride in his association with the institution. He notes that although the university models itself after the American model, the administration does not reflect a democratic leadership like it exists in the USA. In fact, Private American University administration remains autocratic and bureaucratic. Authority is centralized and faculty members do not receive tenure.

“... There was a lot of centralization of power although the university was supposed to be modeled after the American institution. Faculty members have no power. We have very little input in decision-making.” (Dr. Arjun)

Frequently, decisions made in the institutions do not take faculty into account.
“… Decisions are taken not in the faculty’s interest but more for administrative reasons.” (Dr. Arjun)

For example, when the university administration decided to restructure the departments in the business school for budgetary reasons, Dr. Arjun suffered from role ambiguity, as his role in the new department was unclear. This initial positive experience with the university became negative during and after the restructuring of the business school. As a result of the leadership change, Dr. Arjun states that the faculty evaluation standards became subjective. Even though the university provides fairly good research support, there is a lack of recognition in faculty research effort. Guidelines for faculty promotions are unclear. Decisions regarding faculty promotion are left entirely to the Dean.

“… The guidelines for promotion have been left open-ended... The Dean made selective decisions, he does not enforce an objective list for promotion criteria.” (Dr. Arjun)

Dr. Arjun believes that with the change in leadership, policies and management practices became selectively enforced, which is contrary to the American university model. For instance, the Dean made the decision to increase the salary of a faculty member who published an article in a lesser category journal over a faculty who published articles in top journals. Therefore, with the change in leadership, and the merging of departments in the business school, coupled with the subjectivity of the promotion standards, Dr. Arjun’s commitment to the university changed and turnover intentions developed. As thus, Dr. Arjun believes that one of the reasons for non-commitment to the institution is the lack of professional standards in the university.

“… I had a very strong organizational commitment for Private American University for different reasons... When I joined, the university had positioned itself to become number one in the Middle East for delivering American education. So it was a very strong goal that attracted me to join. Some of the reasons for not having organizational commitment would be pretty simple lack of professional standards.” (Dr. Arjun)

He feels that the university fails to recognize or appreciate faculty’s hard work and high research output. Although other faculty share in his views about the practices exercised by the university management in terms of department
restructuring and the criteria used for promotions, the rest of the faculty are afraid to speak up due to lack of academic freedom, and their employment basis.

“... When you are on a contract basis, you cannot protest. Faculty are afraid to speak out because the Provost and the Chancellor are so powerful and because expatriate faculty members are on a contract. Unlike the US institutions, Faculty here does not have tenure.” (Dr. Arjun)

The disillusion causes Dr. Arjun to re-evaluate his commitment to the institution. Although he has created many social ties with fellow faculty members and students and feels loyal to the university, he is not willing to put any more effort into the institution. Dr. Arjun decided to look for opportunities outside the university. He regards quality of life to be more important than monetary gains when it comes to the decision of leaving an organization.

“... Money was secondary to me. What is more important for me is the quality of life, not just life. And quality of life in terms of let us say, a lot of intangibles that my family gets... to enjoy.” (Dr. Arjun)

5.5 Participant Dr. Ted

In agreement with the participant, Dr. Ted, faculty at the business school in Small Public University, the 95 minutes interview occurred on 14 May 2012 at a mutual ground in UAE. Dr. Ted also completed some follow-up questions at a later date. Dr. Ted, a male faculty has been in academia for the last 12 years. He has taught in many universities outside the UAE. Prior to joining the Small Public University, Dr. Ted was a faculty at another university in the UAE. He claims that the unique job responsibility offered motivated him to join the university. Dr. Ted claims that although the university campus is nice, the university itself is not professional. Dr. Ted’s experience started out with a disappointment on his first day at the job. The program curriculum for his teaching did not match what the dean initially proposed, which had attracted him to the job. The role that he is required to play in the business school does not meet his expectations.

“... I felt an attachment when I first arrived there. I spent a lot of time at Small Public University during my spare time when I was still working at my previous employer... to get a running start.” (Dr. Ted)
Subsequently, Dr. Ted notes that the students are unwilling to put effort into learning. In fact, the students manipulate faculty into giving good grades because students’ evaluation of faculty’s teaching is one of the criteria for faculty promotion and contract renewal decisions in his institution. Dr. Ted believes that the university administration places too much trust on the students’ evaluation of faculty teaching skills.

“... Students punished the faculty severely by giving the faculty a very low student evaluation of the learning experience (SELS).” (Dr. Ted)

The university did not show support to faculty for trying to raise the standard in teaching. Instead the university administration allowed the evaluation of 10 students in one semester to wipe out one faculty member’s existing performance record in other courses, past teaching awards and research contributions. Dr. Ted disagrees with the notion of students’ evaluation of faculty’s teaching, as it is based more on popularity with the students than on actual teaching effectiveness.

“... If your motivation for teaching is to educate your students and you get measured on popularity, then there is the clash.” (Dr. Ted)

Dr. Ted attributes the students’ manipulation of faculty’s teaching performance to the institution’s lack of commitment to implement high teaching standards and the unwillingness to adapt to both the students’ and the faculty’s need for change. He feels that his idea of quality teaching is not congruent to that of his university.

“... Regardless of what it is an individual institution has, all educational institutions are different, but surely one common factor is that we all want our students to graduate and the best that they can be... to give the potential to bring out all of the potential within students; everything that they could be, we try to bring it out. And when that is in conflict, when people (institutions) are not really trying to do that, then there is a clash.” (Dr. Ted)

Many faculty members adopt poor institutional practices to keep their jobs, by giving students grades according to how the faculty member feels instead of what the student actually deserves.

“... Another professor who have served the university for 10 years told me that he does not give A’s and neither does he give F’s. ... ‘A’ is a perfectly good grade and ‘F’ is a perfectly good grade as well... he does not want to be accused of grade inflation so he does not give A’s but he was not going to be stupid enough to give people F’s.” (Dr. Ted)
Alternatively, some faculty members inflate the students’ grades to avoid getting poor student evaluations on their teaching. As Dr. Ted explained, each of these cases “has nothing to do with assessment of learning outcome, it is simply about keeping the students happy... it is not good institutional practice”. With the employment conditions in the country, Dr. Ted feels that other faculty members (particularly expatriates) are afraid to express their thoughts and opinions for fear of losing their jobs.

“... There is a group of faculty that know what needs to be done but they are not genuinely prepared to do it because it risks losing their job. So if you are desperate to keep your job then you will swallow your integrity and do what you are told to do. And if what you have been told to do is poor teaching and pedagogical practices, then that is what you do.” (Dr. Ted)

Dr. Ted believes that with the absence of tenure positions for faculty in universities in UAE many faculty members, who cannot afford to lose their jobs, end up doing whatever it takes to stay in employment regardless of ethics. In his own words he explained, “that saddens me ... that people will cheat the system and cheat students and cheat this society”.

Dr. Ted reported that the university leadership is autocratic and operates under a pseudo participation system for decision-making. Although students participate and provide feedback on administrative decisions, in reality, their suggestions, and opinions are ignored because management has already made up their minds prior to encouraging participation. This style of pseudo participation did not help to enhance Dr. Ted’s commitment to the institution.

“... The department chair had already decided way before he got any feedback from the students to change the established curriculum... This idea of pseudo participation ... was an important turning point for me... the institution’s decision is definitely not heading in the right direction by making the changes and the very opposite of what the students were actually asking for.” (Dr. Ted)

Although many faculty members are aware of the issues in the academic environment, many are afraid to challenge the administration because of the employment contractual terms, lack of tenure, and dismissal without due process.

“... There is a general sense of we know how bad things are but what can we do about it?’ Faculty know that if they question the policy and management
Practices then they will be fired as there are no barriers to firing faculty for whatever reasons. Rocking the boat and expecting a long career at this institution is mutually exclusive. Therefore, to survive it is necessary not to take risks to try to be innovative.” (Dr. Ted)

Prior to working at the Small Public University, Dr. Ted used to direct his commitment to the students. He claims deep commitment and feels attached to the students. However, he does not feel the same way for the students in this university because of the students’ attitude and their unwillingness to try or work hard.

“… I have got a deep commitment to students... I am passionate about my job ... and, about wanting to teach... I have had some tremendous feedback from students from ... previous university in the UAE.” (Dr. Ted)

Although he was initially attracted by the monetary gains offered by his job in the UAE, with the improvement in his home country currency, Dr. Ted does not find the salary and benefits to be attractive any longer, particularly given the lack of support from administration toward faculty members who are committed to quality teaching.

“… You cannot remain committed when you know that everything that you are trying to do is being altered to fit an unsatisfactory circumstance.” (Dr. Ted)

With the disillusion at Small Public University Dr. Ted has changed the direction of his commitment.

5.6 Participant Dr. Byron

In agreement with the participant, Dr. Byron, faculty at the business school in Large National University, the 27 minutes interview occurred on 15 May 2012 at a mutual ground in UAE. Dr. Byron also completed some follow-up questions at a later date. Dr. Byron, a male faculty member, prior to joining the Large National University, was teaching in a university outside the UAE, and running a business in Northern Europe. He claims his motivation to join the university was mainly the offer of an attractive salary package.

“... I had offers but I always compared it to what I had at my home country and I was not able to accept it but when the UAE offer came up it was quite
the easy choice for me because of the salary and other conditions.” (Dr. Byron)

During his employment at the Large National University, Dr. Byron developed a good network of friends and colleagues. He finds the quality of the faculty in his college to be high. He enjoys the prestige of working for a university with an accredited business program. He claims that the quality of life in the UAE is good and enjoys living in the city where he works. However, his dislikes the organization of the classroom where male and female students are segregated. The segregation of students causes some turnover feelings for him to return to home country where institutions conduct co-education classes. Additionally, he finds that there is too much secrecy in the Large National University. Information lacks transparency.

“… I particularly do not like things happening in the background without the person who it affects knowing what is happening. This is quite the atmosphere sometimes.” (Dr. Byron)

He reports that changes to the faculty evaluation policy have affected the promotion opportunities of many faculty members, particularly the faculty members who joined the university prior to the changes made to academics’ evaluation policy. Prior to 2009, the Large National University was mainly a teaching university and research contribution was not one of the criteria considered in faculty evaluations. With the policy change, many faculty members who failed to meet the research criteria suffered from fewer promotion opportunities and contract non-renewals. Hence, some faculty either voluntarily or involuntarily left the university at the end of the evaluation.

“… There was a lot of uncertainty … the process of evaluating whether someone should get a contract renewal or not was not very clear or it did not require feedback or it did not follow procedures – I felt it was more subjective and off the cuff type of decision.” (Dr. Byron)

In the Large National University, faculty generally get a three to four year contract renewal, depending on the academic rank. For faculty members receiving only a two-year contract renewal, feelings of job instability develop. Hence, turnover cognitions develop.
"... I have thoughts of now wondering about their (the institution's) commitment and whether they feel if the faculty member is the right person to continue – so it has given me thoughts to what is next for me?" (Dr. Byron)

Dr. Byron observes unfair practices in the recognition process. He reports that there are many cases of unfair recognition in the business school. At the same time, faculty members do not have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process concerning changes that affect academics. Many decisions are not communicated to academics. Instead, faculty members often stumble upon policy changes. For example, faculty members were not aware of the change that the administration made to the contract renewal time schedule. The contract renewal recommendation date was pushed forward six months earlier. In the old policy, Deans made recommendations for faculty contract renewals one semester ahead of the faculty’s contract end date (equivalent to six months prior to last work date of contract term). However, in the new policy, Deans make recommendations for faculty contract renewals 12 months prior to the current contract end date. The policy change affected several faculty members negatively. With the new policy, at the time of the contract renewal process, faculty members who did not meet the research contribution criteria to qualify for contract renewals went through months of aggravation and stress while the university reconsidered their pending research contributions in their renewal decision. This created a feeling of uncertainty in employment status among the faculty.

"... Honestly and sincerely, I am less committed because of how certain things were progressed and I think my colleagues would say the same." (Dr. Byron)

Dr. Byron’s specific disillusion with the institution is that the contract renewal decision failed to take into account faculty’s effort and energy with the students in the classrooms, and professional attitudes in creating team effort within the department. Hence, several faculty members changed their attitudes toward the university.

"... Professional ethics and personal integrity to honor academic profession and scientific discipline overrides institutional demands." (Dr. Byron)

With this disillusion Dr. Byron shifted his commitment from the institution to his research and his profession.
“... My orientation has changed to research. I have the impression that it is better to be a great researcher; a horrible teacher; horrible in service, and not be collegial to colleagues than to be a great teacher doing valuable service and be an okay researcher.” (Dr. Byron)

5.7 Participant Dr. Sameer

In agreement with the participant, Dr. Sameer, a male faculty member at the business school in Small Private University, the interview, which took place on 16th May 2012 on mutual ground in UAE, lasted around 25 minutes. Dr. Sameer also completed a set of follow-up questions at a later date. Dr. Sameer had a choice of either joining a university in Australia or a university in the UAE, and he opted for the Small Private University in the UAE. His motivation to join the Small Private University was the attractive salary and benefits package, the Muslim and Western atmosphere of the country, and the close distance to his home country.

Dr. Sameer enjoys his positive experience with the Small Private University. He likes the university campus and finds the city to be a good place to work and live. He also finds the faculty and administration in the campus to be friendly and cooperative. Dr. Sameer commented that the university has undergone many changes. The student standard has increased, and the academic leadership has changed for the better in the last couple of years. He states that although the university is developing very slowly, the policies and management practices are constantly improving. He identifies with the policy changes in the university for he was one of the pioneers in their making. Dr. Sameer feels committed to the university.

“... I fought lots of rules here... I have a sense of ownership in it.... I feel a sense of attachment here.” (Dr. Sameer)

However, Dr. Sameer finds the leadership style in the university fairly democratic, not as autocratic as it seems. For example, the university management has been keen on feedback and processes have improved over time. As he says in his own words, “lots of problems have been solved since last year, a very positive approach”.

In general, he is satisfied with the institution. He affirmed that many faculty members share his observation that positive changes have already taken place in the university. Dr. Sameer also finds the university to be fairly supportive in
research. Many faculty members receive research grants and attend conferences twice a year. Dr. Sameer reports that since joining the university, he himself, has received several research grants and attends at least two conferences a year. He claims that the university is currently making improvements to support faculty in doing research by providing online research databases. Dr. Sameer perceives this change as a big improvement in research support from the university.

Dr. Sameer has some disillusionments with the institution in terms of faculty teaching loads. He states that the teaching load of 12 lecture hours per week is high for faculty to be productive in research activities, and to contribute time to academic administrative duties. He expresses disappointment with the university management for not living up to the promise regarding reduction of faculty’s teaching load for faculty members who actively publish academic articles.

“... They had promised that if you publish, they would reduce our teaching load but this has not been put into effect yet.” (Dr. Sameer)

Dr. Sameer confirms that he feels attached to the university and has no intentions of moving to another institution. Whenever he encounters conflicts in his job, turnover intentions do develop. However, he manages to overcome the turnover cognitions because of his commitment to his profession and teaching.

“... My profession is the passport to easily move around.” (Dr. Sameer)

5.8 Participant Dr. Jane

In agreement with the participant, Dr. Jane, Lecturer at the business school in National Satellite Campus, the interview occurred on 18th May 2012 at a mutual ground in UAE. The interview lasted approximately 31 minutes. Dr. Jane also completed a follow-up questionnaire at a later date.

Dr. Jane, a female faculty, has worked at National Satellite Campus as a Lecturer for 12 years. Prior to joining the university, Dr. Jane served as a faculty and an administrator at a college outside the UAE. Her motivation to join the National Satellite Campus as a lecturer was to make a career change from administration to academia. Moreover, the attractive salary package from National Satellite Campus motivated her to move to the UAE and to join the institution.

“... We do have a very good package. We get return tickets every year for our dependents and ourselves. Of course, the salary is tax-free.” (Dr. Jane)
Dr. Jane claims that she has had a positive experience at the National Satellite Campus. She finds the country to offer good and affordable home support systems, which is important for her. She particularly likes the environment for she finds the students to be nice and her fellow faculty members to have high academic standards.

“... It is the people and the other faculty that makes you stay.” (Dr. Jane)

In general, Dr. Jane finds the quality of life to be good compared to her home country. She claims that the country itself provides fairly good schools for faculty’s children. She believes that the university provides good supportive policies. For example, she particularly likes the transition assistance that the university offers to new faculty and their family members. However, she finds the management style in the institution to be autocratic. Dr. Jane reports that management does not consult with faculty when making decisions regarding academics. She specifically dislikes management’s policy regarding announcements of national holidays. She claims that announcements of national holidays are often last-minute leaving faculty with insufficient time to make holiday plans with their families.

“... The management style appears to be a dictatorship style. There is not a lot of consultation. If you don’t like it you can go.” (Dr. Jane)

Dr. Jane states that she will be happy to leave the current institution if a different or challenging offer presents itself. However, she anticipates difficulty in changing jobs due to the visa restrictions in the country. She reports that with the visa restrictions and the university regulations, faculty members cannot change employment to another government institution, or even transfer to a different campus within the institution. However, she noted that changing employment to private institutions is much easier. Dr. Jane notes that the drawback is that private institutions seem to offer less attractive salary and benefit packages compared to government institutions. Additionally she regards the employment visa process to be cumbersome for faculty changing employment from private to government institutions. Before applying for a work visa with government institutions, the faculty member has to cancel both his and his family’s existing residence visas. This extensive process deters faculty with families because of the children’s schooling needs, and the long process of canceling and applying for new residence visas for the entire family. In general, Dr. Jane has positive feelings toward her employer, and she claims that she will recommend the university to
other faculty. Her decision to stay with the university is based purely on family reasons.

“... I would leave if there were somewhere I particularly wanted to work.”
(Dr. Jane)

5.9 Participant Dr. Sultan

Below is a case narration of a 44-minute interview with Dr. Sultan, faculty at the business school in Large National University, taken on 20 May 2012. Dr. Sultan is a male UAE national faculty. Upon completion of his Bachelors degree at the Large National University Dr. Sultan took on a management role in a government organization in UAE. He later joined the National Teaching Assistant (TA) program at the Large National University.

His responsibilities as a National TA were to assist faculty members in teaching and student advising. As part of the National TA program, Dr. Sultan received a scholarship for a doctoral program with a university overseas. Upon completion of his doctoral degree and as part of the National TA program, the Large National University offered Dr. Sultan a faculty role in the business school. This was a dream that had come true for Dr. Sultan. Since his undergraduate study at the university he had often returned to the university campus whenever he was in town. His motivation to join the university is two-fold. First, his undergraduate study experience at the Large National University inspired him to serve the institution. Second, the requirement of the National TA program facilitated this opportunity to attain a faculty position at the institution. The program stipulated that he serve in a faculty role at the university for the same amount of time that he took to complete his doctoral scholarship overseas. Together with the country’s employment legislative regulation, Dr. Sultan states that

“... as a faculty member, you are already tenured – you do not have a contract... that is a job safety.” (Dr. Sultan)

Dr. Sultan believes that he feels part of the family in the university because of his attachment to the institution during his Bachelors degree studies. He feels comfortable with many faculty and staff members in the business school because some of the faculty members were his professors when he was in the undergraduate studies at the university. Therefore, he developed good relationships with his fellow faculty. However, Dr. Sultan has some concerns with
the management practices exercised in the university. Dr. Sultan finds the 12 credit hours teaching load per semester (equivalent to 12 lecture hours per week) to be high for faculty expected to produce research. He claims that given the long teaching hours, it is almost impossible for him to find time to collect data for the research ideas he developed.

“... The teaching load is quite high for faculty doing research. A 12 credit hours teaching load per semester is ridiculous. This semester I have nearly forty male students and forty female students. Teaching alone is a full-time job... With less teaching load, I would have time to work on my research.” (Dr. Sultan)

Furthermore, the courses vary each semester. As a result, faculty members have to spend time preparing new courses every semester instead of spending time on research. The tasks for each assigned course do not just involve delivering the lecture in class; they also include course preparation averaging between two to four hours per course per semester. Some assigned classes have as many as 40 students, which means faculty have to allocate time to mark the 40 students’ examinations, homework assignments, and still put time into advising and mentoring. Dr. Sultan states that he also has to allocate time to handle student issues and the scheduling of examinations.

“...Realistically, a three-hour teaching time requires at least six hours of preparation.” (Dr. Sultan)

Besides the high teaching load, Dr. Sultan comments that faculty members have to participate in many committees in the university, which again is very time-consuming. For instance, the student advising activity is manually done and is both a labor- and time-intensive activity. Each faculty usually has between 25 to 30 students to advise, which requires too much of the faculty’s time in carrying out academic administrative duties. Thus, the high teaching load and the academic administrative duties allow faculty very little time to devote to research. Many national and expatriate faculty members share his views regarding the problem of high teaching loads.

“... Allow people (faculty) to actually do the research they want, at the time they want. Get administrative workers – as we are close to final examinations – why should faculty members be proctors in examinations? I have never seen
Dr. Sultan feels that non-academics do not fully understand the nature of a faculty’s job.

“… People think that since we are not at the university, or that we do not punch in or punch out; we do not do as much work. We work throughout the weekend because we need to prepare for a Sunday class or an examination. It is literally a 24 hour job.” (Dr. Sultan)

Therefore, Dr. Sultan believes that faculty members need academic freedom.

“… Freedom to … decide when to teach… the rest of your (the) time is up to you to do academic administration, community duties or (and) research… Time to teach, and the rest of the time to do research or community duties.” (Dr. Sultan)

Dr. Sultan claims that several faculty members share his view regarding the tedious manual tasks performed by faculty, which are not a good use of faculty skills and time. In terms of the university’s management practices and policy, Dr. Sultan finds some of the management processes to be cumbersome, labor intensive, and inefficient. Dr. Sultan experiences delays and roadblocks from some of the administrative processes exercised in the human resources department and academic areas.

“… For instance, it takes four days to a week to receive a to-whom-it-may-concern (salary confirmation) letter…. It delays everything you want to do with that letter. It interrupts your time with the teaching and administrative schedules.” (Dr. Sultan)

He recommends for some of the management practices to be computerized to make the process more efficient. However, he perceives resistance from the respective administrators of the processes. He felt strongly that many processes in the university require improvement. Dr. Sultan also expresses concern for the image of the university as portrayed by the staff members, faculty members and students.

“… You expect people to be professional coming to the Large National University... when someone does something so unprofessional, you start to
question, am I in the right place or is he (or she) in the wrong place?” (Dr. Sultan)

As part of his identification with the university, and to enhance the university image, Dr. Sultan provides consulting services to outside entities as a way of connecting the university and the community. Another important issue that concerns Dr. Sultan is the attitude of students nowadays. Students are constantly complaining. They miss classes and are not even bothered with their performance when they miss examinations.

“... Students do not really care. They do not care if they do not attend. They do not care if they miss an examination.” (Dr. Sultan)

With the current trend of competing internationally, Dr. Sultan feels that university administrators are putting too much concentration on university rankings instead of quality teaching and producing quality students.

“... Concentrating on a (ranking) number does not mean anything to me when the same thing still happens... regardless of how good we teach or how good our students are.” (Dr. Sultan)

Dr. Sultan affirms that he is attached to the academic world. He regards his commitment to the Large National University as a way of committing to his country, the UAE. He claims that,

“... Unless something major happens, I do not see myself leaving.” (Dr. Sultan)

5.10 Participant Dr. Mark

In agreement with the participant, an Internet interview was carried out on 22 may 2012 with Dr. Mark, previously a faculty at National Satellite Campus. Dr. Mark also completed some follow-up questions at a later date.

Dr. Mark, a male faculty, has at least 16 years of service in academia. Dr. Mark states that his dissatisfaction with the university environment in his home country motivated him to take the faculty post at National Satellite Campus. He regards his motivation to join the National Satellite Campus as an adventure and an escape from the management and negative social conditions of his employer in his home country. Dr. Mark reports that he loves working at the National Satellite Campus. He particularly likes the diversity of the faculty in the business school.
He finds the salary and benefits package attractive. In comparison to his hometown, Dr. Mark comments that the cleanliness of the country, the absence of poverty, the ultra-modern urban environment of the city and the relatively crime-free society are a nice change for him. He enjoys the students and the university library facilities. He finds the nine credit hours per semester (equivalent to nine credit teaching hours per week) teaching load to be fair for his role does not require research contributions or participation in university academic administrative duties. As such, he states that he has enough free time to pursue another degree while working.

Dr. Mark reports that the standard of the courses offered by the university is rigid, with little room for adjustments and modifications. The course assignments, routine tests, and examinations are sub-standard and not academically sound. In fact,

“... the assignments asked of students were too light, not demanding enough.”
(Dr. Mark)

For instance, one assignment in the course was to have students interview prospective faculty members. He believes that the low teaching standard prevents the National Satellite Campus from creating world-class students. His attempts to gain management support to improve the teaching standard were not appreciated. He feels that the resistance was due to the under-qualified academics in administration. Furthermore, the university does not include faculty in the decision-making process, particularly on matters that concern academics.

“... People in management did not share my wish to create world-class students. I did not agree with a system that set the same assignments, test and examinations for seven years in a row.” (Dr. Mark)

Dr. Mark believes that the university does not acknowledge his efforts with the students and does not want him to develop good faculty-student relationships. He claims that although many other faculty members share his views, none are willing to speak up. Faculty members prefer to criticize the policies and management practices behind closed doors, for fear of losing their jobs. Dr. Mark claims that, “there is a spirit of fear permeated in the department”. Dr. Mark states in his responses that he is proud of the institution and he is willing to contribute to the success of the university. However, he does not feel a sense of belonging with the university, for during his term of employment, he often feels unwanted by the
university administration. Therefore, when the university terminated his contract, Dr. Mark’s commitment re-divert accordingly.

5.11 Participant Dr. Carol

In agreement with the participant, an Internet interview with Dr. Carol was carried out on 27 May 2012. The interview lasted for a couple of months. It involved an initial set of questions and two sets of follow-up questions. Prior to joining the Small Local University, Dr. Carol worked as a consultant outside the UAE. She states that she is using the Small Local University as a stepping-stone to build a career in the Middle East. She plans to achieve an academic promotion during her employment at the university.

Dr. Carol reports that her experience at Small Local University has been great. She has the opportunity to work with faculty and students from different culture and background. She claims that although the students make her feel “a part of the family” in the institution, she does not feel attached to the university. Dr. Carol particularly likes the students and the challenges in teaching the students. She notices that the students in the UAE are more challenging to teach than students in other countries which she has taught. She reports that the development at Small Local University is very slow. Although the university has some good policies and management practices, many are static. The slow pace in development affects the productivity and efficiency of the institution, particularly in the area of policy and management practices. Dr. Carol is particularly dissatisfied with unfairness in policy and management practices. She claims that many expatriate faculty members share her view that the policies and management practices regarding salary increments are unfair. The perceived unfair treatment of salary increments between national and expatriate faculty members has affected the productivity and motivation level of herself, and according to her, also many other expatriate faculty members.

Dr. Carol reports that the management practice regarding salary increment only managed to leverage talents and productivity among UAE nationals. Furthermore, management does not make any distinctions between good and poor performances among faculty members. There are no recognitions or rewards for hard work and no punishment for poor performances. For instance,

“... Management did not appreciate my extra effort to help and encourage students to learn.” (Dr. Carol)
Though Dr. Carol is frustrated with the unfair policies and practices in the university, she remains committed to contribute to the success of the institution.

“… I am giving more than the best that I can for the students to love learning as well as prestige for the university by presenting research abroad and by being up-to-date with learning internationally.” (Dr. Carol)

Dr. Carol has strong beliefs that the university will improve over time. However, she also believes that

“… Loyalty is a two-way processes between the employer and the employee.”
(Dr. Carol)

5.12 Participant Dr. Omran

This case narrative is a 76-minute interview with Dr. Omran, a faculty at the business school in Large National University. Dr. Omran, a male faculty member, is a National of the UAE. He obtained his doctoral degree from outside the UAE. Prior to being a faculty at the university, Dr. Omran held a National Teaching Assistant (TA) position in the institution. The Large National University funded Dr. Omran’s doctoral education and upon graduation the university offered him the faculty role. As part of the TA program criteria, Dr. Omran had to serve the university in the faculty capacity for the number of years he spent in the TA program overseas. His motivation to join the university is three-fold. First, he disliked the routine office tasks that he experienced during his internship in commerce. Second, he wanted to follow the footsteps of his father and uncle who are also academics. Third, he aims to help the university bring a broader impact on the society through the students, for he believes,

“… to help students become better citizens... could really help the country.”
(Dr. Omran)

Dr. Omran claims that he has had a fairly good experience at the Large National University particularly in the area of teaching assignments. He appreciates that the business school has shown cooperation with his teaching schedule. He believes that the business school recognizes his time and research contributions in terms of awards, and public appreciation. He enjoys the prestige of being a faculty at the university because outsiders hold faculty at the university with high regard. Thus, according to him, it gives him “a sense of pride” in his job.
Nevertheless, he does not feel a sense of belonging with the university for several reasons. He dislikes that the students are losing their mother tongue language and the environment in the university is in his own words “lacking a social life”. He claims that an average nine credit hours per semester is high, especially for faculty who are also expected to contribute to quality research. He notes that this issue is more of a concern for expatriate faculty than for UAE national faculty because UAE nationals are tenured upon hire, while expatriate faculty are on contractual terms. Contract renewals for expatriate faculty are based on performance.

“... Expatriate faculty members are most concerned about teaching load and research because their tenure, or their promotion is dependent on it. UAE Nationals are not very concerned about that because they are already tenured so promotion is not a big issue for them. Job security is very important for people. Whenever people feel that they do not know whether they are staying or not, it truly harms their motivation.” (Dr. Omran)

Dr. Omran is not completely satisfied that the university is not giving sufficient research support. He experiences difficulty in finding faculty to do joint research. He claims that the faculty members in the business school do not share similar research disciplines. Therefore, he has to do joint research with faculty members not in his research stream. He notices that he did not encounter this problem in his doctoral student role while at a university in the US. In his experience with US universities, departments recruit new faculty members based on compatibility of research streams with existing faculty members, which makes joint research possible.

Dr. Omran expresses concerns with several management practices exercised in the university. First, he is not particularly happy that the university does not give faculty members a chance to participate in the decision-making process. For example, the university administration does not involve existing faculty in the selection of a new department chair.

“... The department chair was leaving and we did not know who would become the new chair until he was appointed. That is different from the US institution. In US institutions, even as a doctoral student, I had a voice in choosing the department head. We had a voice and we knew who the next chair would be. But in this university we do not know that.” (Dr. Omran)
From Dr. Omran’s experience in US universities, existing faculty and doctoral students normally have the opportunity to participate and get involved in the selection of department heads. Second, Dr. Omran attributes the lack of participation in decision-making to lack of transparency in information. For example, a successor was recruited prior to the announcement of the step-down of the department chair. The problem with lack of transparency of information in the area of management practices is also seen in management approvals of policy change. Faculty members often only stumble upon policy changes during their course of action because university management does not make the changes transparent to the university community.

“... You are not notified until you have something to do with the policy.” (Dr. Omran)

Dr. Omran reported that his experience with this particular incident assures him that there is a lack of transparency, and a lack of empowerment to the department chairs to keep faculty informed.

“... We could be more informed, more transparent. Empower department chairs to make decisions.” (Dr. Omran)

In general, Dr. Omran is not satisfied with the salary package received. He claims that the salary package that the university offers is sufficient to provide a comfortable lifestyle but not comparable to the compensation and work hours that UAE national employees receive in other government firms.

“... I am not happy with the financial aspects of my job.... The amount of money you get in this university is not really attractive and if you compare with other jobs you feel that you are not getting what you should be getting... Faculty members who had left the university for other government firms claimed that there is much less work but more money. But here in this university, there is a lot of work with less money.” (Dr. Omran)

“... The people who graduated with me from the Large National University were getting salary in the range of 70,000 to 90,000 AED... but here at Large National University you make much less than that, almost half of that.” (Dr. Omran)

Dr. Omran believes that he has gone beyond his call of duty to support and identify with the institution. He has shown support to the institution in various ways. He mentions that his Dean recently told him, “... you do not say no and
now you are overloaded” with work. However, with the issues discussed so far, Dr. Omran does not believe that the institution recognizes his contributions. He claims that, “this is why people do not feel a part of the family” in the university and for the same reasons, “faculty members are not willing to take part in the institution’s events.”

Dr. Omran claims that he has no turnover intentions for several reasons. First, jobs are more secured for national faculty at Large National University than anywhere else in the country. Second, due to family reasons, moving to another Emirate is not possible. Third, the salary package for academics at public-controlled universities is higher than private-controlled universities. Thus, Dr. Omran confirms that he aims to continue to serve the university until retirement.

**5.13 Summary**

Table 8 below shows a summary of the participants’ experiences of organizational life factors as outlined in the case narratives above.

This study details and constructs each story as told by the respondents. Most participants make a great effort to set the contexts for their stories and some share more than one story, as in the case of Dr. Jake, Dr. Karen, Dr. Sunil, Dr. Ted, Dr. Arjun, and Dr. Omran. Thus, some of the case descriptions highlight comparisons made by participants who had previous experiences in universities outside the UAE. In having acquired a holistic understanding of each narrative in the case descriptions, Chapter 6 will provide an illustration of the themes that emerged from the participants’ perceptions of organizational commitment and identify common themes among all the cases.
Table 8. Participants’ experiences of organizational life factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Jake</th>
<th>Karen</th>
<th>Sunil</th>
<th>Arjun</th>
<th>Ted</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Sameer</th>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Sultan</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Orman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Autonomy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers Relationship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Differences</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making &amp; Participation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical/Unethical Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Practices</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Promises</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality &amp; Standards</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition/Non-recognition</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support &amp; Funding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/Benefits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Ties</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfairness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Mission</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment/Location</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Faculty experience and sense of commitment

This chapter reports on the findings and analysis of the 12 case descriptions narrated in Chapter 5. Within this study, the findings focus on the multidimensional construct identified by Meyer and Allen (1991) to reflect commitment in three forms: affective commitment (emotional attachment to the institution), continuance commitment (the perceived costs of leaving the institution), and normative commitment (perceived obligation to remain in the institution).

This study repeatedly analyzes the full set of transcripts (interview transcripts, interview notes, field and memo notes) to achieve an explanation and understanding of faculty’s perceptions of commitment from a social scientific perspective. The analytical discussion for each theme pertains to what the respondents shared in the study. To provide an understanding and to make a meaningful analysis of the behaviors, events, and actions shared by the participants, this study takes into account the UAE setting and context (in Chapter 2). The narrative inquiry applied in the study uses the context to connect and situate the respondents’ experiences to cohere and structure the stories while reflecting, narrating, and assigning meanings to the disparate experiences shared.

Based on the respondents’ experiences with organizational life, five themes emerged from the analysis: economic compensation, organizational values, autonomy, organizational support and justice, and leadership. This study finds that several factors motivate the respondents to join their institutions. Some of the motivators include attractive salary package, leadership style, research funding and support, values and standards of the institution, family reasons and career opportunities. Table 9 below lists the items that motivate the respondents respectively. Among the twelve respondents, the highest motivators were salary and benefits (motivating half of the respondents), career prospects (motivating two-thirds of the respondents), and the location/environment (motivating half of the respondents). Findings also show that the motivating factors given by the participants to join an institution may have shaped the faculty’s commitment to the institution. Several other characteristics (academic freedom and fairness) found in the context of academic workplace may also have shaped faculty’s commitment and affected the faculty’s attitudes and behavior in the institution. The following sections will start with the respondent’s definition of commitment,
followed by findings and analysis of the themes developed from the respondents’ stories.

Table 9. Motivators to join institutions for respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Jake</th>
<th>Karen</th>
<th>Sunil</th>
<th>Arjun</th>
<th>Ted</th>
<th>Byron</th>
<th>Sammer</th>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Sultan</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Card</th>
<th>Omran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality &amp; Standards</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support &amp; Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/Benefits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Prospects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Reasons</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment/Location</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Respondents’ definitions of commitment

This section explores the various definitions and dimensions of the respondents’ commitment. The respondents were specifically asked to define their perceptions of what commitment mean to them. The definitions they offered show commitment to be a complex and multi-dimensional construct frequently underscored by a sense of loyalty and acts of effort put into the work. This complexity shows that the commitment process involves many components. The term ‘commitment’ as defined by some respondents, gives the impression that commitment has an assumed quality. For example,

“... Working for the good of the students, your department, your college and the university, and keeping all stakeholders in mind, then you can extend the commitment.” (Dr. Byron)

“... I really would feel committed to this place if I see that there is opportunity for promotion, not on the scientific thing, but in administrative position. I would feel more committed.” (Dr. Omran)

Other respondents see commitment as reciprocating the support and valued resources provided by the institutions.

“... There is a precondition for faculty commitment... and that is university commitment or employer commitment. The employer must show commitment
toward the welfare of the faculty. Only then can we get a positive response. It is a two-way street. It cannot be one-way.” (Dr. Sunil)

“... People can only be loyal to an institution if they feel that the institution is loyal to them.” (Dr. Jane)

“... Commitment constitutes support from top management.” (Dr. Carol)

The respondents’ definitions reflect the social exchange theory, whereby the individuals reciprocate when they feel that the institution provided the necessary valued resources in the workplace (Gouldner 1960). Hence, when faculty feel supported and rewarded, they will exhibit greater commitment to the university. Reciprocating commitment may in turn lead to increased performance and other work behaviors and attitudes that can benefit the institution (Umbach 2009).

Subsequently, one respondent views commitment as a psychological contract between the employee and the employer. The psychological contract theory of Rousseau (1995) posits that employees and employers both develop mutual obligations to one another, whereby the employee owes an employer certain contributions in the job and the employer owes inducements for work.

“... Organizational commitment means there is respect from my side and the managing side.” (Dr. Sameer)

Two respondents give the impression that commitment is of no singular importance it is simply a responsibility of the individual worker.

“... Organizational commitment from a personal perspective is committing oneself to the goals and visions of an organization.” (Dr. Arjun)

“... Commitment not only means teaching your load, doing the research and doing the community service... It is showing a positive energy of the institution you are working at [for] and the country you belong to.” (Dr. Sultan)

At this level, commitment to both respondents is about obligation to perform in an institution, implying an implicit employee-employer contract, an unwritten contract in the workplace. The two faculty members also show that there is some amount of giving to the university, in the level of commitment. One characteristics of the respondents’ commitment is the loyalty feature, whereby faculty members commit regardless of monetary gains.
Two respondents see commitment as a culmination of satisfaction in the various job aspects. Research shows that job satisfaction and affective commitment are related but they have different constructs. Commitment encompasses the total organization whereas job satisfaction is limited to how an employee feels about one aspect of the job, (Porter et al. 1974, Mowday et al. 1982). However, other relative research has shown that job satisfaction can develop commitment (Mathieu and Zajac 1990).

“… Organizational commitment will be achieved when there is challenge and satisfaction in teaching, work life balance and professional growth... sufficient time to do research is important and that is the major part that will build my commitment to that particular institution.” (Dr. Karen)

“… Organizational commitment comes from various aspects of satisfaction, mostly non-monetary things.” (Dr. Jake)

As seen above, commitment to the institution involves several key elements in the work environment, particularly in an environment such as higher education, where many changes can dramatically impact the working conditions, practices, and academic autonomy. The narratives of the respondents’ stories reveal that experiences of several organizational life factors within the academic work context form the individual faculty’s perceptions of commitment. Some of these organizational life factors identified from the stories include economic compensation, organizational values, organizational support and justice, autonomy, and leadership. Subsequent sections in this chapter highlight the findings for each of the aforementioned factors (themes), which the respondents reflect upon as they share their experiences of commitment in the higher education institutions.

6.2 Economic compensation

“… Faculty ego factors are different from company workers in a commercial environment. Compensation is only one factor; a relatively low level factor.” (Dr. Sunil)

This study finds economic compensation to motivate at least 50% of the respondents to join their institutions. The desire to join the institutions because of the attractive compensation can be interpreted as affective commitment (Allen & Meyer 1990). However, the finding for this study on economic compensation,
contradicts the theory because attractive salary and benefits package is found to be a motivator for some faculty, but it is not enough to foster long-term commitment or continuance commitment among the expatriate respondents.

“... Professors look for recognition as a motivating factor, and that in my opinion, ranks as number one. That is, recognition by the students, and the deans that they are doing a good job, that they are contributing in a material way to the university's welfare.” (Dr. Sunil)

One possible explanation as to why expatriate faculty members regard attractive economic compensation to be a motivator to stay but not to retain commitment, is that most expatriates come to work in the UAE for financial, family or personal reasons and are aware that there is no job stability. The contracts for expatriate faculty in the UAE are on fixed terms with no opportunity for tenure or chance to qualify for permanent residency in the country. Expatriate contract periods depend on the institution, ranging from one to four years at a time. Visas for expatriates are capped at three years. The employment arrangements between expatriate and UAE national faculty are disparate. Unlike expatriates, as affirmed by the national respondents, UAE national academics receive tenure upon hire, by default of the government’s employment policy.

The expatriate respondents were specifically asked in a set of follow-up questions to identify their perceptions of the differences in the employment arrangements between expatriates and national faculty (see Appendix 8. Respondents Perceptions of Disparity in Employment Arrangements). Besides the perceptions of disparity in salary, benefits, and teaching loads, sabbatical leave for expatriate academics is treated as unpaid leave without any benefit entitlements, compared to paid leave with benefits for national faculty. As an anonymous person once remarked, most faculty members come to the UAE to work with two empty buckets; one to fill up the money, and the other to fill up “nonsense” from the employer. When either the nonsense bucket or the money bucket becomes filled, the expatriate will decide that it is time to leave their employer. This may be the reason several expatriate respondents have high turnover intentions and several of them feel that money is only secondary to their decisions when changing employer.

“... What is more important for me is the quality of life, not just life... in terms of let us say, a lot of intangibles that my family gets... to enjoy.” (Dr. Arjun)
“... I always seek professional growth rather than monetary gains. In fact, I have accepted a job that pays 15% less, but I can start building a career.”

(Dr. Karen)

Conversely, this study finds consideration for economic compensation important to UAE national respondents, particularly for those whose positions are an outcome of the Teaching Assistant (TA) program. The salary and benefits for entry level positions for fresh graduates hired from the TA program as an Assistant Professor is usually, at least 50% higher than expatriate faculty members in the same academic rank. In fact, in some cases, as once related to me by an anonymous ex-faculty member of Large National University,

“... Their starting salaries are higher than some existing and new expatriate Associate Professors at the university. It is unjust.” (Anonymous)

Even with the disparity in employment arrangements (as shown in Appendix 8. Respondents Perceptions of Disparity in Employment Arrangements) in favor of national faculty, this study found claims of dissatisfaction among UAE nationals with their economic compensation, and perceived job turnover intentions.

“... In the last few years, many National faculty members left the institution because of the salary gap between the university (Large National University) and other government organizations.” (Dr. Omran)

Contrary to previous studies (Meyer & Smith 2000, McElroy 2001, Meyer et al. 2004), the findings for this study affirm that attractive economic compensation is a motivator, but it does not foster affective commitment or normative commitment among expatriate respondents who are on fixed-term appointments. Several expatriate respondents claim that they are switching jobs to alternate employers who provide lower salaries and fewer benefits. On the other hand, attractive economic compensation fosters affective, continuance and normative commitment among national respondents.

Several expatriate respondents continue to stay with their current employer even when they are not committed to the institution. Respondents claimed that their reasons are not based on the attractiveness of the economic compensation. For many of them, the reasons for not leaving current employer are because of the lack of alternative employment opportunities and the restrictive work visas in the country. With the immigration law of the country, expatriates find it cumbersome
to move between jobs. Switching between employers involves a large number of interruptions in the job switching process and to the family.

“... Lots of people do not go from one university to another very easily. If you leave this university you tend to leave the country. So, again that could be a reason some people stay so long if they have children they cannot suddenly take them out of school.” (Dr. Jane)

As the findings show, commitment encompasses the whole organization, not just one aspect of the job. Therefore, other job attributes besides attractive economic compensation may also improve the respondents’ commitment level.

### 6.3 Organizational values

“... There was one incident... when I was asked to break rules. That went beyond my conscience.” (Dr. Jake)

In this study the focus on values will be on the ethical component of organizational values. Values are “the standards that guide the external adaptation and internal integration of organizations” (Hunt et al. 1989: 79). University’s ethical values are determined by the institution’s unendorsed practices. Non-organizational, organizational, and interpersonal issues at the faculty’s academic workplace can guide a number of ethical views (Jepsen et al. 2009). The repercussions of the ethical issues in an academic workplace may have consequences on maintaining membership with the institution. This study finds perceived organizational values to shape faculty member’s affection and loyalty to the institution. Incongruences between individual faculty’s personal moral values and institution’s values may shape the individual’s turnover intentions (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001).

Findings from this study show a relationship between faculty member’s perception of organizational values and affective and normative commitment for all faculty members across institution types. Many respondents in this study view values to be an important facet of organizational culture in terms of management practices, vague contractual promises, and the quality of institution personnel and students. Faculty members who experience unethical managerial practices question their loyalty to the institution because they perceive the institution to be unwilling to support ethical reasoning and behavior.
“... Many rules I was happy to bend because I knew them. But I was not comfortable in breaking rules. There was one incident, one incident when I was asked to break rules. That went beyond my conscience... So this was a clear clash of my compliance with many other things since I bend rules... This I couldn’t do, I said, this is not acceptable... This caused a big problem with the dean... there were pressures applied in many ways but I took a very strong stand.” (Dr. Jake)

“... The problem is with the ethics... People in a way conduct unethical things in order to survive there, just through the pressure of the higher management... I could not imagine myself running the department and neither would I be ever willing to take such unethical decisions.” (Dr. Karen)

Congruent with Mowday’s (1998) findings, in this study, respondents who found their personal values and organization values to differ tended not to bond with the organization. This study also finds incongruence in individual faculty’s expectations of professionalism in supervisors and coworker to affect both expatriate and national faculty’s passions for organization membership (Porter et al. 1974, Reichers 1985, Busch et al. 1998). The unprofessional image of the department supervisor and coworker as echoed by Dr. Karen, “the way they talk to you” sends a negative message not only to the faculty but also to the community, so “you start to question am I in the right place?” echoed Dr. Sultan. Hence it shows that as respondents maintain membership (affective commitment) with the university, they are concerned with their identities at the institution and how others outside the institution perceive their membership. Thus, similar to previous research findings, perceptions of external prestige help generate affective commitment (Fuller et al. 2006).

Also congruent with previous research (Rousseau 1995), this study finds that when the psychological contract is broken, the employee’s trust in the institution becomes questionable, and the faculty member feel discouraged. As the study data shows, two respondents’ trust levels in the institution were affected by unmet contractual promises concerning reduction in teaching load and research support.

“... They promised research funding, they promised access to databases, downtime for research, that is, reduction of teaching loads, travelling time and opportunity for conference presentations, availability of research grants... many of the benefits that had been promised to faculty have not been delivered and they keep saying of course that this will correct itself in the next
two or three years but whether that happens is a matter of conjecture we are not sure whether it will or not... There was a suggestion last year that that there would be downtime for research, that is a reduction in teaching loads by three hours for those who publish in refereed journal. Unfortunately, that has been put on the back burner because of the budgetary considerations. When that is restored, I am not sure.” (Dr. Sunil)

“... They have promised that if you publish, they would give us teaching load reduction but that has not been put into effect yet.” (Dr. Sameer)

This study also finds differences between faculty’s personal values and institutional values regarding teaching standards, which failed to enhance faculty commitment, but instead, created frustration (Lawrence et al. 2012). Therefore, if the respondents are unable to identify their personal goals and values with that of their institutions, they will not feel attached (affective commitment) to the university (Meyer & Allen 1991). Three expatriate respondents were discouraged by the incongruence in teaching standards between the institution and the individual’s expectations.

“... The level that we are teaching is so low that it is just frustrating” (Dr. Karen)

“...It is never going to happen unless you change the process to actually force the issue of quality teaching... it’s more than that, it’s actually about giving people a proper education rather than just saying well we can’t do it with these students... And that’s the clash – ultimately that was the clash of philosophies.” (Dr. Ted)

“... The assignments to students are too light, not demanding enough... and yet people in management did not share my wish to create world class students” (Dr. Mark).

Thus, this study finds a relationship between faculty member’s perception of organizational values and affective and normative commitment for all faculty members across institution types. Unfortunately, this study finds UAE national faculty members to be weak in sharing their views on management practices. One possible explanation may be because of the Arab culture, particularly in the UAE, where criticisms of superiors’ actions are generally considered as a lack of respect for individuals in authority. In the UAE culture, individuals in authority maintain the father figure. Managerial attitudes and practices are shaped by the Islamic
values, where strong emphasis is put on obedience to the leaders. Employees are expected to accept the authority of the leader and comply. Subordinates are also expected to show respect to and obey superiors (Yousef 1998a). Therefore, this may be the explanation for national faculty withholding their views on the management practices exercised in the institution.

6.4 Perceived autonomy

“… Faculty have nearly always been very independent minded. They do not like to be told. They do not like to be given guidance. They like to be masters in the classroom. Do what they feel is important. Teach what they feel is important not what the course outcomes are, or the program outcomes are.”
(Dr. Sunil)

This study defines autonomy as the extent of job-related independence given to faculty members to structure, and control how and when they do their particular job tasks. Research has shown that a reasonable degree of autonomy given at the workplace can nurture and develop affective organizational commitment among employees (Mathieu & Zajac 1990). Conversely, a lack of autonomy and too much supervision affects the individual’s emotional attachment (affective commitment), and the obligation to remain with current institution (normative commitment). In this study, faculty job autonomy is measured based on the respondent’s perception of autonomy.

The two UAE National faculty respondents regard autonomy as the key feature of the academic profession, because of the nature of the faculty’s work. One of them in particular, made a conscious decision to join the academic world for that very reason.

“…The freedom of doing things I like. Here you do have a boss but he does not tell you what to do every day on your job… they don’t tell you exactly how to teach and what to teach in the course…so that’s the freedom and not having to report to a boss who oversees your daily work.” (Dr. Omran)

Dr. Omran and Dr. Sultan both find task autonomy to foster perceptions of personal competence, which may aid in shaping higher commitment.

“... The freedom in terms of when you teach and the rest of your time is up to you to do community work or research... You decide what you want to do and...
On the contrary, expatriate respondents do not feel that they have task autonomy. 

“If you want to do research, you have to ask for permission from our higher management.” (Dr. Karen)

Stories from the respondents show that not only do faculty lack autonomy, even Deans are not empowered to do their jobs, to be effective in their roles to help faculty members increase job satisfaction, and loyalty to the institution (Zeffane & Al Zarooni 2008).

“... Deans do not have the power to make decisions without taking advice from the top.... You are certainly free to take action but freedom can get you into trouble so you really need to seek advice from the top about what you are doing and whether it is right or wrong.” (Dr. Sunil)

Further findings from this study also show commitment to diminish when faculty members fail to receive the freedom to plan their daily work life. Research has shown that organization culture can sometimes determine the degree of empowerment (Zeffane & Al Zarooni 2008). Given the research context in this study, empowerment is uncommon in the UAE culture. Arab leaders have privileges above their subordinates, and subordinates are therefore expected to depend on the leaders to make decisions.

In addition, a lack of trust permeates the UAE society. For example, at one of the federal institutions, all expatriate faculty and staff have to show clearances from the telecommunications company even if they do not have a land line telephone service. Informant II stated that this lack of trust from the institution applies to faculty in all disciplines. Employers lacking trust tend not to empower their employees. Managements with higher trust, delegate the greatest power, which in turn results in higher employee participation (Tzafrir 2005). Trust from management signals to faculty that the university cares. As researchers (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991, McElroy 2001) have shown, obligations to the employer develop when individuals perceive trust from the employer. Therefore, with a constant lack of empowerment, it will take the institution considerably more time and effort to gain faculty’s trust for their department heads.

As noted by several expatriate respondents, nowadays, faculty members are losing control over their jobs, they no longer have a say in, or are given the
opportunity to select the course they teach. Instead, management assigns courses to faculty that are outside the individual’s specialty without any explanations, or prior consultation with the faculty member. Apparently, such managerial behavior is evident at other disciplines:

“... Faculty does all the work, administration just bark the orders. The world is changing and life is not the same for academics anymore.” (Informant I)

Hence, commitment declines when expatriate faculty members perceive the lack of freedom to select the courses to teach. Expatriate faculty respondents from publicly controlled universities attribute the lack of freedom in choice of courses to teach as a weakness in management to consider the faculty member’s expertise and knowledge.

“... There was not really a rational reason given [as to] why the courses were allocated... People who are teaching human resources for example are specialized in marketing, while people who are teaching marketing are specialized in management... everybody is teaching something other than what they are specialized in.” (Dr. Karen)

This management trend apparently is happening in both public and private institutions especially in universities where “there is a large shortage of staff”, said Dr. Jake.

As the findings from the study show, faculty members believe that they need the autonomy (degree of freedom, independences and discretion) from the institution to carry out their responsibilities: freedom to choose courses to teach which are within their specialization, freedom to plan the day, and freedom to select topics of research (Adriaenessens et al. 2006). However, the findings also show that the national faculty respondents perceive autonomy to be present while expatriate faculty members do not hold that same perception. The lack of autonomy causes resentment among expatriate faculty members and impacts their affection (affective commitment) for the business school. The lack of independence to embark on research, and insufficient discretion to make decisions clearly alters commitment among expatriate faculty in public-controlled institutions. Thus autonomy is found to be an important job dimension in the academic profession to foster positive affective, and normative commitment for faculty.

Both expatriate and national faculty believe in and value academic autonomy not only in their choice of research topics and scholarly pursuit, but also the
choice to manage their own time outside teaching. However, the organization of the corporate-style university in the 21st century has shifted faculty autonomy to the new corporate university management (Progler 2010). Congruent with previous research (Altbach et al. 2009), the decrease in academic autonomy and, the increased demands for accountability and control from university management add stress for academics.

“… People have had nervous breakdowns... mental breakdowns. Physically people cannot do that much work as they get exhausted... It is a very tiring job. It takes a lot of energy. People aged a lot. Everybody has noticed that people are aging fast. So, it is not a healthy environment. The question you asked, ‘Is that compensation really worth it?’” (Dr. Karen)

6.5 Perceived organizational support and justice

“… They will support you to publish good research, but having published the research, the recognition was very selective, which I think is detrimental to the human culture.” (Dr. Arjun)

Organizational support and justice in this study pertains to the just and fair treatment of faculty in relation to what they thought they deserved and what they received. It posits that if faculty members believe that they are fairly treated, faculty will likely have positive attitudes about their work and their contributions, which in turn shape their behavior (Cohen & Keren 2008). Therefore, the degree to which faculty members react positively or negatively toward their roles from fairness in the academic workplace defines their loyalty (affective and normative commitment) to the institutions. Justice, equity and fairness are important to everyone in varying degrees (Jones 2000). Organizational justice is noted in several areas namely, teaching load, salary increments and rewards, and promotions. Organizational support is noted in research funding, job security and quality of students.

This study finds organizational support and justice to encompass three components: distributive, procedural and interactional justice. Distributive justice, as shared by the respondents, relates to the distribution of resources and outcomes in comparison to what other faculty members receive. In this study, distributive justice is the degree to which teaching loads, teaching assignments, and research time are allocated in an equitable manner. Procedural justice is the perception of fairness of procedures used to determine the outcome decisions. Therefore,
perceptions of the degree to which the procedure is just depends on the individual faculty experiencing the effect of the decision, and according to if the individual regards the methods and guidelines to be fair. Interactional justice refers to the fairness of interpersonal communication, specifically with the method used by institutions in conveying information and changes that affect academics.

6.5.1 Perceived distributive justice in teaching load

This study finds perceptions of unfair management practices in academic administration appointments, teaching assignments and teaching loads in public-controlled institutions. Faculty members with perceptions of unfairness in workload experience difficulty in prioritizing and accomplishing their work. This in turn leads to role ambiguity, role conflict and diminishes organizational commitment as the individual’s loyalty is challenged by such a situation (Wolverton et al. 1999).

All the respondents are concerned with the high teaching load, and increased academic administrative duties in their institutions. When compared to research universities, particularly in the USA, the respondents’ reported teaching loads per semester were found to be high. Table 10 below shows a comparative teaching hours per week from the AAUP (2013), the NCES (2002), the UAE MOE (2011) and the teaching hours reported by the respondents.

Table 10. Comparisons of weekly teaching hours globally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAUP</th>
<th>AAUP</th>
<th>NCES</th>
<th>UAE</th>
<th>UAE Research-oriented Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research-oriented Institutions</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>Per Semester</td>
<td>Research-oriented Institutions</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>Reported Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>Per Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>7 to 11</td>
<td>Average 14.5</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This study finds teaching load in most institutions to be high given the expectations to produce quality research as part of the faculty’s role. The range of teaching hours reported by all respondents is between 9 and 12 lecture hours per week. All the institutions covered in this study except for National Satellite University, are research-oriented universities, and faculty are required to
Contribute to quality research. In comparing with universities globally, the AAUP (2013) recommended teaching hours per week are 9 to 12 hours and preferred recommended hours are 6 to 9 hours for research universities. In comparison to the NCES (2002) report, faculty members in USA research universities are teaching between 7 and 11 hours per week. Therefore, based on the comparison, for faculty in UAE institutions, which are research-oriented universities, a 9 to 12 teaching hours per week is high with expectations for quality research contributions.

All the respondents recognize that institutions in the UAE are demanding research contributions from faculty because of the global university rankings. However, as one respondent pointed out, the issue regarding the distributive justice in teaching load is more about finding the time to do research while undertaking heavy teaching hours and high academic administrative duties:

“... Teaching alone is a full-time job... With less teaching load, I would have time to work on my research.” (Dr. Sultan)

“... For universities who are a mixture of research and teaching... you have to reduce the teaching hours, and promote research. And by promoting research I mean, you’ve got to give them downtime for research by reducing teaching loads.” (Dr. Sunil)

Therefore, this study’s findings support the view that faculty want to remain at institutions where research is believed in and valued by institutional administrators but there has to be a balance in the distribution of faculty’s time between teaching, research and academic administrative responsibilities in order to generate quality research contribution.

6.5.2 Perceived distributive justice in economic compensation

This study finds national faculty to be particularly concerned with distributive justice of economic compensation. As one respondent (Dr. Omran) stated, national workers in local government firms were taking home higher salaries than faculty at the public-controlled institution, thus, creating a feeling of unfairness in terms of salary distribution.

“... A new graduate is getting a salary comparable to an Assistant Professor in this university. I have been working for seven years to get that same salary.” (Dr. Omran)
Although perceptions of inequity and injustice may have created some unhappiness (job dissatisfaction), the national faculty (Dr. Omran) makes the decision to remain with his employer because of the calculative cost of leaving.

“... The job security here at the university is much higher than anywhere else.”
(Dr. Omran)

Thus, Dr. Omran’s experience in this aspect is congruent with the claims of previous researchers (Becker 1960, Meyer & Allen 1991, Allen & Meyer 1996, Meyer & Allen 1997, Meyer & Smith 2000, Jones 2006) on continuance commitment. Conversely, this study does not find expatriate respondents to show much concern with the aspect of distributive injustice in economic compensation. Can it be that they do not believe that the institution will support their concern and take action, or have they just accepted the disparate employment arrangements?

6.5.3 Perceived procedural justice in promotions

This study finds traces of procedural injustice in terms of promotion and performance evaluation experienced by expatriate faculty members from both private- and public- controlled universities. Faculty members perceive that their opportunities for growth and career advancements are hampered as a result of the subjective evaluation standards and ambiguous policy guidelines in the institution. However, due to limited resources and funding, particularly with decreased government funding in public institutions and competition in student enrolments, academic institutions are tightening their budgets, which may have also contributed to fewer promotion prospects (Baron 2000, Machiori & Henkin 2004).

Although most institutions have their own established criteria for promotions, in Dr. Arjun’s case, with a change in leadership, the promotion process became subjective. Congruent with previous research (Cohen 2007a), employee’s perceptions of justice in reward decisions can significantly influence the individual’s commitment to the institution. As you may recall from Dr. Arjun’s story, his initial perception on commitment for the university was high because the university modeled itself to US institutions. In American institutions, faculty promotions are assessed objectively as per the institution’s criteria. Thus, with the promotion issue experienced at his university in the UAE, Dr. Arjun does not seem to perceive his current employer as positively as when he first joined the
institution. Therefore, when things are perceived to be worse than originally believed, faculty members respond negatively (Ambrose & Cropanzano 2003).

“... Things are not as professional as they ought to be—then that would be a shock.” (Dr. Arjun)

6.5.4 Perceived interactional justice in communicating changes

Interactional justice component of organizational support and justice in terms of transparency is a major issue for both UAE national and expatriate faculty members in public-controlled universities. When institutions fail to share information on changes in policy and guidelines to academics, faculty members perceive the action as a lack of trust from the institution’s side. Faculty members who perceive trust from the employer will develop a sense of obligation toward the institution (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991, McElroy 2001).

The lack of transparency in information, such as policy changes, new guidelines that affect academics, and change in executive management in the department are some of the concerns expressed by the respondents. Previous research has shown that transparency in information helps re-establish the faculty's sense of predictability and control, which in turn helps to reduce perceptions of job insecurity (Adkins et al. 2001).

“... Be transparent. It is about how information is communicated from management... Most of the colleagues that I talked to are quite frustrated and sometimes that frustration leads to lower quality of performance and intentions to leave.” (Dr. Jake)

This study finds the three justice constructs to be significant for both expatriate and UAE national faculty members regardless of institutional sectors. Unfairness in non-financial matters has a stronger control on expatriate faculty members’ organizational commitment. Faculty’s organizational commitment is also coerced by their perceptions of fairness and how the institutions value them. Significant similarities exist in all justice constructs. Though differences are found in the employment arrangements between expatriate and national faculty, both expatriate and national faculty experience the interactional justice construct.

This study’s findings on organizational support and justice suggest that perceptions of management practices on distributive, procedural and interactional justices are related to faculty’s affective and normative commitment to the
institution. Faculty members tend to feel obligated to institutions and remain when they feel that the management practices exercised by the university are fair (Meyer & Smith 2000). Therefore, this study finds organizational support and justice to be an important factor in shaping faculty members’ perceptions of fairness. Institutions that show support and justice can eventually encourage faculty to maintain organizational membership (normative commitment) and self-efficacy (Hardré et al. 2011).

6.5.5 Perceived distributive support in research

Both expatriate and national faculty members in public- and private-controlled universities experience distribution justice in research support. This study finds the lack of distributive support in allocating time for research to decrease faculty’s loyalty to the institution.

“... Research is most important to my career... If my institution does not allow me to commit sufficient time for [to] research, I will seek other institutions.” (Dr. Karen)

As the respondent’s statement shows, when a faculty member believes that the university is supporting her work, a positive attitude will develop toward the job (Fairweather & Rhoads 1995). Research contribution is a prime factor for promotion considerations and contract renewals for expatriate faculty members in UAE institutions. Faculty’s promotion opportunities and contract renewal are hinged on their research publications, teaching performance, academic administrative contributions and students’ evaluations. With insufficient research support either in terms of time and resources for research, respondents expressed concern for the roadblock that will impede their tasks. Previous research (Gouldner 1960) shows that individuals reciprocate when institutions provide the required resources and support. Besides, institutional support on research can promote continuance commitment (Cohen 2007b). Commitment will in turn, manifest in various work behaviors, facilitate productivity (Bland et al. 2006) and increase performance to benefit the university (Mowday et al. 1974, Porter et al. 1976, Steers 1977).
6.5.6 Perceived procedural support in job security

This study finds the lack of job security for expatriate faculty members from both publicly and privately controlled institutions to strongly sway organizational commitment. The labor environment in UAE institutions consists mainly of expatriate faculty members who reside temporarily in the country. The UAE residency law provides no option for expatriate faculty members to settle down permanently. Faculty positions are temporary with employment contracts spanning a period of either three or four years depending on the academic rank and the institution. In the UAE, faculty contracts are at will and the individual can be dismissed from the institution without cause. Thus, faculty members perceive the procedural issue on job security as a lack of care and concern from the business schools. Congruent with previous studies (Ameen et al. 1995, Kipkebut 2010), perceptions of job insecurity affect expatriate respondents’ commitment levels, and create turnover cognitions. Also congruent with other researcher (Yousef 1998b), job security has a relationship with organizational commitment among the expatriate respondents.

“... Faculty commitment towards an organization, the university is vastly curtailed because of the visa regulations... there is no tenure here. Your tenure in a job and in this country is as good as how good your visa is... unlike other countries, visa has nothing to do with your job, your residency in a country is independent of your job, organizational effectiveness through getting a residency would be easier.” (Dr. Sunil)

Thus, many expatriate faculty respondents do not feel attached to their business schools, particularly because of the nature of their employment contract, fixed-term appointment. The lack of job security in procedural justice has prevented expatriate faculty members from voicing their opinions. The lack of tenure-track contract coupled with dismissal without due process is the cause for fear of job security among the expatriate respondents. In the higher education setting, tenure sends a message of long-term employment that is inviolable only in extreme cases. Although the expatriate respondents are not on tenure-track contracts, some have 3-year and others have 4-year contracts. According to Adkins et al. (2001), this means they do have promises of short-term job security. Thus, congruent with previous research (Adkins et al. 2001), all the expatriate respondents who experience job insecurity have turnover cognitions, which imply that they do not feel an obligation to remain (normative commitment). However, this study does
not find concerns for job security with UAE national respondent because with the UAE labor policy, national faculty members’ positions are tenured once they join the institution.

6.5.7 Perceived procedural support with student quality

Many respondents perceive the lack of management support in their concerns over the quality of the students’ academic skills and attitude toward learning. Both expatriate and national respondents are concerned with the students’ low academic skill levels and their “reluctance to learn” as stated by Dr. Arjun.

“... Students do not really care. They do not care if they do not attend. They do not care if they miss an examination.” (Dr. Sultan)

One respondent (Dr. Sunil) attributes the problem to the “poor quality of education received before coming to the university”. Another attributed the student’s lack of drive to university management’s practices. Several respondents felt that management themselves should develop a sense of belonging for the student, instead of putting the responsibilities on faculty to motivate the students, since students do not see faculty “as educator, they treat us as somebody who give assessments and grades” echoed Dr. Karen.

Several expatriate respondents find it ironic that the students are evaluating the faculty’s teaching effectiveness, when the students themselves are “not even trying”, stated Dr. Ted. In the UAE institutions, faculty’s promotion opportunities and contract renewals are based on their annual evaluation performance, which takes into account the students’ evaluations. The student’s evaluation can account for as much “as 50% of the total evaluation in some institutions depending on the institutions” (Informant I). This may be a reason why faculty members are afraid to upset the students or to fail the students. Instead, faculty members tend to give students higher grades than they deserve. Apparently, assigning a low grade will have repercussions for the faculty member. For faculty in the UAE, without tenure, there is no academic freedom to protect them.

“... I was murdered by the students in the student evaluations... they punished me severely by giving me very low evaluations.” (Dr. Ted)

A few expatriate respondents perceive that the university management does not support the faculty in the issue of grade adjustments. Instead, in a couple of instances as reported by two respondents, management supports the students
instead of the faculty. For example, one respondent reported that faculty members were told to adjust the students’ grades when they appealed for higher grades. According to Gerson (2010), students are not afraid to ask for higher grades than they deserve. Thus faculty members tend to inflate grades to save their own jobs. Hence, students can successfully manipulate faculty. Congruent with recent research on higher education consumerization of college students (Delucchi & Korgen 2002: 104), these students who seek high grades with minimum input effort are “grade grubbing”.

The students’ low academic quality also puts a lot of time and strain on the faculty members.

“... It was a real challenge to deal with low-level type students.” (Dr. Salem)
“... Students do not want to go beyond the bare minimum.” (Dr. Arjun)
“... Makes it very difficult to deliver courses at the level we expected.” (Dr. Sunil)

As thus, it affects faculty’s involvement in the institution, lower affective commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001). Additionally, other respondents are concerned for the future of the institution to attract high-level academics because of the students’ pedagogy.

“... The student pedagogy... discourages high-level academics to enter the classroom.” (Dr. Jake)

In addition, several expatriate respondents express concerns over the low-level curriculum and student assignments. Two of the expatriate respondents believe that management was not ready to make the change to upgrade the standard because of the quality of the students. The respondents’ feelings for the quality of the student and its impact on the institution’s future reflect the individual’s emotions toward the university (Meyer & Smith 2000) whereby feelings of warmth and affection are expressed (Shaffer & Harrison 1998). Affective commitment is drawn from the respondents’ emotions to a particular group, that is, the students in the institutions (Jones 2006).
6.6 Leadership

“... Autocratic, authoritative, bureaucratic, centralized, devolution of power is limited.” (Dr. Sunil)

Institutions in UAE are generally managed under a strong umbrella of bureaucracy. With the diversity of the workforce in UAE, leadership styles exercised in the institutions play an important role in faculty’s experience of organizational life. Both expatriate and UAE national faculty members from public- and private-controlled institutions find bureaucratic processes unnecessary and time-consuming. The university bureaucratic processes not only affect faculty’s teaching schedule and administrative responsibilities, they also take away free time for faculty to conduct research. This study finds a majority of the respondents feel that management is taking advantage of them, thus their trust for management is likely to be low, which may not help with shaping their levels of commitment.

Findings from this study show that institutions in the UAE do not have participative styles of leadership. Faculty members do not feel that management involves them enough when making decisions that concern academics. Take for example the situation reported by Dr. Omran, where faculty members in the department were not even aware of or informed by the Dean regarding the resignation of the department chair. Faculty in the department only knew about the resignation when a replacement chair was instated. It is unlike the USA institutional practice reported by Dr. Omran, where faculty members including doctoral students, play a part in the selection process for a new Chair. As researcher (Yousef 2000b) shows, faculty members are more committed to their institutions when they perceive their managers to adopt participative behavior, for participative leadership enhances employee commitment and contributes towards organizational effectiveness. The concern expressed by Dr. Omran recalls a similar problem in the collaboration between Yale University and the National University of Singapore, where the exclusion of faculty members from the decision-making process accompanied an academic mission change (Alajoutsijärvi et al. 2013c).

Respondents from publicly and privately controlled institutions also cite discontent with strong managerial control and bureaucracy. In some institutions, faculty’s work hours are monitored with “clocking in and clocking out” process, as reported by Dr. Jake. A national respondent (Dr. Sultan) also felt that the
administration was “too rigid for change.” This is congruent with research, where a perception of non-responsive leadership does not foster organizational commitment (Lawrence et al. 2011).

6.7 Summary of findings

In summary, various organizational life factors experienced in the academic workplace are related with faculty’s commitment. Some factors are more important than others depending on the individual’s expectations, background, experiences and culture. Autonomy is the one common factor of organizational life found among all the respondents. Respondents feel strongly for the need to have autonomy in deciding when and how to carry out their tasks in order to be effective in the academic workplace. For expatriate faculty, management support when there are low quality students is essential for them to uphold their role as an educator without becoming manipulated by the students. National and expatriate faculty members strongly need management’s support to balance their time in carrying out the essential tasks in their role: teaching, research and academic administrative duties. As a result of their experiences with the organizational life, the respondents re-evaluate the directions of their commitment:

“... My loyalty to my profession will secure my worth.” (Dr. Jake)

“... I am an academic and research is my key area... I need to grow. I need to publish... I am loyal to my research discipline... my research is my career, not my teaching. If my institution does not allow me to commit sufficient time to research, I will seek another institution... My research is most important to my career... and this will bring employment opportunities in the future, even outside the Middle East.” (Dr. Karen)

“... I have gone beyond the call of duty... I feel an attachment as far as my professional responsibilities are concerned. I was hired for a job, and I will stay here for at least until the job has been done. I will see where my career takes me.” (Dr. Sunil)

“... I definitely feel loyal to the place. I feel attached to the place... I tried very hard to be an asset to my department. I focused on quality research apart from my teaching. I did not even think of looking around for different institutions till the change in leadership happened... but now the inspiration is regressing. I feel more loyalty to the profession than to the institution. I
should be more committed to my discipline than the institution. There are no safeguards other than an individual’s research and teaching record to fall back on.” (Dr. Arjun)

“... Research is part and parcel of teaching up-to-date topics... I am committed to research. I have loyalty to students regardless of what institutions they belong to.” (Dr. Ted)

“... My orientation has changed to research. I have the impression that it is better to be a great researcher and be horrible in teaching and service than to be a great teacher that do valuable service and be an okay researcher.” (Dr. Byron)

“... I am just going to stick to my profession... my passport to easily move around.” (Dr. Sameer)

“... I like teaching. I love teaching. So, I am attached to my profession. So, I would not say I am particularly attached to the institution... you become attached to some of your students... that could be true of any institutions that you go into... so, that could be anywhere.” (Dr. Jane)

“... I was more committed to research.” (Dr. Mark)

“... Research for future endeavors.” (Dr. Carol)

“... I like the freedom of the academic world and I do not think that is specific to this university but rather to any institution... showing a positive energy of your institution and the country you belong to.” (Dr. Sultan)

“... I feel more committed to my country, not to the institution... If I have another opportunity to serve the country... I might go there. The institution is not really... an obstacle for me to serve the country.” (Dr. Omran)

All the respondents recognize that their profession, and area of discipline will secure their worth. This study concludes that faculty members are committed, but their commitments are not invested in the business schools. Instead, expatriate faculty members commit to their profession, area of discipline, students and research, instead of to the business school. UAE National faculty members commit to the academic world and to their country instead of to the business school. Hence, the findings of this study have several theoretical and practical implications and contain ideas for future research.
7 Discussions

The purpose of this study is to examine what faculty members perceive as commitment when experiencing organizational life in academic workplaces in UAE business schools. This study uses the multidimensional organizational commitment model as a framework to identify the commitment levels. This chapter discusses, interprets and evaluates the findings made by this study, and highlights contributions made to the higher education and organizational commitment literature. Discussions also include theoretical and practical implications, limitations of the study, and future research directions. This section starts with the summary results for the two research questions.

7.1 Summary of research question one

Research Question One: What factors of organizational life are related to faculty organizational commitment in UAE business schools?

Results of this study show that several factors of organizational life in the academic environment are related to faculty commitment. Although the results are somewhat mixed, there is evidence in the study to support that faculty’s experiences of organizational life in the academic workplace are related to the individual’s commitment. This study identifies five organizational life factors that are frequently cited by business faculty: economic compensation, organizational values, autonomy, organizational support and justice, and leadership (the processes that leaders use to enact decisions).

7.1.1 Economic compensation

Previous studies find evidence of attractive salary and benefits to be related to affective commitment (Meyer & Smith 2000, McElroy 2001, Meyer et al. 2004). The result of this study on economic compensation shows that monetary gains may be a motivator for consideration to join an institution but they do not secure retention. The initial attraction of the salary and benefits generates faculty’s affection for the institution but does not enhance retention among expatriate faculty. Strong negative feelings stemming from non-monetary factors may have played a stronger role in shaping expatriate faculty commitment.
Therefore, this study argues that studies of previous researchers (such as Baron 2000, Meyer & Smith 2000, Marchiori & Henkin 2004, Kipkebut 2010), who claimed that attractive benefit packages develop stronger affective and normative commitment, do not apply to expatriate faculty in the UAE. In juxtaposition, this study shows that UAE national faculty members are likely to change their employer in order to attain more attractive pay (affective commitment). However, they may also remain with current employer out of obligation to the business schools and to the institutions (normative commitment). One explanation is that the national respondents perceive that they have already made a significant investment in their employment based on the gains they received as a Teaching Assistant prior to taking on the faculty position. This explanation is in line with the study conducted by Street (2009), continuance commitment enhanced as a result of the calculation of the investments made in employment. Therefore, the attitude of the UAE national faculty member from a publicly controlled institution who feels obliged to remain with the university is fulfilling his part of the contract (Meyer & Smith 2000). The faculty’s social responsibility offers normative commitment to the institution. Another explanation for normative commitment among UAE national faculty may be the loss of prestige were the individual to separate from the current institution (Torka 2004), which is a perceived calculative cost as in Becker’s (1960) theory and continuance commitment component in the Meyer and Allen (1991) theory. On the other hand, some expatriate faculty members have the desire to stay because of the calculative costs of changing employer, but do not feel obligated to remain.

In a transitional employment environment, attractive salary is not a determinant of commitment for expatriate faculty members. Even with the strenuous visa regulations in the UAE and the comparatively low salary offered by private institutions, many faculty members from public-owned institutions continue to develop turnover intentions. Several expatriate respondents from both public- and private-controlled universities have changed employer for less attractive salary packages. However, as for UAE national faculty, the results of this study are congruent with previous research claiming that continuance commitment is strong when there is a perceived cost associated with leaving the current employer (Meyer & Allen 1997).

Hence the results in this study on economic compensation show that in a transitional employment environment, economic compensation has a relationship with continuance and normative commitment profiles for national faculty. Yet for expatriate faculty from both privately and publicly controlled institutions,
economically compensation is a motivator to attract faculty in the beginning but has a weak effect on affective commitment and does not enhance continuance or normative commitment. The implication for higher education administration is that they may enhance expatriate faculty commitment in a transitional economy through factors other than financial rewards.

7.1.2 Organizational values

This study’s results on organizational values are congruent with previous findings of a study conducted by Hunt et al. (1989) that found employees to view management’s unethical conduct and decision-making negatively. Thus, faculty members who disapprove or do not accept the institution’s values will not be willing to exert effort on behalf of the university. Awareness of unethical conduct is associated with perceptions of organizational values. Faculty’s perception of management’s behavior and actions affects the way faculty views management’s performance. Therefore, this awareness of unethical management practices may have changed several expatriate faculty members’ attitudes and behaviors toward the institution. The faculty’s commitment is seen as attitudinal because the individual’s attitude toward the institution governs his or her belief about the institution’s values (Porter et al. 1974, Shepherd & Mathews 2000, Mowday et al. 1982).

Perceptions of faculty commitment are dependent on the extent to which the individual identifies with the institution’s goals and values. Therefore, if the faculty cannot internalize his inner convictions concerning the perceived unethical values of the institution, he will develop strong intentions to leave (Allen & Meyer 1996). In agreement with a previous study conducted by Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), affective commitment develops as the faculty member recognizes the value-relevance and normative commitment is generated when the faculty member identifies with the institution. Therefore, this study’s results on organizational value identifies with previous studies that value congruence with organizational commitment assumes that faculty members who find consistency between their own values and the institution’s values will manifest positive attitudes and behavior towards their jobs.

This study’s results also show that several expatriate faculty members who are aware of unethical management practices perceive their institution to be acquiring unethical values. Bearing in mind that faculty members’ level of organizational commitment is influenced by their perceptions of the institution’s
unethical behaviors and values, this study suggests that ethical management practices in terms of promotion and evaluation standards will improve the faculty’s perceptions of the university. This would lead conceivably to stronger identification with the business school and the institution’s standards and would in turn lead to a greater degree of affective commitment. An ethical work environment would help the faculty members to internalize the institution’s values and standards, fostering higher levels of affective commitment (Hunt et al. 1989). Hence, the results of this study identify that expatriate faculty members from both institution types embrace ethical academic environments and are not comfortable with performing tasks, which are not in line with their personal beliefs. Hence, an individual’s values guide his or her attitude and behavior, across cultures and nations (Cohen 2007a). However, in this study, unlike expatriate faculty, UAE national faculty did not express any qualms regarding the unethical management practices. National faculty may be withholding their views on the management’s practices as a sign of respect for individuals in authority, because in the Arab culture, particularly in the UAE, criticisms of superiors’ actions are generally considered as disrespectful and nationals are scared of the possible consequences of criticism in an absolute power monarchy.

7.1.3 Perceived autonomy

The results of this study show that both faculty groups across both types of institution frequently cited that more autonomy is needed for faculty members to effectively carry out their jobs. Nowadays, many corporate-oriented universities are encountering the issue of faculty autonomy. According to Musselin (2007), the problem of academics receiving less and less autonomy stems from institutions adopting the new corporate-style managerial practices. As a result, institutional controls are tightened, academic activities are diversified into academic work, and researchers become knowledge workers. Thus faculty members lose more and more autonomy in their work. Faculty members no longer have control over how they organize their time, or discretion on how they allocate daily tasks. Faculty members are recruited as contingent staff instead of being given traditional tenured positions. With the fixed term contract type, expatriate faculty in UAE mirror the contingent faculty profile.

As previous researchers have shown, employees who experience autonomy in performing their work will develop a higher degree of identification with the institution (Felfe et al. 2009) and this will in turn influence the individual’s desire
to stay with the current employer (Gellatly et al. 2009). This study’s results reflect that lack of autonomy alienates faculty and leads to turnover intentions (Allen & Meyer 1990). However, previous studies conducted by Abu Elanain (2009) claimed that autonomy in a high uncertainty avoidance collectivist culture, such the UAE, might cause higher turnover intentions. The reason being that in the Arab culture, autonomy and independence are uncommon. However this study’s results show that faculty members’ ego may be different from non-academics. Both expatriate and UAE national faculty have expressed the need for higher levels of autonomy and independence together with the chance to maximize their incomes. Thus, this study’s results show that lack of autonomy has a relationship to lower commitment (Witham & Glover 1987) for expatriates and UAE national faculty, and across institution sectors. Therefore, this study confirms that autonomy is a robust attribute of organizational life that can be related to faculty commitment even in a collective culture.

As the study’s results show, regardless of race or nationality and regardless of whether the faculty members are working in a public- or private-controlled institutions, autonomy is important to academics. The main reason that faculty members choose to stay with a university is the freedom that they receive in terms of choosing the course to teach, the topic of research and how to plan for the day (Adriaenessens et al. 2006). Several respondents view lack of autonomy to select the course to teach as management’s weakness. Faculty members who resent their loss of autonomy will react by restricting their behavior to the minimum as affective commitment declines (Meyer et al. 2004). Without autonomy, faculty cannot perform with the challenges and complexities that are specific to their fields and disciplines (Noorda 2011). Congruent with previous researchers’ findings, the presence of autonomy, a characteristic of academics’ work may bolster perceptions of personal competence, which manifests itself in increased commitment (Steers 1977, Mathieu & Zajac 1990). Thus, if university management incorporates autonomy into academics’ job, the faculty’s job will be enriched, which in turn will lead to higher commitment.

7.1.4 Perceived organizational support and justice

Results from this study demonstrate that institutional support is the key challenge facing contingent faculty (AAUP 2012). Concerns for organizational support and justice were frequently cited in three areas: distributive, procedural and interactional justice. Distributive justice in teaching load, teaching assignments,
and academic administrative duties can prevent stress for expatriate faculty members. Congruent to a study by Iqbal et al. (2011), perceptions of unfairness adds stress (Altbach et al. 2009), resulting in the individual developing intentions to leave the institution. While presence of perceived organizational support produces a sense of belonging for the faculty to maintain membership with the institution (Buck & Watson 2002). In the academic world, the promotion process for faculty members is often long, cumbersome and stressful. In the UAE, faculty promotion is dependent on teaching evaluations, research contributions, participation in academic administrative duties and student evaluations. Thus, if there is no distributive justice in teaching loads and academic administrative duties, faculty members may not be able to allocate enough time to produce research, which in turn affects their evaluations.

Subsequently, this study also shows that expatriate faculty members who perceive promotional decisions and performance evaluations to be subjective do not develop strong attachment for their institutions (Kipkebut 2010). Similar to findings of several previous studies, commitment is related to promotion practices (Iles et al. 1990, McElroy 2001). Therefore, when faculty members perceive that there are opportunities for advancement, affective commitment increases (Meyer & Allen 1997, Pfeffer & Viega 1999).

The results from this study also reflect that the lack of job security among expatriate faculty members in both private- and public-controlled institutions poses a problem for institutions trying to develop and maintain employee commitment. Security of employment can signal a long-standing commitment by the institution to the faculty workforce. A previous study conducted by McElroy (2001), reflects a similar outcome, employees who receive assurance of continual employment feel obligated to return the loyalty exhibited by their institutions (normative commitment). This study’s results show that with enhanced job security, faculty members will be more likely to generate loyalty and expend extra effort for the university’s benefit (affective commitment).

On the issue of students manipulating faculty for higher grades, this problem is common in institutions all over the world. Faculty members with fixed-term employment are especially vulnerable because without tenure, their contract renewals are dependent on good student evaluations. However, the situation in the UAE is more severe because faculty’s contracts are not only fixed-term, they are also at-will contracts where termination can happen without due process, and visa restrictions can affect a faculty’s chance of getting employment elsewhere in the
country. Hence, expatriate faculty members need management’s support to shield them from students’ manipulation.

For contingent faculty, management support with student evaluations can definitely instill a sense of fairness and care from the institution to the academic profession. Faculty will be less inclined to inflate grades in order to save their jobs. With the low academic skills of the students, respondents expressed concerns that management was not ready to help the students. Suggestions made by two respondents were turned down without consideration because management did not want to take the initiative to make the change. This may hurt the students and the institution in the long run. Instead of moving forward, institutions will be moving backwards when students without the level of standard are joining the job market (job system) every year.

“... Academic faculty may not always be able to provide what they consider to be ideal curriculums because of limited budgets or conflicting demands for resource funding. Initiatives that are undertaken with the best of intentions by those charged with the responsibility of creating ideal curricula that best meet the needs of the student... often find that practical considerations and administrative constraints will force changes to their original plans.” (Jewels 2012: 323.)

This study shows evidence that there is a relationship between faculty members’ prioritization of their work and institutions’ value placement on research publications to compete in global university rankings. However, institutions are not living up to their mission if their implemented reward system is not compatible with their stated mission. For example, in one of the institutions, as reported by a respondent, Dr. Sameer, management failed to uphold their vague contractual promises on research support and reduced teaching hours for faculty with a high research performance. Another respondent, Dr. Arjun, reported a second case, where management used subjective promotion standards to award faculty’s promotion and overlooked a faculty member who had published in a high-ranking journal. If institutions do value and want to promote research collaboration from faculty, university management should reward faculty who achieve. As research shows, rewards promote efficacy, which is essential for higher productivity (Hardré et al. 2011). To enable faculty to produce high quality research, it is imperative that institutions that have a research mission invest in resources and provide faculty members with the tools they need for research.
The results of this study on organizational support and justice, and organizational commitment agree with previous studies from Bowen and Ostroff (2004) that fairness in decision-making methods will draw higher commitment from faculty. At the same time faculty members who perceive that the institution is just and fair will in turn reciprocate to the university through positive attitudes and behavior (Kinnie et al. 2005). Conversely, when faculty members perceive unfairness in organizational justice, frustrations and resentments develop and thus result in a loss of loyalty and attachment to the institution (Kipkebut 2010). Therefore, institutional practices enacted by management in promotions, evaluations, decision-making, employment security and research support play a strong role in cultivating affective commitment, especially when faculty members believe that the outcome of the practices exercised by management is fair (Kinicki et al. 1992, Meyer & Smith 2000). The study conducted by Shore and Wayne (1993) showed the similar result that committed faculty members are more likely to remain with the current university. Thus, this study finds inequity, low distributive, procedural and interactional justices to be a factor of organizational life that faculty members regard when perceiving commitment.

7.1.5 Leadership

The leadership concept plays a highly critical role in a diverse workforce. An autocratic management style hinders faculty members’ opportunities to contribute toward decisions that concern academics. Faculty time spent on bureaucratic processes means time lost on research work. The results of this study show that faculty members who perceive their supervisors as not adopting participative leadership behavior feel less committed to the business schools. In congruence with a previous study conducted by Gormley and Kennerly (2010), faculty members in UAE institutions, both expatriates and nationals hold positive views of work environments that encourage participation in the decision-making process. In organizational commitment theory, participation in decision-making has been found to link with affective and normative commitment (McElroy 2001). Several researchers have covered the immense change made to university management. University administrations have moved more toward the corporate managerial style. Decisions are made and controlled at the top. Management gives less and less support to academics in all areas. Since business school administrators in a corporate university structure may tend to be very knowledgeable about the corporate models of management, this may affect the way they run the operations
in the business school. Also, they may be accustomed to the mobility of the business environment and may accept faculty turnover more readily. However, they may be less tolerant with collaborative faculty governance. The lack of organizational support found in this study is in line with the discussions made by several researchers on the evolution of the university structure.

As with the study done in the Gulf context by Yousef (2000a), this study’s results reflect that managers who adopt participative leadership behavior can create a more satisfying work environment. At the same time, faculty members feel valued and trusted when leaders in their institution involve them in the decision-making process and show transparency in policy and guideline changes. When institutions share information on key organization matters, faculty members feel a sense of trust from the university and thus create a sense of emotional attachment, which increase affective commitment (Allen & Meyer 1990, Meyer & Allen 1991, McElroy 2001). To attain the level of commitment from the faculty members, institutions need to employ appropriate leadership processes to influence the psychological empowerment of the diverse workforce (Witham & Glover 1987, Zeffane & Al Zarooni 2008). The level or type of commitment that an organization elicits from the employees depends on the type of authority the organization employs to control the people (Witham & Glover 1987). Views from two expatriate respondents echo the findings of previous researchers:

“… People in leadership make decisions without understanding the culture, the context, and the system, and so the whole system suffers through it.” (Dr. Jake)

“… Higher management does not seem to realize that, by controlling budget and micro managing through fear, they push the faculty to the limit.” (Dr. Karen)

The five factors of organizational life are common among faculty in public and private institutions. However, data from this study shows some difference in economic compensation from a small sample of UAE national faculty from public-controlled institutions. Data from this study also shows a lack of information shared by national faculty on organizational values. Based on the size of the sample, it is unclear whether the discrepancy was a reflection of the institution type or the nationality of the faculty. Therefore, it will be intriguing to
conduct further research on a larger sample of national faculty to distinguish the differences.

7.2 Summary of research question two

Research Question Two: Which factors of organizational life differentially relate to organizational commitment of faculty in public institutions compared to faculty in private institutions?

This study did not find any individual characteristics of organizational life to be significant for only faculty in public or faculty in private institutions. The reason may be due to similarities in operations and governance in both sectors. For example, the governance of institutions in the UAE is very different from that of the public and private institutions in the USA. In the USA, the President of the board in public institutions takes on an advisory role, while in private institutions the board president takes on a participatory role (White 2003). Whereas for both public- and private-controlled institutions in the UAE, the Chancellor (President of the University) has more influence over the university management. Therefore, decision-making tends to defer to the Chancellor. In terms of an institution’s legal status, state laws and regulations in the USA are applied differently to public and private institutions (White 2003). While in the UAE, the state laws and regulations for hiring and firing faculty are equally applied to both public- and private-controlled institutions.

The result for research question two further shows that expectations built on Western experiences will not always be supported in non-Western economies. Lack of support for question two suggests that apparently uncontroversial assumptions about institutional effects or faculty attitudes should indeed be investigated in contexts such as this one, since unsupported findings such as this can carry as much knowledge as those supported by the data. In this case, it unexpectedly appears that no individual characteristics of organizational life are significant for only faculty in public or faculty in private institutions.

7.3 Theoretical implications

The theory used in the conceptual framework for this study is organizational commitment. The components of commitment are used as a tool to identify the faculty’s perceptions of positive attitudes and behavior towards their work.
Researchers of organizational commitment using educational settings have argued that faculty commitment is linked positively with job performance and turnover (Buck & Watson 2002, Bland et al. 2006, Smeenk et al. 2006, Kipkebut 2010). Committed faculty tend to put more effort into teaching, research and academic administrative activities, which in turn benefits the institution and the students (Busch et al. 1998). Therefore, institutions can use organizational commitment to identify and create institutional practices to improve job performances in transient faculty.

Several factors of organizational life, namely the degree of autonomy, job challenge, role conflict, variety of skills used, role ambiguity, fairness of policies, decision-making participation and involvement, and feeling of fair treatment by the organization have been identified as antecedents of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen 1997). Umbach (2007) has proposed that contingent faculty are less committed than full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty. Findings from this study affirm the theory that faculty who are unable to internalize inner convictions with the perceived unethical values of the institution will develop turnover intentions (Allen & Meyer 1996). Conversely, affective commitment is generated when faculty recognize the institution’s value-relevance (Meyer & Herscovitch 2001). Therefore, institutions with ethical work environments will be able to foster higher affective commitment in faculty (Hunt et al. 1989).

Results from this study also confirm that institutional support practices are significant and can enhance organizational commitment among transient or contingent faculty. Positive faculty perceptions of supportive institutional practices and fairness in decision outcomes foster an obligation to reciprocate (Meyer & Allen 1991) through increased effort to the institution (Mowday et al. 1982). Institutional practices that are perceived to be just and fair have shown to encourage faculty to reciprocate with positive attitudes and behavior (Kinnie et al. 2005). Therefore institutions that provide fair work-related policies and procedures can promote both affective and normative commitment (Lawrence et al. 2012). Perceived organizational support creates a strong sense of belonging. Thus, belonging will become a part of faculty’s social identity with the institution (Buck & Watson 2002). At the same time, opportunity for advancements, degree of autonomy (Meyer & Allen 1997, Pfeffer & Viega 1999) and participative decision-making (McElroy 2001) provide faculty with individual goal attainment and self-efficacy, which enhances affective commitment (Allen & Meyer 1990).

However, contrary to findings of previous researchers (such as Meyer & Smith 2000, Kipkebut 2010), this study did not find attractive salary and benefits...
package to have a strong influence on affective and normative commitment among expatriate faculty in a multicultural, transitional economy. Additionally, support of management on student quality is seen as a significant feature of faculty organizational life.

Therefore, this study affirms that the five factors of organizational life positively relate to faculty commitment in teaching, research, and academic administrative duties in both public- and private-controlled institutions. Results from the study finds congruency with some previous studies as well as some new discoveries based on the UAE context. Fig. 15 below summarizes the theoretical implications of this study’s results.

**Fig. 15. Theoretical implications of the study.**

### 7.4 Overall summary of results and contributions to literature

The overall results for this study show that management support in the quality of students and procedural justice for promotions are crucial to expatriate respondents. Economic compensation remains significant to national faculty. For expatriate faculty, though monetary factors are strong motivators to join the institution, items to do with management support and justice on many issues are more significant. The results reflect that expatriate faculty members’ priorities and interests shift over time during the period of employment as a result of their experiences with the organizational life in the academic environment in UAE.
business schools. Their experiences lead them to rethink their initial motivation to join the institution, their current status of commitment and the future of their profession, and area of discipline. Several expatriate faculty members who initially joined the institution because of attractive economic compensation have developed turnover intentions. One respondent has already accepted a job offer with a cut in pay to devote more time into research. Those who initially join the institution because of attractive economic compensation have also shifted their commitment to their profession, and area of discipline instead of to the business school. On the other hand, UAE national faculty members commit to their country via their commitment to the institution. Regardless of the focus of their commitment, as long as faculty members are given incentive to contribute and show dedication to their work, there remains a form of commitment.

With the nature of their role, faculty commitment is not limited to a particular school or institution but to the academic world via faculty members’ profession, area of discipline, and research contributions. This study’s results show that in a transitional employment environment, both expatriate and national faculty members are committed but neither of their commitments is invested in the business schools. Expatriate respondents believe that the commitment they have, which is to their profession, area of discipline, and research, can develop in any business school, and in any institution. UAE national respondents believe that commitment to the country can develop anywhere, in any business school, institution or business organization. Hence, this result contributes to the current literature and suggests modifications to the existing theory, to account for professional commitment instead of organizational commitment for academics.

The results from this study add to existing literature on organizational commitment in business schools, in several ways. First and foremost, many recent research studies conducted on higher education and organizational commitment literature discuss how students are now consumers of the institution and are able to manipulate faculty members for higher grades, but none of these studies discuss the lack of organizational support to faculty regarding student quality. Second, unlike most studies on organizational commitment, this study is carried out in a transitional multicultural economy where employment arrangements are skewed between expatriate and ‘local’ (UAE national) academics. Third, one key finding from this study shows that contrary to studies conducted in stable employment economies, other intrinsic factors play a more important role than economic compensation on faculty commitment in a transitional employment economy where visa regulations are tight, particularly for expatriates. Fourth,
contrary to studies on organizational commitment in collectivist cultures (Abu Elanain 2009), both expatriate and UAE national faculty unlike administrative staff need autonomy because of the nature of their work. Fifth, regardless of the collective culture in the United Arab Emirates, where leaders consult but do not embrace subordinates’ participation, the lack of participation creates negative feelings among all respondents and across all institutional sectors. Sixth, expatriate faculty members hold high values and are not willing to perform tasks that are deemed unethical. Unethical practices enacted by management deter expatriate faculty from committing to the institution. However the results of this study show that national respondents did not cite instances of unethical management practices. This may be explained by cultural reasons, subordinates do not question decisions made by leaders. It may also be that the national respondents are treated differently from expatriates. Finally, congruent with studies on organizational commitment literature, this study’s results show emphasis placed on the importance of employee-supervisor relationships. Findings show evidence of relationships with supervisors play a vital role in promotion opportunities where promotion evaluations are subjective instead of objective.

This study makes a miniscule contribution to the area of research on business schools. Although there have been several studies in the area of business school research, limited research has been carried out on academics’ experience of commitment in the business school, particularly, in a multicultural, transitional higher education environment. This study’s findings also show that business faculty members are concerned with at least five factors of organizational life that interact in their academic environment. One major finding from this study sheds some light for the business school, that regardless of nationality, faculty commitment is directed to the faculty’s profession, and area of discipline.

Thus, results from this study add to the literature on organizational commitment and to the area of research on business schools. This study results also contribute to the transferability of commitment in the UAE context. This study shows the utility of examining potential factors of organizational life that are related to faculty commitment in a multicultural, transitional employment economy. In addition, the descriptive narratives on perceptions of faculty commitment provide rich text for understanding commitment from the faculty’s perspective. This study also provides practical contributions for institutions to use existing professional commitment to support commitment to business schools. Based on these contributions, the organizational commitment theory should be
refined to accommodate perceptions of commitment in a multicultural,
transitional employment economy.

7.5 Practical implications for institution and business school administrators

The results for this study have strong implications for the business school management in the United Arab Emirates workplace regarding how to enhance faculty commitment to the business schools. To manage a diverse workplace, higher education management needs to understand the particular make-up of their institutions, and identify the factors that influence academics’ organizational commitment. To stay competitive in the marketplace, strategies adopted by business school administrators should focus on the factors that enhance faculty commitment to the profession, area of discipline, research and students, which in turn encourages commitment to the institution.

Considering results from this study on economic compensation, institutions and business school administrators in UAE aiming to increase the commitment of both expatriate and UAE national faculty members need to examine their existing institutional and management practices. Business school administrators need to ensure that both institutional and management practices in the institutions are increasing affective commitment, or normative commitment, without increasing continuance commitment. As Meyer et al. (2004) note, employees with high continuance commitment may stay with the organization but will only perform at the minimum requirement to retain employment. Special attention should be directed to the means used to determine the amount of economic compensation given to UAE national academics in order to reduce turnover intentions. To attract and retain high quality faculty, institutions need to consider offering expatriate faculty members tenure positions or longer employment terms to enhance intellectual capital and to reduce turnover costs for the institutions.

Faculty members, unlike administrative staff have the long-established values of academic freedom and autonomy in performing work. Faculty members require the freedom to choose courses to teach, which are within their specialization, and freedom to plan their day. Faculty members’ roles in the UAE require autonomy to determine the order and pacing of the three expected tasks: teaching, research and academic administrative duties. The extent of discretion given to faculty members to pace these tasks, and the specific procedures for accomplishing those tasks, scheduling, coordination with other faculty and
students are crucial for the individual to identify with their institutions. Academics are not mere transmitters of knowledge, they need the freedom and authority to motivate the students, rather than just entertain the students in the class and focus on assignments and examinations (Delucchi & Korgen 2002).

Faculty members, in particular, require time to develop their abilities and increase their knowledge to be effective in teaching the most-up-to-date material. Business faculty academic work is stretched by the additional program (MBAs and executive education) offerings in business schools. At the same time, business faculty suffers from rewards and advancement opportunities because of the nature of their research caters for business ‘best practices’ instead of scientific rigor, like in Engineering schools. Therefore, academic administrators need to provide faculty members opportunities to be creative, and provide more research funding, and support. As research has shown, institutions that tap the ideas, skills and effort of all its faculty members will achieve organizational effectiveness (Pfeffer & Veiga 1999). Hence, higher education institutions, both public- and private-controlled needing to improve commitment perceptions among academics should be evaluating their intrinsic and extrinsic values to create the perception of fairness.

Business school administrations need to examine organizational support and justice from the faculty’s viewpoint and ensure that procedures used to set goals are clear. They should monitor the behavior of academic administrators to ensure fairness while administering activities. The significant relationship shown in this study’s results on justice and perceptions of commitment suggests that managers in higher education take appropriate actions to provide sufficient distributive, procedural and interactional justice when managing academics. Particularly in the area of research contributions, instead of measuring research contribution by scientific rigor, university management may consider measuring business faculty’s research by which ideas can be put into practice for the use of business executives (Bennis & O’Toole 2005). Transparency in information can affirm academics’ perceptions of justice. Whereas, fair procedures and outcomes can improve the level of commitment perceptions and in turn reduce turnover intentions.

Business schools and institutions, in general, should cooperate with faculty to generate intellectual curiosity in students, and protect faculty from the students who are looking for high grades but are only willing to put the minimum amount of effort into the learning. Thus the institution would be actively creating a culture that reflects the value of what the institution expects from the students. University
management themselves, can send messages to the students to reinforce a culture of care (Delucchi & Korgen 2002), to show students that they support their learning, which will in turn lead to students’ commitment to learning (Wasti 2005). Management should also show support to faculty when incorporating student’s evaluations in the faculty’s evaluations. Some possible strategies to consider, as stated by Johnson (2011) is: (1) cap the number of “A” grades that faculty can award in any given class, (2) use a weighting system on student’s evaluation on the basis of the grade distribution, and (3) support faculty that abide by the grading standards in the case of a grade dispute.

As for faculty members’ levels of organizational commitment, as influenced by their perceptions of the institution’s ethical behaviors and values, this study’s results suggest that institutions that implement ethical management practices for promotion and evaluation standards are likely to improve faculty’s perception of the university. Specifically in UAE business schools, to create an ethical organizational climate, business school management needs to develop, implement and communicate their policies and procedures to encourage ethical behavior among academic administrators and faculty. University management too must honor the institution’s ethical philosophies. Thus, for a higher education administrator to win commitment from faculty members, concrete and consistent policies and actions are necessary. With a faculty workforce that belongs to a multitude of social strata and cultures, business school leaders’ characteristics and their interrelationships with faculty members are two important areas for the institution to examine. Higher education administrators may well learn from some of the suggestions provided by the respondents regarding how commitment can be enhanced in the business schools:

“… Leadership to show transparency and be upfront... Develop people and give them some sense of achievement and personal growth.” (Dr. Jake)

“… Place importance in professional development... Provide research grants... Give faculty more independence... Have fair promotional opportunities and fair pay scales.” (Dr. Karen)

“... If the compensation is adequate, treatments are fair to all races or nationalities and gender, it does not matter if there is equality, the management is seen to be fair... cannot satisfy and make everyone happy. Nonetheless, there is still a way, not to upset people. The university’s got to be
committed to the faculty and the faculty can then see that it is a good place to work. Then you will get the commitment.” (Dr. Sunil)

“... Have objective standards for everyone. Recognize efforts objectively. Provide a long-term career plan. Transparency. Create a professional environment that fosters a culture of interaction, collegiality, which in turn squeezes commitment.” (Dr. Arjun)

“... Encourage innovation.” (Dr. Ted)

“... Transparency. Provide a participative decision-making process.” (Dr. Byron)

“... Provide funding and support for research. Autonomy for faculty.” (Dr. Sameer)

“... Provide job security and encourage research.” (Dr. Mark)

“... Increase recognition and research funding.” (Dr. Carol)

“... Transparency and encourage people to voice their ideas and get more involved in decision-making, participation in change management. To attract UAE nationals, give higher pay incentives.” (Dr. Omran)

As Lorange (2008) indicated, the most critical success factor and bottleneck for many business schools is the attraction and retention of suitable faculty. A culturally diverse group of faculty with a strong experience is key to providing the proper prescriptive knowledge base in business school classrooms. To achieve this, faculty members need strong research commitment to translate the knowledge into teaching. This study has its limitations and they are addressed in the following section.

7.6 Limitations of the study

One of the limitations of this study is that only a small aspect of the cross-cultural comparison has been conducted, which does not provide sufficient explanation for the differences found or allow conclusions on causality to be drawn. It will be important to conduct further research on a larger sample of national faculty to further distinguish differences between sectors. The respondent sample consists of 83% expatriate and 17% UAE National faculty members. Of the 83% expatriate faculty members, six were from public-controlled institutions and four were from
private-controlled universities. With the spread of respondents from both public and private sector universities, the findings are potentially transferable to both types of institutions. The study only found participation from two UAE national faculty members from publicly controlled institutions to participate. One explanation for the disparity is that the salary packages in private institutions are not as attractive as public-controlled institutions. Thus, with the differences in the samples and settings, explanations on differences in this study are skewed. The disadvantage of using multi-faculty from different institutions is that everyone in the sample is not exposed to the same institutional experience, meaning that the study cannot reasonably give a detailed explanation of the results.

The most notable limitation in this research is the nature of the data collection instruments and procedures. This study relies strongly on the respondents’ self-report measures of commitment perceptions. The data collection tool relies upon the integrity of the respondents. Therefore, in terms of dependability and credibility of the data collection instrument, this study’s findings and conclusions are reliant upon the individual respondent’s emotional state at the time of the interview. The results may be affected by the subjective assessment used in the study, raising the potential for the common method bias problem and creates a possibility of an artificial increase in the strength of the relationships perceived. Given the variability in how commitment is perceived and the nature of the responses given, this study uses the self-report assessment in the data analysis. This study, only measures a perception of a construct rather than directly measuring the construct itself. Although the self-report assessment used in the study is a good way to assess the participants’ perception of commitment, this measure also creates cognitive bias. Therefore, to minimize the self-serving bias, this study assumes that the respondents’ perceptions are fair accurate reflections of the phenomenon. There are some drawbacks on using the informant approach, but on balance the advantages of independent confirmation outweigh the disadvantages of lack of in-depth organizational property information. Informant reports may be tainted because of biases and deficiencies of business school specifics, for example. To ensure credibility, this problem is minimized by the researcher sticking to the guidelines for “selecting informants and evaluating the quality of data” (Seidler 1974: 829). The selected representative informants were reflective, articulate, and personable.

This study takes reasonable steps to ensure procedural equivalence. However, the transferability of the findings is unlikely to be universal, given the modest sample size, and the fact that many of the respondents had not been with their
institutions for an extended period. Nevertheless, that the respondents represented are of many nationalities and working in different institutions across two sectors suggests that their experiences may be applicable to a wide range of individuals.

The limitations of this study affect the possibility of generalizing the findings. The results in this study cannot generalize beyond the stated population—the faculty members of business schools in UAE institutions. Another limitation to this study is the extent of the true feelings and beliefs shared by the respondents, bearing in mind that respondents may tend to provide socially desired answers for the study. Furthermore, the assessment of the findings is the researcher’s qualitative self-assessment based on the data collected (i.e. without the aid of software programs), instead of using the traditional scientific quantitative method of assessment. However, the results in this study are pertinent and valuable to the literature on commitment in the UAE context. Despite the limitations, the conceptual framework and argument put forth in this study offer several opportunities for future research and practical application.

### 7.7 Future research directions

The possibility exists of carrying out future research to investigate commitment of local (non-expatriate) faculty. Further study should consider other organizational life factors that are related to faculty commitment. For example, examine support of Department Chairs and Deans, support of colleagues, support of rewards for performance and research, and institutional governance. Another area for future research involves a comparison from a direct measurement of the commitment level among faculty in UAE business schools with faculty in other professional schools. This will provide a more direct test of perceptions of commitment from business school faculty, narrowing down the determinants that are non-specific, that apply to faculty in general. Furthermore, there is use in carrying out future research to investigate academic staff commitment in countries other than North America. An additional future research idea is to investigate and juxtapose any difference in commitment from faculty and commitment from staff in a multicultural, transitional employment economy.

### 7.8 Conclusion

The intent of this study is twofold: to provide empirical validation of the organizational commitment construct, and to explore its impact on business
schools. This study provides evidence of the five components of organizational life that impacts organizational commitment, which should aid future research. This research shows that a faculty’s role in the business school can lead to different perceptions of organizational life. The aim of this study is that by proving and bringing attention to the organizational commitment construct, this research will open new avenue to both organizational study researchers, and management of business schools. The organizational commitment construct offers management of business schools a way of organizing and managing that could reduce vulnerabilities by being more sensitive in the academic environment. Fig. 16 below shows an overview of the study.

![Fig. 16. Overview of the Study. (source: diagram adapted from Petri Ahokangas, Oulu Business School).](image)

Study findings show that although economic compensation is an extremely important factor of organizational life and the key reason many faculty members come to the UAE to work in the first place, this study shows that researchers on commitment theory who propound that money induces employee commitment in supposedly related issues like turnover reductions, are incorrect. The interview data show that money is not a factor inducing commitment, or at most it is a very weak factor in increasing or maintaining expatriate faculty commitment in a transitional employment environment. However, the other four factors of organizational life (organizational values, autonomy, organizational support and
justice, and leadership) show definitive effect on expatriate faculty’s perceptions of organizational commitment.

For national faculty however, all five factors of organizational life are related to perceptions of organizational commitment, with added stress in fact placed on the economic compensation factor. Thus the differentiating factor is economic compensation, as it is ineffective for expatriate faculty members but essential for national faculty members. Economic compensation is definitely a viable recruitment tool for national faculty. Nevertheless, all the respondents are committed, but their commitments are not invested in the business schools. Instead, expatriate faculty members commit to their profession, area of discipline, students and research, while UAE national faculty commit to the academic world and to their country.

The results of the study contribute to the existing literature on organizational commitment and the emerging business school research. Although data from this study is technically ‘limited’ to the business school, this research is consistent with general university trends (in relation to commitment, organizational life, and corporate university model). The findings are further strengthened by having informants, faculty from outside the business school discipline, interpret and develop comments made by the interviewees. Effectively, the informants act as a form of internal validity for the study, strengthening the credibility of the results, while also tending to bolster expectations of external validity, suggesting that similar results are likely to emerge in settings beyond the business school context itself.

With scarce research on organizational commitment in higher education institutions, particularly in business schools, this study’s research will extend knowledge in the sector. In summation, this study makes three important contributions to the business school and organizational commitment literature: (1) it introduces a new concept regarding organizational support on student quality, (2) academics in a transitional economy commit to profession, area of discipline, or country, not to the business school, and (3) in a transitional economy, where there is no tenure, and future careers are threatened by lack of research publications, and tolerance levels are tipped by frustrations with the system, economic compensation becomes a secondary issue for expatriate faculty. Hence, attractive economic compensation does not foster commitment in a transitional employment economy. Autonomy in any collective culture fosters commitment. Lack of participative leadership in the autonomous Arab culture does not foster organizational commitment, but rather does quite the opposite. Given the three-
fold implications of this study’s results, in order to rectify the lack of commitment and the high turnover intentions evidenced in the UAE, business schools should look to enact specific changes in the areas discussed above, while still keeping in mind the *sui generis* context of the higher education institutions in the United Arab Emirates.
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Appendix 1 Comparing traditional research and corporate universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Research University</th>
<th>Corporate University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normally, state financing higher education</td>
<td>Self financing with minimal state funding and interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-tier + instructional program</td>
<td>Professional-oriented courses normally last from a week to several months; increase importance in distance education and life-long learning; contents of the courses and study programs are tailored to fit market needs; growth of professional schools (Markevičienė 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-long courses</td>
<td>One-week to four-month courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-long personnel</td>
<td>Many contingent, temporary and adjunct faculty. Personnel contracted for a short-term; instructors and coordinators contracted over professors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized choice of research agenda. Research relegated to individual faculty/researcher and their areas of interest.</td>
<td>Shift in research priorities in favor of applied research at the expense of fundamental investigations, since corporate money is likely to subordinate the public aims of research to private ends, with the value of the work less important than its potential to generate revenue (Markevičienė 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized research, guided by academic units, university departments, and carried out by individual researchers has given way to centralized planning and contracting of service. This has resulted in serious tensions between managers and teachers/researchers at the Service University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding by gifts and grants</td>
<td>State assisted funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of the university by tenured staff (professors)</td>
<td>Management of the university delegated to administrators; administration and management determine the resources for disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research as the core of education</td>
<td>Corporate university places research and teaching to be equally important. Faculty members are required to do research outside their established teaching load. Academics no longer have control over research priorities and assignments, for university leadership are responsible for setting research policy (Tjedvoll 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students not as a client</td>
<td>Students treated as clients for their tuition are revenue creation. Consumerism dominates the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from Markevičienė (2004) and Tjedvoll (2010)
Appendix 2 Research process mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Problem / Phenomenon</th>
<th>To draw wider conclusions on organizational commitment among academics in business schools outside North America, particularly, in UAE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Literature on organizational commitment, higher education, business schools, UAE, organizational life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>What factors of organizational life are related to faculty organizational commitment in UAE business schools? Which factor of organizational life differentially relates to organizational commitment of faculty in public institutions compared to faculty in private institutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Adopts the constructivist paradigm to establish the meaning of the phenomenon from the participants' views. Uses the qualitative approach to study and make sense of the phenomena. Adopts the narrative strategy of inquiry, with a phenomenological angle to report the study. The adopted research design focuses on understanding the perceptions of commitment from the participant’s own frame of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and Limitation</td>
<td>The research is limited to 12 individual business school faculty case studies. Generalizability will be limited by institutional and cultural differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Deductive logic: Uses the theory to figure out the questions to ask in the interview-based situations. Inductive logic: Draws some inductive inferences from the data collected to consider answers for the research questions. Method: Uses qualitative descriptive studies such as semi-structured interviews, open-ended questions and 12 case studies to collect the data. Generates thematic codes to analyze the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result Statements</td>
<td>Reports the results of the research with an emphasis on the difference and similarity between National and Expatriate faculty, and between public and private controlled institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Discussions</td>
<td>Revisits the phenomenon and the research question to describe this new understanding of the phenomenon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation/ Implication/ Conclusion</td>
<td>Compares the result statements with previous literature and organizational commitment theory. States the theoretical and practical implications, and future research directions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear

My name is Cheryl Lim. I am currently a doctoral student with the University of Oulu in Finland. I am conducting a research study to examine the organizational commitment of faculty members. I am interviewing a select group of faculty members working in business schools in the United Arab Emirates, a non-Western context where little formal investigation on this topic has been undertaken.

The research study recognizes that the workforce in UAE is multicultural and diverse, and that business schools comprise both expatriate and national faculty members, groups which may have very different views about personal commitment to their institutional employers. The study seeks to gather and analyse a range of business faculty experiences through testimonies and narratives of participants’ personal experiences in employment.

This study aims to understand organizational commitment from the point of view of individual experiences in local business schools, and to differentiate commitment from related constructs in the theories of employer/employee relations. The methodology used for the study is unstructured interviews, a format that allows participants to relate their opinions, reflections and experiences in an open-ended narrative form.

An interview with you would be extremely helpful to my research if you would agree to share with me your opinions, reflections and experiences as a faculty in UAE business school.

The interview will be recorded digitally and as per Oulu University Business School guidelines, all interviewees retain the right to review and edit their interview transcripts before the final version is considered for the study, and if you wish, to place restrictions on the availability of the interview to special conditions under which it may be, accessed by researchers.

Please be assured that this is a completely unbiased and neutral investigation, and my interest is strictly to understand faculty perceptions of commitment to an academic institution. Needless to say, anything you say will be held in the strictest of confidence. When the interview is transcribed, the name of the interviewee and of other persons mentioned in the interviews will be changed into pseudonyms. The same procedure will be used for the names of organizations or institutions in which you mention.

I sincerely hope that you will consider participating in my research study and agree to a short interview as soon as possible. I am currently in the UAE and I appreciate if you would please respond to me at your earliest convenience and inform me of a time and place for our discussion. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

If you are busy and unable to assist, I would appreciate your advice as to who you think I may seek to explore my research.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Lim
Doctoral Student
Oulu Business School
University of Oulu
Finland

Email: xxxxxxxx
Tel: nnnnnnn
## Appendix 4 List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Group</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Interview Length</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Public Controlled Institution</th>
<th>Private Controlled Institution</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years in Service</th>
<th>Total Years in Academia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>10-Mar-2012</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>Ex-faculty</td>
<td>Large National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>25-May-2012</td>
<td>48 min 52 sec</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Ex-faculty</td>
<td>National Satellite</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>6-Apr-2012</td>
<td>1 hr 10 mins</td>
<td>Sunil</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Small Private</td>
<td>Private American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>7-May-2012</td>
<td>59 mins</td>
<td>Arjun</td>
<td>Ex-faculty</td>
<td>Large National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>11-May-2012</td>
<td>43 mins</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>14-May-2012</td>
<td>1 hr 35min 4sec</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Ex-faculty</td>
<td>Large National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>15-May-2012</td>
<td>27min 22sec</td>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>18-May-2012</td>
<td>24min 44sec</td>
<td>Sameer</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>18-May-2012</td>
<td>31min 46sec</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>20-May-2012</td>
<td>44min 10sec</td>
<td>Sultan</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat</td>
<td>22-May-2012</td>
<td>via email</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Ex-faculty</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>27-May-2012</td>
<td>via email</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Small Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 1/3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>20-Jun-2012</td>
<td>1 hr 16min 42sec</td>
<td>Omran</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Large National</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5 Interview release agreement

I (the “Interviewee”) consent to the recording of my statements and grant to Cheryl Lim and Oulu University in Finland, and their assigns, licensees and successors (the “Interviewer”) the right to copy, reproduce, and use all or a portion of my statements (the “Interview”) in all forms and media throughout the world and in perpetuity for any research-related purposes including incorporation in an academic research study (the “Work”).

I grant the Interviewer the right to use only pseudonyms in place of my name or any names of organizations or institutions mentioned in the Interview in connection with all uses of the Interview and waive the right to inspect or approve use of my Interview as incorporated in the Work.

I release Interviewer from any claims that may arise regarding the use of the Interview including any claims of defamation, invasion of privacy, or infringement of moral rights, rights of publicity or copyright.

I acknowledge that I have no ownership rights in the Work, and I understand that Interviewer is not obligated to utilize the rights granted in this Agreement.

I have read and understood this agreement and I am over the age of 18. This Agreement expresses the complete understanding of the parties, Interviewee and Interviewer, and this understanding is affirmed by signature below.

Interviewee:
Name: __________________________________________________________
Date:  __________________________________________________________
Signature: __________________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________

Interviewer:
Name: Cheryl Lim, Oulu University in Finland
Date:  __________________________________________________________
Signature: __________________________________________________________
Appendix 6 Follow-up questions

Participant Experience in Current Institution:
1. Discussions of your institution with people outside the university:
   a. What type of discussions have you had about your institution with people outside the university?
   b. What do you enjoy or not enjoy most in your discussions of your institution?
   c. What is it about your institution that makes you feel like ‘part of the family’?
   d. What are your feelings about your institution’s problems?
   e. What is your sense of belonging to the institution?
2. What are some of the feelings shared with you by the other faculty members in regard to the policy and management practices exercised at your institution?
3. Staying with your institution:
   a. What is your career plan with this institution?
   b. How long would you take to build your career with this institution?
   c. How much of the current academic economic conditions affect your options to find a job with another institution?
4. Recognition from your institution:
   a. How and what have the institution done to recognize your effort with the students?
   b. How and what have the institution done to recognize your effort with research?
5. Changes to personal circumstances:
   a. What would happen if you quit your job without having another one line up?
   b. How difficult would it be for you if you want to leave the current institution right now?
   c. How much of your personal and financial life will be disrupted if you decide to leave?
6. Will you recommend your institution to other faculty?

Participant Opinions and Views
1. What constitutes organizational commitment for faculty in UAE business schools?
2. How can business schools in UAE leverage talents and productivity among faculty?
3. What are your views about faculty changing employment from institution to institution?
4. What are your views about remaining loyal to one’s institution?
5. Are you more committed to your research discipline than to your institution? If yes, why? If not, why not?
## Appendix 7 Case narrative outline template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to join</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General feeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/pracs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in personal circumstances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define OC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for non-commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS enhance commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How BS leverage talents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification to change jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of the institution with people outside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend institution to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison between UAE &amp; US faculty work environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8 Respondent perceptions of disparity in employment arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Arrangements</th>
<th>Expatriate Faculty</th>
<th>UAE National Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly salary</td>
<td>3.5 times less than national faculty (Dr. Sunil)</td>
<td>Minimum 1K AED plus benefits as regulated by the government (Dr. Sunil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 to 2 times less than national faculty (Dr. Byron)</td>
<td>2 to 3 times more than expatriate faculty (Dr. Jake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same as expatriate (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>Higher than expatriate (Dr. Mark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>5 to 6 times less than national faculty (Dr. Jake)</td>
<td>5 to 6 times more than expatriates (Dr. Jake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher benefits than expatriates (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>More flexibility (Dr. Byron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>12 hours per week (Dr. Sunil)</td>
<td>Equal to expatriate faculty (Dr. Sunil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High 9 to 14 hours (Dr. Jake)</td>
<td>Same as expatriate, but no evening classes and does not abide by the institution’s stipulated office hours (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 hours and abide to institution’s office hours (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>Options to select the course to teach (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero to same (Dr. Jake)</td>
<td>More flexibility, and have the option to select the course to teach (Dr. Byron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic administrative duties</td>
<td>33% more than national faculty (Dr. Sunil)</td>
<td>Same as expatriate faculty (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same amount as national faculty (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>Optional (Dr. Byron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td>Minimal (Dr. Jake)</td>
<td>Equal to expatriate faculty (Dr. Sunil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No support (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>Given the opportunity to select the course to teach (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less funding than national faculty (Dr. Byron)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research rewards</td>
<td>None (Dr. Jake)</td>
<td>Same as expatriate faculty (Dr. Sunil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same for everyone (Dr. Sunil)</td>
<td>No research reward but somehow the one expatriate faculty was awarded the teaching award, two years in a row (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No rewards (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive-based (Dr. Byron)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>Based on institution’s promotion standards (Dr. Sunil)</td>
<td>More flexible (Dr. Sunil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>High chances because of Emiratization (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision-making</td>
<td>Same for everyone (Dr. Sunil)</td>
<td>Same as expatriates (Dr. Sunil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>Less at risk to speak up (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not encouraged (Dr. Mark)</td>
<td>No significant difference (Dr. Byron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on their role (Dr. Byron)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with supervisor</td>
<td>Less personal (Dr. Karen)</td>
<td>More personal. No repercussions for not meeting deadlines (Dr. Karen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interact with department chair, but never met the dean (Dr. Mark)</td>
<td>Frequent interactions with chair and dean (Dr. Byron)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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