Higher Education Administrators at International Branch Campuses:

A Mixed-Methods Research Study on Organizational Commitment.

_____

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Curry School of Education

University of Virginia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

by

Murielle de Wekker,

B.A., The University of Bordeaux III, France

M.A., Syracuse University, Syracuse

May 2014

Abstract

Advisor: David W. Breneman, Ph.D., Department of Leadership, Foundations and Policy

The creation of international branch campuses (IBC) has been a recent and significant development in international higher education, with a 23% increase of branches between 2009 and 2012 for a total of 200 IBCs worldwide (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). Despite this growth, there is a dearth of research on employees managing these new operations. To fill this gap, this doctoral study features IBC higher education administrators. This work is based on a mixed-methods design to measure and explain organizational commitment of international branch campus administrators. Organizational identity is the theoretical construct of this dissertation.

The goals of this research study are twofold. Its first purpose is to measure the level of organizational commitment among upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators at international branch campuses. It also explores the relationship between specific organizational variables, personal characteristics and levels of organizational commitment. The second goal of this study is to investigate and describe how upper-level and mid-level administrators perceive their organizational commitment to their international branch campus. More specifically, it seeks to uncover how perceived environmental uncertainty, organizational and personal characteristics influence their organizational commitment.

The research questions are:

1. What is the level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

2. What are the differences in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators?

3. What is the relationship between selected organizational variables and personal characteristics with organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

4. How do non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators make sense of their organizational commitment in the context of perceived environmental uncertainty?

5. In what ways do selected organizational variables and personal characteristics influence how non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators perceive their organizational commitment?

To answer the research questions, an Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979) was completed by 205 administrators and ten administrators were interviewed.

The answers are:

1. The level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators is average.

2. There is no significant difference in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level administrators.

3. There may be a relationship between one organizational variable (campus size) and organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators. Administrators working for large campuses (with over 1,000 students) have significantly higher levels of commitment than administrators working for small campuses (with less than 50 students).

4. The IBC administrators' relationship with the home campus is the primary factor influencing their commitment. Other factors, such as the challenges of operating in a foreign country, influence their commitment too, but in a lesser way.

5. IBC administrators' commitment was found to be influenced by six personal characteristics and four organizational variables.

A mon Fils, Christophe.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Much has been written about employee organizational commitment (EOC).

Research shows that employee organizational commitment has a positive impact on

employees' job performance (Ketchand & Strawser, 2001; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990;

MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Aheame, 1998; Riketta, 2002). EOC reduces absenteeism and

turnover rates (Abelson & Sheridan, 1981; Angle & Perry, 1981; Bluedorn, 1982;

Ketchand & Strawser, 1998; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Porter et al, 1974; Stallworth,

2004). It improves employees' adaptability to organizational change (Iverson, 1996; Lau

& Woodman, 1995; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). The organization literature also reveals

that a high level of EOC can benefit society because of the decrease in job movement and

the increase in national productivity and work quality (Chow, 1994; Mathieu & Zajac,

1990).

For the most part, EOC studies have focused on employees from the corporate

sector. EOC in higher education has been sparsely examined. The few EOC studies

pertaining to higher education have concentrated on academic staff or teaching faculty

but have neglected administrators. As a result, "there is little unity in understanding job

satisfaction in a college or university context" (Smerek & Peterson, 2007, p.230). This

research gap is particularly blatant with higher education administrators working for

international branch campuses (Lane, 2011). An international branch campus involves a bricks-and-mortar presence in a host country fully or jointly owned by the awarding institution. It awards degrees taught face-to-face, supported by traditional physical infrastructure including libraries, laboratories, classrooms, faculty and staff offices (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). There are 200 international branch campuses worldwide, with a 23% increase since 2009 (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). This growth is a significant development in the off-shoring of higher education.

Operating a branch campus abroad is no small task and it is risky (Altbach, 2011; Becker, 2009; Green, Kinser & Eckel, 2008; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). Sixteen IBCs closed between 2008 and 2012 (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). Campus closures are often caused by operational challenges, market fluctuations, complex and fast-changing regulations, low enrollments and insufficient market research (Becker, 2009; Rumsey & Altbach, 2007). Senior university officials often have high expectation that do not match the realities of student markets. Some IBCs also close because of the local context due to restrictive national policy issues such as visa requirements and quality assurance standards (Woodfield & Middlehurst, 2009). Considering these risks and this turbulent environment, universities must invest significant amounts of time, money and human resources into the venture of operating branch campuses to make them work. Higher education administrators are at the core of this effort as their role is to ensure the success of this new type of academic enterprise. Employment arrangements at IBCs vary (Becker, 2009). Some administrators are expatriates who serve the branch campus on a short-term

basis and return to the home institution after their assignment. Most often, IBCs hire a mixture of local and home campus administrators, primarily for financial reasons. Based on what the EOC literature reveals, it is clear that if international branch campuses want to be successful in the long run, they must have a committed workforce.

Statement of the Problem

The literature is clear about the positive outcomes of organizational commitment. Despite the large number of studies about its benefits in various organizational contexts, there is little research about the organizational commitment of higher education administrators, especially about those employed at international branch campuses. As such, more research is needed on this topic. Consequently, this dissertation addressed the gap in the literature by investigating international branch campus administrators' level and perception of organizational commitment.

Research Purpose

The goals of this research study were twofold. Its first purpose was to measure the level of organizational commitment among upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators at international branch campuses. Organizational commitment refers to the ways IBC administrators identify with their organization's goals and values. It also represents how willing they are to exert their efforts on behalf of their organization. Ultimately, it is a measure of their intention to stay with their international branch campus. Furthermore, the study explored the relationship between specific organizational variables and personal characteristics with their organizational commitment.

3

The second goal of this study was to investigate and describe how upper-level and mid-level administrators perceive their organizational commitment to their international branch campus. More specifically, it sought to uncover how perceived environmental uncertainty, personal and organizational characteristics influenced their organizational commitment.

<div align="center">Significance of the Study</div>

This study is significant for several reasons. First, it makes important contributions to the field of higher education research because it adds to the research on international branch campuses. It addresses the dearth in the literature corpus on international branch campuses. In addition, there has been little empirical research on administrators employed at IBCs. Prior research has focused primarily on IBC faculty but scholars have paid less attention to administrators. How administrators make sense of their experience in an international branch campus setting needed to be explored. There is also a paucity of research comparing the administrative behavior of upper-level administrators with their mid-level counterparts. Comparing and investigating these differences extends the knowledge on organizational issues in higher education.

Second, this dissertation contributes to the organizational literature as it opens a window about aspects of EOC that have been under-studied in the higher education context, specifically the role of environmental uncertainty and the impact of a transient and multicultural workforce. Indeed, prior studies suggest that perceived environmental uncertainty (PEU) is an important explanatory variable for employee motivation,

performance, and job satisfaction (Anderson & Kida, 1985; Ferris 1977, 1982; Gul & Chia 1994). However, no studies have focused on the international higher education sector. Because IBCs operate in a turbulent environment, one can learn useful lessons about the ways administrators perceive their commitment knowing that there is a high risk they may lose their jobs. In addition, although the literature on expatriation and job satisfaction is plentiful, there is a dearth of research pertaining to the higher education field. IBCs are particularly useful sites to study these aspects because they have a multicultural workforce made up of expatriates and locally-hired employees. Because IBCs are brand new organizational forms, using them as a research sample yield unique findings about EOC.

Third, this study has practical implications for higher education practitioners and policy-makers. For one thing, it highlights the importance of a committed workforce. Evidence suggests that employees with strong commitment to the organization are more valuable employees than those with weak commitment. Employees who are committed to their organizations are more likely to be productive, creative and innovative (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). By highlighting the importance of employee commitment and its consequences, the hope is that university managers will become more educated about the topic and more inclined to enhance the level of organizational commitment at their branch campus. By providing facts and data about a wide range of international campuses, this study allows practitioners to understand the reality of organizational commitment as well as management challenges at IBCs. The data may empower them to

address issues related to employee commitment and campus operations in their own institution. Higher education policy-makers may be able to create management policies that have a higher chance of success because they will be based on empirical evidence collected in this study. Given the resource constraints at every college and university, it is essential for university leaders to create policies that make a positive impact on their international branch campus. Even small changes in employee performance can have a significant impact on the organization and its overall functioning.

Fourth, the theoretical framework used for this study adds value to advance the conversation about IBCs. Indeed, organizational identity influences behavior, decision-making and attitudes in organizations. As such, applying organizational identity theory allowed the researcher to (1) study organizational commitment as a phenomenon embedded in the specific context of IBCs; and to (2) explain why particular types of administrators may perceive EOC differently because the theory supports the idea that particular groups within organizations have their own identity and their own ways of behaving. Finally, using the organizational identity concept for IBC administrators tests what others have examined for various higher education groups. It extends past research and examines the topic more thoroughly.

To conclude, this study addresses the significant problem of organizational commitment at international branch campuses. The objective of this research is to better understand the EOC phenomenon by providing critical insights into IBC administrators' level of organizational commitment and perceptions.

Theoretical Framework

Organizational identity is the theoretical construct of this dissertation. Identity is the concept characterizing the impressions that employees have of their organization (Bess & Dee, 2008). Organizational identity has implications not only for how members identify with their organization but also for how their identification impacts members' own perception of self. In line with this perspective, the premise of this study is that organizational identity affects how higher education administrators perceive their commitment to their international branch campus. It assumes that when individuals identify with and extend effort towards organizational goals and values, organizational commitment occurs.

Organizational identity theory is a powerful lens for explaining change, action and inaction by employees or groups of individuals (Albert, Ashforth & Dutton, 2000). Indeed, organizational identity has been linked to employee motivation (Cheney, 1983), cooperation (Dukerich, Golden & Shortell, 2002), job satisfaction (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000) as well as commitment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Cheney & Tompkins, 1987; Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Rotondi, 1975).

The utility of the construct also resides in the fact that it does not necessarily see the organization as a whole. Subgroups within an organization may transcend the larger entity. They may hold considerable influence and power over how the organization functions (Ashford & Mael, 1989; Rotondi, 1975). As such, organizational theory was applied to the professional group studied for this dissertation. It allowed the researcher to

7

study the relationship within the administrator subgroup, and the organization at large, that includes both the international branch campus and the home campus.

Research Questions

The research questions of this dissertation were:

1. What is the level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

2. What are the differences in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators?

3. What is the relationship between selected organizational variables and personal characteristics with organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

4. How do non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators make sense of their organizational commitment in the context of perceived environmental uncertainty?

5. In what ways do selected organizational variables and personal characteristics influence how non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators perceive their organizational commitment?

Methodology

To answer these research questions, the researcher conducted a mixed-methods study. First, upper-level and mid-level administrators employed at international branch campuses were surveyed. The researcher used the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday, Steers & Porter (1979) which is supported by a substantial body of reliability and validity documentation. In addition, the researcher collected data on demographic and organizational characteristics of IBC administrators. Second, the researcher conducted interviews of IBC administrators via Skype. The questionnaire included questions about the factors influencing the participants' organizational commitment and demographic questions.

Delimitations and Limitations

There were several important limitations to this study. First, it was restricted to international branch campuses that offer at least the equivalent of the American Bachelor's degree. Consequently, the findings cannot be generalized to institutions providing only certificates or two-year programs. Second, the study included non-faculty upper-level and mid-level administrators. As such, the findings cannot be applied to entry-level higher education administrators or faculty administrators. Third, the sample for the quantitative part of this study was not entirely representative of the IBC

administrator population because 68 of the 200 IBCs listed in the Lawton & Katsomitros report (2012) were not accessible for data collection. Despite these limitations, the study provided critical insight into the organizational commitment level of IBC administrators.

Definition of Terms

To better understand the research questions, a clarification of terms is essential. The following terms are used in this study:

Employee organizational commitment (EOC). EOC is defined as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, and is said to be characterized by three factors: a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization's goals and values; a readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974).

Higher education administrators. For the purpose of this study, it refers to non-faculty upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators. They include Presidents, Chancellors, Provosts, Vice-Presidents, Deans, Associate Vice-Presidents, Assistant Vice-Presidents, Directors Chiefs, Registrars, Comptrollers and Managers (Scott, 1978; 1979).

International branch campus (IBC). This study used the definition set by the 2012 Observatory on Borderless Higher Education report. The term *international branch campus* refers to "a higher education institution that is located in another country from the institution which either originated it or operates it, with some physical presence in the host country that is accredited in the country of the originating institution" (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012, p.7). Excluded from this definition are:

- study-abroad programs for home students

- institutions that are part of operations in which more than one institution's programs are offered.

- campuses whose programs are offered through a third-country institution.

- institutions established as branch campuses but are now independently accredited institutions with degree-awarding powers.

- independent institutions modeled on foreign higher education systems, or established with substantial academic input from foreign providers, or established by foreigners.

- federal or co federal universities with campuses in different countries but which were all established at around the same time, such that no institution can be considered derivative of another.

- research centers established in partnership with institutions or governments in other countries.

- non-degree-granting operations.

Internationalization of higher education. It is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the goals, functions (teaching/learning, research, services) and delivery of higher education" (Knight, 2003). It refers to the specific policies and initiatives of individual academic institutions and systems.

Perceived environmental uncertainty (PEU). An individual's perceived inability to predict the organizational environment accurately. In this study, PEU refers to two particular types of uncertainty: (1) state uncertainty: administrators experience state uncertainty when they perceive the organizational environment, or a particular component of that environment, to be unpredictable; and (2) effect uncertainty: an inability to predict what the nature of the impact of a future state of the environment or environmental change will be on the organization (Milliken, 1987, p.136).

Transnational education. Transnational education is the mobility of educational programs and institutions across borders (OECD, 2009). This is the preferred term for internationally mobile programs and institutions and is used interchangeably with the term cross-border education (Guruz, 2008).

CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this section is to give an overview of the existing literature on

international branch campuses. It also explores the topics of organizational commitment

and organizational identity theory. The IBC phenomenon needs to be understood within

the broader context of international higher education. Therefore, this literature review

starts with a note on the impact of globalization and the current state of transnational

education.

The Globalization of Higher Education

Globalization is defined as the integration of economic, political and cultural

forces worldwide (Denman, 2002; Guruz, 2008; Weber & Duderstadt, 2008). More

generally, it can be interpreted as "the widening, deepening and speeding up of

worldwide interconnectedness" (OECD, 2009). It entails the formation of worldwide

markets operating in real time, which facilitates the cross-border mobility of production.

Although globalization is not a new phenomenon (Altbach, 2007; Marginson & Rhoades,

2002), its scale and pace are. This is mostly due to the advances of information

technology that compress time and space, which makes cross-border exchanges

instantaneous (King & Bjarnason, 2004, p.50).

Globalization takes place at the economic, political and cultural levels (Breton,

2003; Currie & Newson, 1998; King & Bjarnason, 2004; Marginson & Rhoades, 2002;

McBernie & Ziguras, 2007; Odin & Manicas, 2004). At the economic level, globalization takes the form of trade liberalization and the development of a world market (Odin & Manicas, 2004). At the political level, globalization is responsible for the decline of sovereign nation states and for the growth of interstate collaboration (King & Bjarnason, 2004). At the cultural level, globalization has created a homogeneous world culture (Odin & Manicas, 2004), promoted multiculturalism and diversity (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). It has also raised questions about the cultural appropriateness of transnational curriculum and pedagogy (McBernie & Ziguras, 2007).

Higher education drives and is driven by globalization (OECD, 2009). Although higher education systems are heterogeneous systems marked by national characteristics (King & Bjarnason, 2004), all of them have been subject to globalization forces, albeit in different capacity (OECD, 2009). As a result of globalization, four major transformations of higher education have occurred: privatization, commercialization, entrepreneurialism and managerialism.

Privatization

One of the fundamental ways globalism has changed higher education is by redefining it as a private good. Until the 1980s, higher education was perceived as a public good, that is, governments had an intrinsic responsibility in financing the cost of higher education. However, things changed with the fiscal crisis of the states. The welfare state model was challenged by the rising cost of healthcare, pensions, K-12 education and corrections. Neo-liberals condemned state inefficiency, advocated for economic

14

rationality and conservative fiscal policies (Guruz, 2008). These events forced governments to cut down their appropriations for higher education. In the 1980s and 1990s, the higher education policies of Australia, Canada, Great Britain, the United States and the United Kingdom shifted to emphasize increased student participation with less public funding (Slaughter, 1998). These states started putting more of the financial burden on students. It is important to remember that this emphasis on student contribution depends on the type of market economies in which universities function, as well as the country's economic robustness and willingness to support public education (Odin & Manicas, 2004). For instance, in Western Europe, there still is a strong commitment to education as a public good (Odin & Manicas, 2004). However, in Mexico, Brazil and Argentina, which are countries with weaker economies, private higher education is widespread mainly because of the restructuring processes imposed by the IMF and the World Bank (Rhoads & Torres, 2006).

Commercialization

A second effect of globalization has been the commercialization of higher education through the implementation of numerous trade agreements. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has had a major impact on higher education because it focuses exclusively on trade in services. For GATS purposes, higher education is a commodity, a tradable professional service (Breton, 2003; Guruz, 2008; King & Bjarnason, 2004). GATS, which is administered by the World Trade Organization, consists of four major provisions: cross-border offerings, foreign consumption,

commercial presence and presence of natural persons (Altbach & Knight, 2006; Knight, 2002; Morshidi et al, 2009; Rhoads & Torres, 2006). Cross-border offerings include distance education, e-learning and virtual universities. Consumption abroad refers to students who go abroad to study. Study abroad flows currently represent the largest share of the global market for education services. Commercial presence alludes to satellite campuses, twinning partnerships, franchised arrangements with local institutions and international branch campuses. Finally, the last provision (presence of natural persons) includes faculty and researchers working abroad temporarily (Knight, 2002; Morshidi et al, 2009). The GATS has given access to education providers to markets that were previously protected. Higher education institutions have become suppliers in a global education market and are now behaving like firms (McBernie & Ziguras, 2007; Odin & Manicas, 2004). In short, globalization has created a new global education marketplace, which has pressured academic institutions to compete at the international level (Canaan & Shumar, 2008).

<center>Entrepreneurialism</center>

To make up for the loss of public subsidies and state funding, universities worldwide have undertaken various entrepreneurial activities to generate profit. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) have called this phenomenon "academic capitalism". In industrialized nations, entrepreneurialism shows mostly in the form of industry-university collaboration. Commercial activities based in university interdisciplinary centers in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and the United States have been in existence since

the 1980's (King & Bjarnason, 2004). In the United States, the Bayh-Doyle Act of 1980 made it legal for universities to patent their research findings. This has led to a boom in industry-university partnerships. In addition, the establishment of campuses abroad with the intention of generating revenues has also become a tool to respond to the new paradigm of the entrepreneurial university.

<div align="center">Managerialism</div>

Managerialism is based on the idea of autonomy, accountability, efficiency and quality and draws from private sector management principles. As such, managerialism is "one of the prime elements in a shift to a neo-liberal educational policy discourse" (Burbules & Torres, 2000, p.118). It has permeated all institutions of higher education. Deem & Brehony (2005) write that new managerialism has created the following practices: the further reduction of funding, the maximization of academic work and workloads (with pressure for excellence in both teaching and research); more emphasis on teamwork; the introduction of cost-centers to university departments; greater internal and external surveillance of the performance of academics and an increase in the proportion of managers, both career administrators and manager-academics (Deem & Brehony, 2005). They also suggest that manager-academics have easily embraced managerialism because it empowers them. Universities' concern for quality standards in teaching and research has indeed legitimated the presence of this new class of managers.

The great majority of researchers have been quite critical of globalization and of its impact on higher education. Many commentators point out that the world of globalized and private higher education has widened inequalities (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Currie, 1998; Marginson, 2006). It has resulted in the traditional domination of the Northern hemisphere over Southern developing nations. (Altbach, 2007). Others write that managerialism has increased the alienation of academics from their university, that it has created a lack of trust (Currie & Newson, 1998) and has led to a loss of collegiality (Odin & Manicas, 2004). The commercialization of higher education has undermined academic standards and turned students into consumers of education (Bok, 2003; King & Bjarnason, 2004; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). A minority of researchers have written about the benefits of globalization that translate into wider access, internationalization, multiculturalism, university-industry collaboration and efficiency (Currie & Newson, 1998).

The Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization is often confused with globalization. However, the terms carry a different meaning. There is a consensus among researchers that internationalization is a strategic response to globalization (Altbach, 2002; Beerkens & van der Wende, 2001*;* Knight, 1997; Scott, 1998). Knight's definition is commonly used to describe internationalization: it is the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the goals, functions (teaching/learning,

18

research, services) and delivery of higher education (Knight, 2003). It basically refers to the specific policies and initiatives of individual academic institutions and systems.

Historically, higher education has always included international activities, a process which started during the Greco-Roman period with the Sophists and continued later on with the travels of scholars across Medieval Europe (Guruz, 2008; Teather, 2004). Throughout the centuries, universities have been the international vectors of knowledge, but this used to take place informally and at the individual level (Neave, 2001). The internationalization of higher education as a formal and deliberate process really started in the twentieth century. Indeed, after World War II, governments made a concerted effort in finding mechanisms that would promote peace and understanding between nations. They envisioned higher education and academic mobility at the center of this movement and made them instruments of foreign policy (de Wit, 2002; Guruz, 2008). For example, in 1946, the American government established the Fulbright exchange program, which still promotes the exchange of scholars worldwide to this day. Two decades later, it passed the Title VI of the Higher Educational Act and the National Defense Education Act to facilitate student mobility. Other examples include the establishment of mobility scholarships through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union and individual countries as well as institutional structures like the Institute of International Education (IIE), the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the British Council (Guruz, 2008).

Although the internationalization of universities is not new, it intensified in the 1980s because of globalization. Indeed, the development of a new global economy has required nations to educate their workforce with international skills and competencies. In the United States as elsewhere, universities and colleges have responded to these changes and new needs by intensifying their international involvement through the implementation of internationalization strategic plans and policies (Altbach & Knight, 2007). The 2005 IAU Global Survey on Internationalization of Higher Education reports that 73% of the 526 higher education institutions surveyed, ranked internationalization as a high priority. They listed knowledge and research capacity as well as institutional prestige as their top three rationales to internationalize. In addition to academic and knowledge-based rationales, they included financial motivations.

Indeed, universities' motivations to internationalize have grown even stronger after they realized they could make profits, absorb an increasing student demand, and enhance their competitiveness and prestige (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Naidoo, 2010). In short, universities' internationalization process shifted from being a marginal activity to becoming a central strategy. To illustrate this point, a new internationalization index was developed by the British Council with the Economist Intelligence Unit in 2010. It tracked policies in 11 countries to quantify international collaboration, overseas branch campuses, joint academic programs, publications and patents, academic and student mobility, visa policies, quality, access and recognition of foreign degrees. Germany ranked first. Australia and Britain were second and third respectively, having the most

open environments to international collaboration and ambitious internationalization

policies (Sharma, 2010). Internationalization has particularly impacted research

universities. As Marginson eloquently puts it, they have become global research

universities: " a global research university is the multiversity, plus more research, much

more mobility, global systems, and ranking" (Marginson, 2010).

Although there may be variations among countries, universities'

internationalization plans usually focus on student and faculty mobility (outgoing study

abroad students and in-coming international students/faculty), academic cooperation

(through research collaboration with foreign faculty) and curriculum integration (with the

introduction of an international perspective in course content). New approaches have

recently emerged in the field of internationalization such as online education and

international consortial activities. This study focuses on one particular area: the creation

of branch campuses in foreign markets. Mazzarol, Soutar & Yaw Seng (2003) note that

the creation of international branch campuses is the latest wave of globalization in higher

education (after student mobility and the formation of institutional consortia and

coalitions in the 1990s). The business literature is useful in explaining how a foreign

market entrant like a university gradually enters a foreign market. It involves entry modes

(Agarwal & Ramaswami, 1992).This pattern is called the "Uppsala internationalization

model" (Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975; Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; Mazzarol,

Soutar, & Seng, 2003; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007) and is often applied to the

phenomenon of higher education internationalization. This model refers to three distinct

entry modes into a foreign market: first exportation (universities send their students abroad), then partnership or twinnings (universities join international consortia) and finally off-shoring and sole ventures (universities set up branches abroad).

International Branch Campuses

This section focuses on the current state of international branch campuses worldwide. It reviews published information about their source and host countries, the costs and benefits of international branch campuses (IBC) as well as risks, regulations, management issues and best practices. The section concludes with a look into the future of these overseas campuses.

Current Data

Because there is no central registry for IBCs, the most reliable and updated source of information about IBCs is the 2012 Observatory on Borderless Higher Education report. Lawton & Katsomitros listed 200 international branch campuses (see Appendix A for information about the report). The authors highlighted that the number of IBCs increased significantly since the last report issued in 2009. Between 2009 and 2012, 38 additional IBCs were created, an increase of 23%.

Home countries

Universities from 24 countries own international branch campuses. The United States dominate the market with 78 campuses. Their dominance can be explained by historical reasons as American colleges and universities have been setting up overseas campuses for several decades for their study abroad students and military personnel

(Guruz, 2008). It is only in the 1990s that universities from other countries started setting up campuses abroad (Farrugia & Lane, 2012). Second in rank is France, with 27 campuses, then the United Kingdom with 25 branches. Numbers for France are skewed because the growth is due to only one educational institution that has been expanding rapidly. The United Kingdom owes its third position to its higher education funding system, which is dependent on international student fee income. India and Australia are ranked fourth and fifth with 17 and 12 campuses respectively. Following are Malaysia (with 6 campuses), Iran (6) and Canada (4). Since 2009, the United Kingdom and France have been the countries that have increased their IBC numbers the most.

Table 1
Top 5 home countries

	Number of IBCs	Market share
The United States	78	39%
France	27	13.5%
The United Kingdom	25	12.5%
India	17	8.5%
Australia	12	6%

Host countries

As of 2012, there were 67 existing host countries for a total number of 200 IBCs. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) was the country with the most IBCs (37). Most of the IBCs are in Dubai International Academic City. Second largest host country is Singapore with 18 campuses. Next is China with 17 branches. It holds this position because of its growing economy, an increased demand for higher education and a growing middle class that can afford college fees. Qatar (10 IBCs) and Malaysia (7 IBCs) follow. Although the

Gulf region still hosts the greatest number of branch campuses, Asia is definitely becoming the world's leading destination for new international campuses. A British Council report (2013) found that that Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates had the most favorable environments for transnational education including IBC infrastructure.

Table 2
Top 10 host countries

	Number of IBCs	Market share
UAE	37	18.5%
Singapore	18	9%
China	17	8.5%
Qatar	10	5%
Malaysia	7	3.5%
United Kingdom	6	3%
India	5	2.5%
Mauritius	5	2.5%
Canada	4	2%
Hong Kong	4	2%
Japan	4	2%

Between 2009 and 2012, 22 new host countries appeared in the IBC market. Countries that offer the most support, funding or infrastructure, have experienced the largest growth. The majority of IBC activities come from developed to developing countries ("north to south" provision). "South to south[1]" IBC activities have continued to increase substantially, with 34 campuses worldwide, which represent11 countries from the developing world. This number suggests that these developing countries have

---

[1] "South to South" refers to developing home countries with IBCs in developing host countries.

improved the quality of their education programs to reach a level of maturity for exportation (Becker, 2009). "South to North"[2] IBC activities are still limited with three IBCs (a Malaysian and Iranian campus in the United Kingdom and a Venezuelan campus in the United States).

Table 3
Ten Largest International Branch Campuses

	Students
RMIT in Vietnam	About
Monash University in Malaysia	5,000
University of Nottingham in China	About
AMA International University in Bahrain	4,000
University of Nottingham in Malaysia	About
Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University	3,000
Curtin University in Malaysia	
Limkokwing University of Creative Technology in Botswana	
University of Wollongong in Dubai	
Monash University in South Africa	2,600
Temple University in Japan	2,500

According to a 2011 survey, most home campuses wholly own IBC facilities in these host countries (Lane & Kinser, 2013). Another popular business model is having the local government subsidize the physical infrastructure's cost.

The IBCs listed in the OBHE report belong to both non-profit and for-profit institutions. The majority of branches has been established by private non-profit universities and competes for market share with dynamic public colleges. A sizeable portion of these IBCs is owned by private for-profit educational organizations.

---

[2] "South to North" refers to developing home countries with IBC in developed nations.

Drivers and Benefits of International Branch Campuses

This section gives an overview of the reasons universities open international branch campuses, why host countries are receptive to this type of activity and why students attend IBCs.

Universities open branches abroad to capture a piece of the student market. Some students cannot afford to study abroad but are still willing to pay higher fees to receive a foreign degree in their home country. Revenue generation is usually one of the main incentives for IBCs (Altbach & Knight, 2006; Becker, 2009; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). In addition, having an IBC adds to institutions' international prestige as it gives them an edge in the global higher education market. This prestige factor is often coupled with university leaders' ambition to redefine their institution's footprint in the international arena. In an interview (Redden, 2013), New York University President John Sexton once said: "what NYU -- is *not,* is a hub and spoke, with branch campuses [….]. The phrase that I think captures it best is the notion of an organic circulatory system". George Mason's president also stated: "we created the concept of the "distributed university" […] we don't like the word 'satellite'" (Wildavsky, 2010, p.67). IBCs also allow universities to meet their internationalization goals. They offer their students, staff and faculty the enhanced opportunity to study, teach and do research abroad. Fourth, IBCs are vectors of mutual understanding between people, which fit with the mission of universities. Most institutions are motivated by a combination of all of the factors mentioned (Becker, 2009; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012).

Second, international branch campuses benefit not only universities but host countries too. Currently, there is competition among foreign governments to attract branch campuses, especially from elite universities. Hubs like Singapore, Kulua Lumpur, Qatar and Dubai are prime examples. These hubs are conduits to improving a host country's education system. They allow the country to better meet the rising demand for higher education at a cheaper rate than the home rate. IBCs contribute to their national higher education policy goals. IBCs also minimize student brain drain, as the brightest students are offered the chance to get a prestigious western education at home. In addition, overseas campuses enhance the country's higher education image, especially if IBCs are Ivy-League schools. They also generate revenues to local communities and contribute to economic growth. They attract highly skilled workers and students who may decide to stay after graduation. Finally, IBCs increase the chances for beneficial research collaboration, technology transfer and the adoption of good higher education practices (like quality assurance) in the host country (American Council on Education, 2009). These benefits may increase a country's competitive advantage in the global market. Because IBCs can be a profitable enterprise, many host countries offer them financial incentives like Qatar, open up access to their markets like Singapore, create special investment zones like South Korea and Japan, and provide cost effective and safe locations, like South Korea. (Rumbley & Altbach, 2007).

Third, students benefit from the establishment of international branch campuses. Students can receive a well-known foreign degree without uprooting themselves and

continuing their regular activities like holding a job. It is also considerably cheaper to study at an IBC: tuition fees are usually lower than the home institution's. Students do not have to pay for travel and abroad living expenses. They also need not to worry about visa procedures and immigration restrictions. Getting an international degree exposes them to different teaching models and pedagogies, which make them more flexible in the workplace. Finally, after graduation, these students differentiate themselves in the marketplace because they have earned a distinguished foreign degree. They also believe their chances for professional placement and advancement to be greater.

Risks and Challenges of International Branch Campuses

Establishing a branch campus abroad is a very risky operation (American Council on Education, 2008; Becker, 2009; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). In 2009, Becker's report listed eleven closures of IBCs. The University of Southern Queensland branch campus in Dubai closed in 2005, less than a year after its opening because of academic quality and regulatory issues (McBernie & Ziguras, 2007). The University of South Wales in Singapore closed four months after its opening due to insufficient enrollments, and a lack of curriculum specialization. It cost US $38 million to the institution. George Mason University closed its Ras al Khaimah branch in the United Arab Emirate after three years of operation due to insufficient enrolments, funding troubles and conflict with its local partner. The University of La Verne Athens closed for management reasons in the fall 2004 (McBernie & Ziguras, 2007). Central Queensland University closed its branch in Fiji in 2007 because of political instability, which scared students away. The Ireland's

28

Dublin Business School in Malaysia also closed in 2007 but it was due to the Malaysian government's request to shut down the eleven-year old operation as they had met their needed quotas for accounting and finance graduates. Interestingly, some universities withdrew their programs abroad before even starting. For instance, Yale University backed out of an Abu Dhabi venture because leaders believed it would compromise its brand. The University of Warwick dropped the idea of setting up an IBC in Singapore for academic freedom concerns.

Between 2009 and 2012, Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) tracked 18 more branch campuses' closures. The most cited reasons for closure were a lack of students, budget cuts, accreditation issues, visa restrictions, restructuring at the home campus and other unclear reasons. The University of Waterloo closed its branch in the United Arab Emirates in May 2013. New York University in Singapore will close in 2014 because of a flawed financial model. The University of Nevada at Las Vegas will close its hospitality management program in Singapore 2015. Besides closures, take-overs have also been happening: in 2013, global education giant Laureate announced it bought Monash University in South Africa (Jenvey, 2013; Redden, 2013). The same year, Ave Maria University sold its Nicaragua branch following a multi-million dollar loss.

Adding to the risk of failure are criticism and ethical considerations. Objections to the growth of IBCs have focused not only on the financial risk but also on philosophical and cultural issues. International branch campuses are seen by a few as a symbol of cultural and academic imperialism, which in turn exacerbates the social divide in

developing countries (Becker, 2009). The presence of IBCs in hubs of privileges may lead to the introduction or increase of local public fees in host countries, and create a better world for the affluent and a worse one for the disadvantaged (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). Some contend that IBCs make uncertain contribution to internationalization of the home campus and can even be a threat to academic freedom. Critics, like the Association of American University Professors, have expressed concerns about the limited protections of free speech in some host countries (Yung & Sharma, 2012). In recent years, faculty have also been more vocal about these issues: Yale in Singapore, Duke in China, and other campuses in Qatar have been the target of their criticism (Fischer, 2012; Jaschick, 2013; Lindsey, 2013; Wilhelm, 2011)

In summary, there are basically three types of risks involved: financial, academic and reputational risks. These risks are often triggered by operational challenges, market fluctuations, complex and fast-changing regulations, low enrolments and insufficient market research (Becker, 2009; Rumsey & Altbach, 2007). Senior university officials often have high expectation that do not match the realities of student markets. Some IBCs also close because of the local context due to restrictive national policy issues such as visa requirements and quality assurance standards (Woodfield & Middlehurst, 2009).

IBCs are a risky business for host countries too. It is an expensive proposition to attract foreign universities. In addition, host countries take the risk of increasing inequalities related to access with only the richest citizens receiving superior education. They can also lose control of their higher education system by privileging a private over a

public system. Sometimes, if they allow IBCs to offer highly profitable programs, they may even lose an opportunity to cross-subsidize other high cost disciplines such as engineering and medicine (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007).

IBCs can also be a drawback for students. They may be faced with their program closure and be forced to drop out or finish their studies abroad at the home institution. Students must also ensure that their degree will be recognized at the national level if they want a good return on their investment.

<div align="center">*Regulatory Issues*</div>

Rumsey and Altbach (2007) once jokingly compared the IBC market to the "wild west" because it is sometimes unregulated and involves numerous players. Although some countries lack the political will or the infrastructure capacity to regulate foreign providers (Altbach & Knight, 2006), most have some type of policy in place. For instance, Malaysia's Education Act of 1998 allows universities to establish branch campuses (Mazzarol, Soutar & Yaw Seng, 2003).

Relationships between the higher education institution and the host country encompass various roles: owner, core funder, planner, partner, customer and regulator (OECD, 2004). Regulatory mechanisms impact various aspects of the IBC business such as staffing through employment restrictions and the movement of people across borders via immigration laws (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). In some countries, IBCs are independent organizations while in others they must partner with a local university. When it is possible, it may be advantageous for IBCs to seek recognition and

accreditation as they can receive local funding and their students are eligible for financial awards (this is the case for IBCs located in the European Union). A growing number of countries have set up quality assurance systems for IBCs (such as Hong Kong, Israel, Malaysia, Singapore, South Africa and the UAE). Some of them have not hesitated to close under-performing IBCs.

The most favorable regulations for IBCs are usually provided by international higher education hubs. These hubs host a number of carefully selected international branch universities. There are located in the United Arab Emirates (Dubai International Academic City, University City, Academic City, Ras Al Khaimah Free Trade Zone), in Qatar (Education City), in Singapore and in Hong Kong (Becker, 2009). Hubs are usually funded by governments, which offer IBCs many benefits including tax breaks, brand-new buildings, administrative and financial support, repatriation of profits, foreign ownership. Some hubs like Qatar's Education City, even bear the full costs of hosting IBCs by paying for buildings, infrastructure, administrative assistance, and even staff bonuses. The UAE has been an attractive market for IBCs for several reasons: it is one of the most stable countries in the Middle East, it is wealthy, it is pro-west, its surrounding populations are growing fast, higher education for women is encouraged, the US-style higher education is in high demand, and its expatriate communities (50-80% of the population in the Gulf nations), have a need for private education (American Council on Education, 2008).

Although at times beneficial, national regulatory frameworks may be a challenge for international branch campuses because rules such as entry, legal status, degree recognition, accreditation and quality assurance vary from country to country (Becker, 2009). In addition, societal values may limit the involvement of IBCs. For example, some countries do not recognize equality of opportunity, gender equity, or religious diversity (American Council on Education, 2008). Others, like Malaysia, require IBCs to provide courses in the local language.

Conditions of Success to Develop and Manage a Campus Abroad

To maximize their chances of success, the literature recommends that universities evaluate the following key dimensions of establishing a campus abroad: institutional priorities, location, regulatory issues, the curriculum, funding, and staffing. At the very least, universities should base their decision on academic, strategic and business rationales (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007).

Institutional Priorities

University presidents and their teams must take into account certain key elements related to their institutional priorities: first the IBC should fit and advance their institutional mission, goals and strategic plan; second, it needs to yield a profit (Becker, 2009; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). Prestige considerations should not outweigh financial considerations. To increase its success, a university must also have specific assets on the marketplace such as a prestigious brand name, good marketing capability, and access to cheaper finance (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). In the end, a university with particular

institutional issues such as being risk averse, lacking faculty leadership and engagement, using poor financial models and lacking flexibility will probably fail in the IBC market (Woodfield & Middlehurst, 2009).

Location

The literature suggests location-specific factors which make an IBC endeavour successful: cheaper production costs, tax cuts from the host government and good access to local market. It is important that universities do their homework before they choose a specific location. McBernie & Ziguras (2007) recommend that institutions check out host government attitudes towards foreign education providers as well as their relations between the home and host nations (p.38). Other important factors include: (a) the economic and political stability of the host country;(b) safety and security issues; (c) the host country's infrastructure for transportation, communications, energy and information technology; (d) their compliance records; (e) the business environment like taxation, repatriation of funds and employment regulations; (f) visa and travel regulations; (g) the demand for foreign education; the capacity of home institution to address demand and its interest in retaining its graduates for its own economic development; (h) restrictions on curriculum or pedagogy; (i) the recognition of the home qualifications for purposes of professional accreditation; and finally, (j) the availability of suitable site and local staff.

The IBC literature also recommends university managers to use the following tools and metrics to assess the viability of their location choice: the World Economic Forum's annual Global Competitiveness Report, the Deutsche Bank Eurasia Group

Stability Index, various World Bank reports, the Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index among others (McBernie & Ziguras, 2007, p.38). Although not all factors are equally important, universities should find a site that meets a specific number of conditions set according to the institution's best interest.

Curriculum and Regulatory Issues

University administrators must figure out their curricular model before they set up a branch abroad. Most IBCs offer a similar curriculum to their home campus but some cater to the local demand by providing customized programs (Becker, 2009). Standardizing the course offering has the advantage of facilitating student transfer between home and foreign campus. Customized programs are usually motivated by the financial potential from high demand degree programs such as business and management. It is recommended that universities limit their risk by starting small and offering a limited number of courses and then, gradually expanding the curriculum based on popular programs. Integrating the IBC activities into the home campus (via videoconferencing for instance) is always a good idea as it develops a sense of belonging. Setting up and teaching a course abroad is not an easy task. Faculty and administrators must be prepared for cultural differences, miscommunication and misunderstanding.

As detailed in the previous section, regulatory issues may be a roadblock to setting up a campus abroad. As such, it is recommended administrators educate themselves about possible limitations (Harding & Lammey, 2011).

Funding

35

IBCs have adopted three main funding models (Rumbley & Altbach, 2007): self-funding (the branch is fully funded by the institution), external funding (governments and the private sector contribute to start up and maintenance costs) and provision of facilities (this is more common among newer initiatives like in the states of the Gulf). IBCs are usually established with the idea that they should be self-funded, especially for state schools that cannot use public funds to subsidize IBCs. Besides these models, little financial information has been made public (McBernie & Ziguras, 2007), which makes it difficult to estimate how much universities have invested in IBCs. If anything else, the IBC phenomenon does show that many non-profit universities tend to behave like for-profit ventures if they want to be successful abroad (Kinser & Levy, 2006).

Staffing Considerations

Staff commitment and training are at the center of a successful IBC (Becker, 2009). As such, the nurturing of grass-root administrators is vital (American Council on Education, 2008). Administrative employment arrangements vary among IBCs. Most institutions employ local and home campus staff. The size and types of administrators vary from campus to campus, depending on the type of services they offer. Recruiting staff and faculty from the home campus has its challenges: expatriation is taxing and expensive. Some universities offer incentives like additional allowances, bigger salaries and higher level job titles. Becker (2009) notes that most IBC full time staff are usually paid based on the home campus rates but local staff's remuneration is calculated on local salaries.

Some observers have complained about the inequality of a two-tier workforce, where IBC staff members receive different salaries from those working at the home campus (Denholm, 2012). Becker (2009) wrote that there is a divide between the tenured faculty who teach at IBCs for a semester or two and are compensated through their university's overload system or summer teaching (includes stipends and travel compensation) and the local faculty. These on-site residential faculty members are usually on short-term contract and paid according to local wage rates or higher. They are not offered tenure-track opportunities (American Council on Education, 2008). In April 2009, the American Association of University Professors and the Canadian Association of University Teachers issued a joint statement about the conditions of employment at overseas campuses. They asked that universities honor the provisions in the UNESCO *Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel*. For non academic employees, they expect each institution and its subcontractors to adopt a code of conduct consistent with International Labor Organization (ILO) standards.

Some critics have also questioned universities' decision to hire employees from the home country with little knowledge of the host country's culture. They have suggested hiring local administrators and faculty who were educated in the home university's country and who understand both the local context and the mother campus' culture (Sharma, 2011).

In sum, it is essential that the home institution's leadership backs up the venture for the long term and carefully crafts a business strategy. Ups and downs are to be

expected and the senior management team must understand that success may take several years and is a resource-intensive endeavor (Mazzarol, Soutar & Yaw Seng, 2003). Market research is essential and should be done before approaching a prospective partner abroad. Developing an exit strategy is also a good idea, with ideally a contingency clause in the contract with the foreign partner (American Council on Education, 2008). In any case, universities should observe due diligence and be vigilant on quality. It is important to be flexible because conditions will change.

The Future of International Branch Campuses

Becker's predictions in 2009 about the future of international branch campuses have proven to be true. A wide range of universities, including the internationally prestigious ones have continued setting up branches abroad. However, saturated markets like South Africa and the UAE have not seen much growth. As of 2012, there were no new IBCs planned in the UAE. However new hubs in the Middle East, China, Australia, Bahrain, Singapore, South Korea and Malaysia have developed steadily. These hubs are the Higher Education City in Bahrain, EduCity in Malaysia, Global Schoolhouse in Singapore, Incheon Free Economic Zone in South Korea, University City in Australia, and the City of Knowledge in Panama. After years of delayed legislation, India announced in September 2013 that it would allow foreign universities to set up branches (Mishra, 2013).

The anticipated increased focus on quality assurance regulations, consumer protection measures and government scrutiny (Becker, 2009; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007)

have also proven to become a reality. Lane and Kinser (2013) predict that five international trends will affect international branch campuses in the next years: a greater push-back from faculty members, a shift from expansion to quality, global competition for host countries to be education hubs, a focus on economic development and increasing diversity of programs.

Lawton and Katsomitros (2012) suggest that niches campuses that offer a very limited range of courses within a single discipline may become the typical branch campus model in the future. International branch campus may also face unexpected competition from Massive Open Online Courses (Choudaha, 2012).

Employee Organizational Commitment

The purpose of this section is to examine the various conceptualizations of employee organizational commitment (EOC). The research on organizational commitment is wide and extensive. In an effort to focus on its most important aspects, the following items will be discussed: the definition of EOC, its outcomes and antecedents, EOC in higher education and finally, its limitations and implications.

Definition of Employee Organizational Commitment

There has been a lack of consensus in defining organizational commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Reichers, 1985). Several definitions of employee organizational commitment (EOC) can be found in the literature. Broadly speaking, commitment is about workers' relationships with their organizations, how those relationships are established, and how they influence employees' behavior, well-being,

and contributions to organizational effectiveness. EOC is formally defined as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, and is said to be characterized by three factors: a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization's goals and values; a readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian,1974).

Frameworks to explain and describe the phenomenon of EOC are either uni-dimensional (Blau, 1985; Brown, 1996; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982; Wiener, 1982) or multidimensional (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Angle & Perry, 1981; Gordon et al, 1980; Jaros et al, 1993; Mayer & Schoorman, 1992, 1998; Meyer & Allen, 1984, 1991; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Penley & Gould, 1988). For instance, organizational commitment may mean supporting the goals of the organization and retaining organizational membership at the same time. EOC can also mean commitment to organizations, professions and occupations, teams and leaders, goals and personal careers (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). It may be viewed as a collection of multiple commitments to various groups that comprise an organization (Reichers, 1985).

A long-standing distinction has been made between attitudinal commitment and behavioral commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reichers, 1985; Salancik, 1977; Scholl, 1981; Staw, 1977). The attitudinal perspective posits that EOC is a mind set, which is the process by which employees come to think of their relationship with

their organization. Behavioral commitment refers to the process by which employees become locked into their organization and how they deal with it (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a comprehensive model of commitment based on Mowday, Porter, and Steers' (1982) concept of commitment, which in turn drew on earlier work by Kanter (1968). Meyer and Allen classify EOC into three components: affective; continuance; and normative commitment. Affective commitment is defined as employees' emotional attachment to an organization which makes them willing to assist in the achievement of the organization's goals. Continuance commitment refers to an employee's awareness of the costs related to leaving an organization, while normative commitment is defined as a feeling of obligation to continue employment in the organization. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to stay with the organization as it is the moral thing to do.

O'Reilly and Chatman's model (1986) is also prevalent in the literature. The authors see commitment as a combination of compliance (instrumental commitment) and, identification and internalization (both labeled as normative commitment). These three components correlate highly with each other. The researchers found that compliance correlates positively with turnover.

Outcomes of Employee Organizational Commitment

The degree of commitment employees have for their organization has important implications. These outcomes have been extensively measured and researched. Several studies have shown a correlation between EOC and tardiness, turnover, job satisfaction,

absenteeism and performance (Angle & Perry, 1981; Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Larson & Fukami, 1984; Mowday et al, 1979; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Porter et al, 1976; Steers, 1977; Van Maanen, 1975). Committed employees tend to be more productive and stay longer in their positions. They are also more likely to receive financial benefits and be more creative and innovative (Mowday et al, 1982).

If organizations want to retain talent, they need to have committed employees. The relations between organizational commitment and employee retention variables are well established (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Correlations are strongest for affective commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1997).The research evidence shows that employees with strong affective commitment will choose to be absent less often and will perform better. It is also true that employees with continuance commitment stay with their organization but only because the costs associated with leaving are perceived as too high (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Significant positive relationships have also been reported between employees' affective commitment and their supervisors' ratings of their potential for promotion (Meyer, Gellatly, Goffin & Jackson, 1989) and their overall job performance (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Mayer & Schoorman, 1992; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Sager & Johnston, 1989). Several studies have shown significant negative correlations between affective commitment and various self-reported indices of psychological, physical, and work-related stress (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992;

42

Reilly & Orsak, 1991). Commitment has also been positively correlated with both career satisfaction and non-work satisfaction (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Correlations between commitment and employee behaviors are moderated by situational factors. For example, evidence suggests that the relationship between affective commitment and performance are moderated by employees' level of financial need (Brett, Cron, & Slocum, 1995) and their career stage (Cohen, 1991).

<div align="center">Antecedents of Commitment</div>

Personal characteristics

Personal characteristics refer to variables that are demographic (e.g. age, gender, education, marital status, tenure etc….) and dispositional (e.g. personality and values). Studies have shown that there was a correlation of personal characteristics with EOC (Angle & Perry, 1981; Brooks & Seers, 1991; DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Steers, 1977). However, the relations are neither strong nor consistent (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Work environment characteristics

Researchers have defined work environment characteristics as work experiences, tasks, group attitudes, organizational dependability, situational attributes and other organizational variables like size, culture and climate (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Mowday et al, 1982; Steers, 1977). Studies about these characteristics tend to support the idea that they are correlated to EOC. Work experience variables show the strongest and most consistent correlations with affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The literature contains some support for the idea that organizational structure, policies,

decisions and the employee's role in the organization influence affective commitment (Gellatly, 1995; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Moorman et al., 1993). In addition, affective commitment has been positively correlated with job challenge, degree of autonomy, and variety of skills (Colarelli, Dean, & Konstans, 1987; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Steers, 1977).

Finally, affective commitment is stronger among employees who participate in decision-making (Dunham, Grube & Castaneda, 1994; Jermier & Berkes, 1979; Rhodes & Steers, 1981) and whose supervisors treat them with consideration (Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995; DeCotiis & Summers, 1987) and fairness (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The following variables have also been linked to EOC: latitude or discretion over activities (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Gregersen & Black, 1992), task autonomy (Dunham, Grube & Castaneda, 1994), receptiveness of management to employee ideas (Allen & Meyer, 1990), and job scope (Marsh & Mannari, 1977; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990)

Organizational Commitment in Higher Education

There has been a paucity of research on the topic of higher education administrators and their organizational commitment. Most studies have focused on job satisfaction in regards to academic staff or teaching faculty. Smerek and Peterson (2007, p.230) note that "in higher education, job satisfaction, particularly among administrators, has been sparsely examined, and cumulatively the studies in this area suggest there is little unity in understanding job satisfaction in a college or university context". Despite

44

this dearth in EOC research, a few studies about job satisfaction among administrators stand out and present interesting data.

Chieffo (1991) asked 97 leadership team members (excluding chief executive officers) at two-year colleges in New Mexico about the factors leading to their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results show that leadership behaviors (influence orientation, people orientation, motivation orientation, and values orientation) and organizational structure contributed to their commitment.

Mcinnis (1998) compared academics and administrators at Australian universities to evaluate their job satisfaction and morale, their work values and motives as well as their perception of work styles and conditions. Administrators reported workload, team work, salary and the scope to contribute to quality enhancement as the main factors to job satisfaction.

Anderson, Guido-DiBrito and Morrell (2000) provided a review of the literature on the factors influencing job satisfaction, life satisfaction, inter-role conflict, and stress of student affairs administrators. In regards to job satisfaction, their review points that student affairs administrators tend to be less satisfied than the general higher education administration population, especially if they were female. However, increased experience and education seemed to produce greater job satisfaction, in particular for women.

Volkwein and Zhou (2003) surveyed 1,178 administrators at 120 American colleges and universities to predict administrative satisfaction to determine which personal and environmental characteristics influence administrative work climates. The

results indicate that few state, campus, and personal characteristics exert a direct effect on job satisfaction. Instead, their model suggests that "overall satisfaction is the product of a complex balance of many ingredients" (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003, p. 166). They conclude that work climate has a very significant influence and that teamwork and positive workplace relationships produce the greatest impact on job satisfaction.

In 2004, Rosser conducted a national study to examine the quality of 4,000 midlevel leaders' work life, satisfaction, morale and their intention to leave. The collected data showed that ethnic minorities as well as mid-level leaders with higher salaries tended to have a lower overall level of morale. The study revealed that the quality of mid-level leaders' work life (like career support, recognition for competence, external relationships, perceptions of discrimination etc…) had a direct impact on their satisfaction and intention to stay in their position.

Smerek and Peterson (2007) surveyed 2,700 employees in business operations at a large public, research university. They wanted to uncover the influence of personal and job characteristics on job satisfaction and the predictors of job satisfaction. They discovered that female administrators were more satisfied with their work experience, except when it pertained to salary. Age and ethnic background variables correlated with job satisfaction too. Non-unionized employees and those working in finance, human resources, and information technology reported more satisfaction on the job. They concluded that the work itself was the most significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Limitations and Implications

46

Several themes emerge from the organizational commitment literature. First, there is a lack of consistency in defining EOC. An important goal for future research would be to adopt a unified approach to the classification of organizational commitment. Second, the literature is clear about the outcomes of commitment but its antecedents are less consistent and not widely accepted (Morris & Sherman, 1981; Reichers, 1985). Third, there is a growing consensus among commitment theorists that commitment is a multidimensional construct (Allen & Meyer, 1991). Fourth, the emerging theme is that employees who perceive their organization treats them fairly will be more likely to stay (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Fifth, the various frameworks offer similarities as they all assert that EOC is a mind-set. They also agree that EOC is an affective bond and that present is the desire to follow a course of action whatever the motivations are. Sixth, evidence suggests that affective commitment correlates the most with outcomes such as retention, attendance and performance. As such, organizations may foster a stronger sense of commitment in their employees by implementing various human resources practices such as training and socialization strategies (Allen & Meyer, 1991). However, the research about OC was mostly done in North America, and results may vary in different parts of the world. Indeed, cultures where loyalty to the organization is the standard may favor normative commitment instead. This research gap is the case for the few job satisfaction studies of higher education administrators as they mostly focus on American colleges and universities.

Theoretical Framework

This section provides a description of organizational identity, which was the theoretical construct of this research study. Although there is a lack of consensus about the meaning of organizational identity (Albert, Ashforth & Dutton, 2000), a widely accepted definition was proposed by Albert and Whetten (1985). They defined it as the essence of an organization, that is, its most central, enduring, and distinctive features. It is the answer to the essential question, "Who are we, as an organization?" In other words, identity is the concept characterizing the impressions that employees have of their organization (Bess & Dee, 2007). Organizational identity has implications not only for how members identify with their organization but also for how their identification impacts members' own perception of self. In line with this perspective, the premise of this study is that organizational identity affects how higher education administrators perceive their commitment to their international branch campus.

Organizational identity is a useful concept for understanding organizational commitment because it explains how employees act on behalf of their organization. Indeed, an employee's response to one's organization is influenced by the degree to which he or she identifies with the organization. Organizational identity helps explain employee persistence, direction and other collective behaviors. Organizational identity theory is a powerful lens for explaining change, action and inaction by employees or groups of individuals (Albert, Ashforth & Dutton, 2000).

Indeed, organizational identity has been linked to employee motivation (Cheney, 1983), cooperation (Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002), job satisfaction (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 200) as well as commitment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Cheney & Tompkins, 1987; Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Rotondi, 1975).

Much of the research on organizational identity is built on the idea that identity is as an aspect of psychological processes that take place within the minds of individuals but it is also a relational construct formed in interaction with others (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). In other words, institutional identity is maintained via organizational interactions and processes (like protocols and routines), which in turn make individuals form their own idea of what their organization means to them. These individual perceptions affect employees' reactions and motivation. In this regard, organizational identity theory provides a sound basis for analyzing upper and mid-level administrators' behavior as it may predict certain organizational outcomes such as commitment.

The organizational identity construct is useful in understanding commitment of various work groups within international branch campuses. The utility of the construct resides in the fact that it does not necessarily see the organization as a whole. Subgroups within an organization may transcend the larger entity. They may hold considerable influence and power over how the organization functions (Ashford & Mael, 1989; Rotondi, 1975). As such, organizational theory was applied to the professional group studied for this dissertation project. It allowed us to study the relationship within the

subgroup (the non-faculty administrators) and the organization at large (the international branch campus and the home campus).

In summary, the organizational identity framework added to the conversation about organizational commitment because it provided a good foundation to explain the attitudes and behavior of a very specific group of employees: IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators. This theory also allowed the researcher to show that this particular group has its own identity, which may influence its behavior more than the IBC's identity.

Summary and Conclusion

This literature review shows that universities have responded to the pressure of globalization by intensifying their internationalization activities. What used to be a well-established movement of students and faculty between continents, now includes institutional mobility, with a presence of 200 international branch campuses worldwide as of 2012. Operating an international branch campus abroad is a risky and costly operation that requires the commitment of all of its members, especially higher education administrators. This literature review showed that employee commitment is a necessity for universities, to be successful in the global marketplace. Although researchers have written about IBC management, the field of higher education lacks empirical evidence about the organizational commitment of IBC employees. No study has ever been conducted on this topic. This phenomenon needed to be investigated because universities need to know if their current workforce is an asset to the growth of IBC. Until this point,

IBC higher educators' role and impact were purely speculative. In view of these limitations, this dissertation fills the gap by uncovering the factors influencing IBC administrators' EOC and by measuring their commitment level.

CHAPTER 3:

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter introduces the research plan. It comprises of the following sections: research design and conceptual framework, sampling strategy, instruments and data collection procedures. In addition, the following topics are included: data analysis and interpretation procedures, reliability and validity, trustworthiness, as well as a person as instrument statement.

The research questions for this study are:

1. What is the level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

2. What are the differences in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators?

3. What is the relationship between selected organizational variables and personal characteristics with organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

4. How do non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators make sense of their organizational commitment in the context of perceived environmental uncertainty?

5. In what ways do selected organizational variables and personal characteristics influence how non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators perceive their organizational commitment?

<div align="center">Research Design and Conceptual Framework</div>

The nature of the research questions determined the research design for this study. It is a mixed-methods study, which means it included both a quantitative and qualitative method approach. The researcher opted for a combination of research methods because (1) both qualitative and quantitative data provided a better understanding of the research problem; (2) both methods had complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses; and (3) one type of method was insufficient to address the research problem. The design was non-experimental and was conducted in a real setting because the independent variables could not be replicated in a laboratory.

<div align="center">*The Quantitative Approach*</div>

To assess the organizational commitment of upper-level and mid-level IBC administrators, the researcher conducted a web survey. Because the goal was to collect precise numerical data about the phenomenon, the quantitative approach was the most appropriate to answer the first research question. Moreover, the researcher was interested in learning about the effects and the relationships of organizational variables (like campus size and host country location) and personal characteristics (like age, gender etc…) on organizational commitment, which only the quantitative approach could provide (Krathwohl, 1998). The quantitative approach was also justified in this case because it

was a study of large numbers of people and as such, it made data collection efficient. Finally, one benefit of quantitative data was that the results were relatively independent of the researcher unlike the qualitative approach that was used for the other set of research questions.

The Qualitative Approach

The conceptual approach for the qualitative aspect of this study was based on the epistemological belief that knowledge is constructed (Krathwohl, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In other words, individuals understand their world by developing subjective meanings of their experience. As such, there is no standard interpretation of the world: worldviews are multiple, varied and complex (Creswell, 2007). There are multiple interpretations of reality. Individuals' subjective perceptions are negotiated socially and historically as they are always embedded in a specific sociopolitical and historical moment (Creswell, 2003). These characteristics define social constructivism, which guided the foundations of this study.

The qualitative approach was the best way to provide the data needed to answer the research questions. Indeed, because the goal of this research was to acquire a complex and detailed understanding of how upper-level and mid-level administrators perceive their organizational commitment, the researcher needed to collect data rich in details, which only a qualitative approach could provide (Creswell, 2007). A qualitative inquiry always focuses on meaning in context. This approach was inductive, descriptive and

emic[3] (Johnson & Christensen, 2004), which meant participants' perspective on the EOC phenomenon unfolded as they viewed it, not as the researcher viewed it (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

The advantages of using a qualitative approach to answer the research questions were numerous. The qualitative method made it possible to (1) portray the organizational commitment of the IBC respondents in context; (2) describe the complexity of the EOC phenomenon in a detailed and rich way, which is impossible to achieve with a quantitative method and, to (3) identify contextual factors that may impact how administrators make sense of their commitment.

The Theoretical Construct

As explained in the preceding chapter, organizational identity was the theoretical construct of this dissertation. The premise of this study was that organizational identity affects how higher education administrators perceive their commitment to their international branch campus. Organizational identity posits that organizational interactions and processes (like protocols and routines) influence how individuals form their own idea of what their organization means to them. These individual perceptions affect employees' reactions and motivation. This theoretical perspective guided this work and assumed that interactions within the branch campus are the primary forces driving IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators' commitment.

Sampling Strategy

---

[3] The emic approach investigates how local people think.

This section lays out the strategy for the quantitative part of the research study. The goal was to survey upper-level and mid-level international branch campus administrators. Upper-level and mid-level administrators were defined based on the following chart (Scott, 1978; 1979).

Table 4

Classification of Administrators by Rank

Levels	Positions	Responsibilities	Field of expertise
Upper-level	President Chancellor Provost Vice-President	Develops policy	Academic affairs, Administration, Business affairs, Planning and budgeting, Student services
Middle-level	Deans Associate Vice-President Assistant Vice-President Directors Chiefs Registrar Comptroller Manager	Implements policy	Development, Admission, Financial aid, Annual giving, Public relations, Student housing, Information technology, Student life, Student counseling, Student union, Physical plant/facilities, Institutional research, Planning, Business, Health, Human resources, Finances, Audit, Risk and compliance, Research and development, Communication, Student services and operations, Information technology, Government relations, Accreditation, Marketing, Bookstore, Admissions, Student Recruitment, Library, Cultural and Students Services, Finance, General Services, Communication, Administrative affairs, Accounting, Budget, Security, Facilities, Athletics, External affairs etc….

Excluded from the study were entry-level administrators. These are people who execute and enforce policy.

Included in the survey were institutions that offered at least one Bachelor's degree program. International branch campuses that offer only certificates or diplomas were excluded from the sample for the following reasons: (1) these non-bachelor's degree institutions are usually small and do not have a large staff; (2) they also typically do not model themselves on the traditional higher education administrative hierarchy, which is the focus of this study.

The researcher used the 2012 Observatory on Borderless Higher Education report on international branch campuses (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). There were 200 institutions listed in this report. Expecting that many IBC websites may not provide contact information and that the response rate would be low, the researcher estimated that the sample should include at least 700 people with hopefully a 15-20% response rate (between 105 and 140 respondents).

For the video-conference questionnaire

Consistent with the qualitative research paradigm (Merriam, 1998), qualitative sampling, also known as purposive sampling, was used to collect data for this study. Purposive sampling allowed the researcher to select cases or respondents that provided the richest data for an in-depth study of a phenomenon. Before selecting respondents, the researcher first created a list of essential criteria essential to the study. The goal was to set up a sample with reasonable variation in the phenomenon, settings, and people. As such,

the following attributes were to be present: respondents must reflect a variety of administration areas. There should also be a variety of IBC sizes, sponsor institutions and locations represented. Finally, the sample included two types of higher education administrators: upper-level and mid-level personnel. The table below summarizes the sample strategy and provides a combination of possibilities.

Table 5

Sampling Strategy for Interviews

Selection criteria	Must be included in the sample
Position level	Upper level and mid-level administrators
Years of experience	At least one year
Administrative area	Business Affairs Student Affairs General Administration & Operations Academic Affairs
IBC size	Small, medium and large
IBC age	Between 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 10-15 years and older
IBC home university	From a developed and a developing country Must also include the largest country exporters: the United States, France, The United Kingdom, India, Australia, Malaysia, Iran and Canada

IBC location	In a developed and developing country Preferably in largest host countries like the U.A.E, Singapore, China, Qatar and Malaysia.

The goal was to interview between 8 and 10 administrators. The final sample size would be determined when a point of saturation or redundancy was reached (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Other mitigating factors included the richness of respondents' comments, their professional experience, their availability, their credibility and trustworthiness.

Instruments and Data Collection Procedures

Instruments for this study included a web survey and a videoconference questionnaire. The survey and the interviews were conducted concurrently.

The web survey

First, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday, Steers and Porter in 1979 is an instrument that measures commitment within an organization. It was used to assess the commitment level of IBC administrators. It is the most widely used commitment measure in the literature (Dipboye, Smith & Howell, 1994). This instrument is a 15-item inventory that measures employees' feelings about their organization such as their strong beliefs in the organization's goals, their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and their strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. The descriptive items of this survey are shown in appendix B.

The survey is based on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from a low of 1 (strongly disagree) to a high of 7 (strongly agree). A general score is then determined by acquiring the mean score from the 15 responses after reverse scoring several negatively phrased questions (Mowday et al. 1979). This score is a summary indicator of employee commitment. The higher the score, the more committed an individual is to the organization. Lower scores are associated with intentions to leave the organization. An average score of 1-2 is an indicator of low commitment, 3-5 is considered average and 6-7 is considered high. A second section requesting demographic and organizational information was appended to the OCQ.

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was emailed to the participants via the QuestionPro software. Included with the questionnaire was a cover letter explaining the importance of the research and the confidentiality of the responses. The rationale for using an email questionnaire was to maximize the return rate (all university administrators are connected to the internet) and minimize cost (mailing hundreds of questionnaires worldwide is expensive). An email questionnaire also made it easier for respondents to fill it out quickly by "clicking" on easy-to-read items and accurately as respondents are alerted when they miss items. The questionnaire software allowed for instant compilation of the data, which saves time and money. The survey was administered using the Dillman Tailored Design Method (2007), which has been shown to improve response rates.

Reliability and Validity: The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) has received the most thorough and generally positive evaluation in terms of reliability and validity (Allen & Meyer, 1991). Reliability means that the survey measures things consistently: its questions consistently convey the same meaning. Validity means that the survey measures what it is supposed to measure. An examination of the psychometric properties of the OCQ revealed internal consistency among the items, test-retest reliability, and evidence for the predictive validity of the instrument (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981; Mowday et al., 1979). Other findings provide considerable support for the reliability and validity of the OCQ scales and its ability to measure organizational commitment (Becker, Billings & Gilbert, 1996; Cohen, 1993; Dubin, Champoux & Porter, 1975; Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Meyers, Irving & Allen, 1998; Sheldon, 1971; Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Mowday, Porter & Dubin (1974), Porter, Crampon & Smith (1976), Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974; Steers, 1977; Steers & Spencer, 1977; Young, Worchel & Woehr, 1998). In these studies, coefficient alpha is consistently high (ranging from 0.82 to 0.93 with a median of 0.90).

The video-conference questionnaire

The questionnaire included 12 open-ended questions related to organizational commitment and 11 biographical questions. The questions were guided by findings from the EOC and IBC literature. The interviews were semi-structured with follow-up questions emerging from the participants' answers. The researcher anticipated that it would take approximately 45 minutes to complete each interview. Because the study

participants were located outside the United States, the most efficient and inexpensive way to interview them was by videoconferencing. The researcher used the Skype software. The sound portion of each interview was taped with the Audacity digital recorder software.

Contact with the participants was initiated with a pre-notice letter and email reminders (see Appendix D). When respondents did not answer or declined the invitation, other potential participants from a back-up list were contacted.

The interviews were implemented following these steps: thanking respondents for their time, going over the study's purpose, clarifying logistical questions (interview duration) and obtaining participants' formal consent. In particular, protection of privacy issues including interviewees' right to review and approve the transcript, were explained.

During each interview, the researcher took notes in addition to recording the participants' voice. To elicit detailed answers, the researcher asked about hypothetical scenarios or played the devil's advocate (Merriam, 1998). The researcher did her best to listen well and not speak too much. It was important to be a good listener by hearing the exact words in order to capture the details of how an interviewee makes sense of her/his commitment. During the interview, the researcher tried to be flexible and try to minimize the impact of her own bias by being open to contrary findings.

Immediately following each interview, the researcher wrote reflections in a journal on how to improve her interview technique. She also emailed the participant a thank you

note. Interviews were transcribed within two weeks and submitted to participants'

review.

Trustworthiness: Trustworthiness is the qualitative concept that ensures the integrity

of the study and its data. To ensure accuracy, consistency, dependability, transferability,

confirmability and credibility of the qualitative findings, the researcher used a systematic

method of inquiry. For the analysis to be a representative portrayal of the data, the

researcher took the following recommended steps (Creswell, 2003): (1) triangulation was

used by examining evidence from various sources (interviews and public documents)

which helped build a coherent justification for the themes; (2) a good quality digital

recorder software was used and the interviews were transcribed as accurately as possible

by including pauses and overlaps. Member-checking of transcripts to check data accuracy

was implemented; (3) the researcher used rich and thick description to convey the reality

of the findings and an accurate interpretation of the participants' meaning; (4) the

researcher clarified her perspective and was self-critical about her bias; (5) the researcher

presented negative, rival or discrepant information that ran counter to her themes; (6) the

researcher also maintained a chain of evidence that gave details of each of her research

steps; (7) because this study was conducted according to the philosophical belief that

reality is constructed, and because the researcher had a deep as appreciation for

naturalistic inquiry, people's experiences were highly respected and actively sought after.

The data benefited from the respectful and professional interactions between the

researcher and the participants. Its degree of confirmability showed in the large amount of rich, detailed and in-depth data collected.

Finally, the researcher conducted her research in an ethical way. First, she gathered data in such a way that confidentiality was ensured. She guaranteed participants' confidentiality by not publishing personal or professional data that could point to a specific administrator. Professional titles, campus locations and names were deleted from interview quotes used in chapter 4. The data was stored on her Home Directory Service and the University of Virginia Box, which are centralized file repositories for University of Virginia students. These repositories are protected and regularly backed up. The researcher also abode by the regulations of the University of Virginia Institutional Review Board (see Appendix E).

Person as Instrument Statement

Due to the qualitative nature of the research design, it is essential to comment on connections between the researcher, the participants and the research sites. The researcher believes her cultural background and professional experience are the main factors, which influenced her research.

The researcher is a foreign national from France who has lived abroad in South Africa, Canada, Finland and the United States. Being an expatriate made her adaptable, flexible and open to change. Because of her various cross-cultural experiences, she has the ability to put herself in other people's shoes and understand their viewpoints. Therefore, it was relatively easy for her to relate and empathize with the respondents and

truly appreciate and understand their daily challenges with operating an international branch campus.

Like the researcher, the interviewees were from different countries, which both helped and hindered data collection. There were some challenges with interviewing people whose native tongue was not English. This may have led to misunderstandings and omissions. At the same time, knowing that a non-native speaker conducted the interview in English may have made them feel more comfortable and more willing to talk without feeling self-conscious about their language ability.

Although language and cross-cultural differences may have had an impact on data collection, the researcher believes that her professional experience was the most influential factor. The researcher worked in international education for many years as a teacher of French as a foreign language and as a higher education administrator in international student services and study abroad programs. As such, she has a broad understanding of the realities of working in an international higher education setting. She also understands the politics of higher education and was quite aware that some of her questions may have elicited cautioned answers from the respondents. It is also possible that because of her expatriate background, she may have unconsciously filtered data that may have biased the results of this study.

Finally, the researcher's own organizational commitment level, which was high during her dissertation project, may have also been an influencing factor in her data analysis.

Implementation

Survey Implementation

Data collection

   Survey sampling

   To find administrators' email address, the researcher searched the websites of the

200 IBCs listed in the OBHE report. This was a tedious and time-consuming process.

Several difficulties were encountered:

- Some websites were down for technical reasons.

- Some websites were not in English or French, which prevented the researcher

  from looking up contact information.

- A few IBCs had closed.

- Many IBC websites did not post their staff names, email addresses or

  organizational charts.

- Some websites listed generic email addresses only (for instance:

  admissions@university.my).

- When available, staff ranks and titles were often misleading, confusing or

  missing.

- IBCs from developing countries were less user-friendly than the ones from

  developing countries. Poor page design and weak search options impaired the

  findings of email addresses.

To remedy these problems, the researcher emailed institutions to request staff email addresses. This approach was not successful. Consequently, the researcher could not retrieve any information for 68 of the 200 institutions listed in the report. These missing IBCs were predominantly from France, India, Iran, Malaysia and Uganda.

When organizational charts, job titles and email addresses were posted online, the researcher had to make judgment calls for selecting potential respondents. She followed Scott's chart (1978 &1979) which ranks Presidents, Chancellors, Provosts and Vice-Presidents as upper-level administrators. Deans, Associate Vice-Presidents, Assistant Vice-Presidents, Directors, Chiefs, Registrars, Comptrollers and Managers are categorized as mid-level administrators. For some websites, categorizing potential respondents was fairly simple and straightforward. However, for others, language problems made the process tricky. In many countries "Head" was widely applied (e.g. "Head of Campus", "Head of Student Affairs, "Head of Finance Section"). If organizational charts were available, the researcher was able to determine if "Head" meant "Manager" (mid-level category) or "Vice-President" (upper-level category). For some IBCs, it was impossible to determine. In other cases, titles did not necessarily reflect the level of responsibilities reflected in Scott's chart adding imprecision to the process. For instance, some "managers" were clearly entry-level staff with no staff reporting to them. In addition, some titles excluded from Scott's chart actually included the level of responsibility targeted for this study including Chief Executive Officer, Chief Information Officer, Chief Operating Officer or Assistant Vice Chancellor. The

researcher decided to include these positions, especially when no Associate Vice-Chancellor or even Vice-Chancellor could be found in the organization.

In addition, the researcher noticed that a few administrators' email addresses indicated that perhaps they did not work at an international branch campus but were instead stationed at their home campus. Their addresses showed a different ending than their colleagues at the IBC (e.g. name@university.edu versus name@university.uk or name@uk-university.edu). The researcher decided to still include them in the sample assuming that should they not be IBC administrators, the participants would likely opt out of the survey, although a risk remained that they may not.

To minimize classification error in the sample, the researcher devised two distinct strategies. The first one was to divide the sample into three groups based on the Scott classification: the first group included email addresses of upper-level administrators, the second group included mid-level administrators' and the third group included generic email addresses. When the survey was emailed to the respondents, the three groups were kept separate. Three survey invitations were sent separately (one to each group) instead of having one invitation for the entire sample. This meant that when results came back to the researcher, it was possible to differentiate results for each group based on the Scott classification. To solve the problem with generic email addresses, a second strategy was implemented. The researcher decided to add the following question to the survey to all three groups: ("what is your rank in your IBC?" with the answer: "I am an upper-level

administrator" or "I am a mid-level administrator" or "I am an entry-level administrator").

Survey testing

Before sending the survey, the researcher tested it on a group of people who worked both inside and outside of higher education. After they completed the survey, the following questions were asked:

- How does my message look in your inbox? Is the formatting good? Do you feel like opening my message? Does this message look legitimate?

- Should I change anything about the introduction in my message?

- What was your perception of the IRB consent page?

- How do you understand the term "expatriate"?

- Are the questions clear?

- Is it too many questions per page (3)?

- How was the spelling and grammar?

- Is the space between the answer options and the "prefer not to answer" option confusing?

- Were there any questions that made you feel uncomfortable?

The reviewers' feedback indicated that:

- It took them about six minutes instead of ten to complete the survey

- The font should be improved.

- The invitation message should start with "Dear colleague" instead of "hello"

- Information about time required to complete the survey and the fact that it is confidential should be inserted in the initial email message.

- The fact that it is an important study should be mentioned.

- The wording of the questions should be changed from "degree of disagreement" to "degree of agreement"

- They were bothered by the double negative questions

- The term "expatriate" needs to be defined.

- For respondents with less than a year of professional experience, there is no way to indicate the number of months only in the survey.

- They liked the progress bar on each page of the survey.

- The questions were easy to understand and the questionnaire was easy to take

Based on their feedback, the survey was edited accordingly.

Sending the survey

Timeline

Pre-notice message were emailed on March 26, 2013. The survey was emailed on March 27, 2013. The first reminder was emailed on April 4, 2013.The second and final reminder was emailed on April 22. The survey was closed on June 6, 2013.

Because the initial invitation was sent right before Easter break, responses were slow. The first reminder increased the response rate but not as much as expected.

Consequently, the researcher crafted a more strongly worded final reminder message,

which resulted in the targeted response rate.

Survey management

QuestionPro was the survey software used to manage the data collection process.

After sending the survey, the researcher received fifty undeliverable email address

notices, twenty-one of which were successfully resent.

Reactions

The recipients' reaction to the survey invitation was mostly positive. Many showed

interest in the topic as the following email messages show:

> "More than happy to help. […] It's nice to see some research being done in this
> area regarding administrators as most research on branch campuses tends to focus
> on academics. I feel kind of invisible sometimes!"

> "Hi Murielle, I will be happy to be of help. This is a very interesting topic."

> "This is wonderful Murielle. I am looking forward to your survey; and would
> love to help if you need anything else!"

> "Thanks Murielle, attitudes of expats have come to interest me (finding myself as
> one), but most of the research tends to concern business not academia. You seem
> to be exploring a rarely tread path!"

The researcher also received two negative email messages, disputing the research

value of studying organizational commitment at IBCs and the validity of the

questionnaire being used. Other reactions included asking the researcher for official proof

this was a legitimate research study. A Human Resources administrator expressed

concerns about the researcher sending the survey to his/her IBC staff. Many

administrators inquired how their email addresses were obtained and others asked if they could get a summary of results. One administrator informed me that his/her institution was not an international branch campus.

Results for return and completion rate

The researcher emailed the survey to 572 mid-level administrators, 97 upper-level administrators and 38 unclassified administrators for a grand total of 707 IBC higher education administrators.

Table 6

Frequencies of Sent, Completed and Usable Questionnaires

Rank	Sent	Completed	Usable
Upper level	97	47	42
Mid-level	572	176	163
Generic group	38	11	4
Total	707	234	209

The overall return rate was 36%. Upper-level administrators were more willing to answer the survey (48.4%) than mid-level administrators (30.7%). Not surprisingly, invitations sent to generic email addresses had a lower response rate (28.9%).

Table 7

Percentages of Returned and Usable Questionnaires

Rank	*Returned*	*Usable*
Upper-level	48.4%	89.3%
Mid-level	30.7%	92.6%
Generic group	28.9%	36.3%
Total	36%	72.7%

Missing data and data discrepancy

Before presenting results for the research questions, the issue of data discrepancy and missing data needs to be addressed.

Missing data

There were two types of missing values in the survey: non-responses ("blanks") and refusal to answer ("prefer not to answer").

- There were non-responses from respondents who had not answered a single question but somehow managed to click the "finish" button at the end of the survey. QuestionPro included these respondents in the data set. In the upper-level administrators group, one respondent managed to take the survey three times, but only one was complete. The researcher deleted the cases that had no responses.

- There were also "false" non-responses and "true" non-responses. "False" non-responses were linked to the two questions about expatriate versus immigrant

73

status. If respondents answered "yes" to the first question about expatriation status, the QuestionPro software skipped the second question about immigration status, which showed blank answers in the process. To remedy this inconsistency, the researcher filled these blanks with "2" for "no" because they were caused by the survey logic mechanism and they did not indicate a true non-response.

- Within "true" non-responses, they were blanks that could be easily imputed because the survey was confidential but not anonymous, which allowed the researcher to link case numbers and email addresses[4]. This proved to be helpful with respondents who answered the question about their nationality but did not answer the following question: "Is your nationality the same as the home country of your branch campus? (for instance, you are from <u>Canada</u>, you work in France for a <u>Canadian</u> branch campus)" . There was a high rate of non-responses for this question. Due to the non-sensitive aspect of the question, the researcher assumed that respondents skipped the question because of its slight complexity and its poor design. As such, it was assumed that this systematic pattern of missingness was not showing bias and consequently it was safe to insert the correct information, by retracing respondents to their IBC and home campus. The same deductive imputation method was implemented for the question about IBC's country location.

---

[4] This statement is valid for all cases except for one respondent, whose email address was missing. Consequently, this case was deleted from the sample.

To summarize, the researcher imputed "blanks" for the host country location and the identical nationality questions only. All other missing data were left "blank" and coded as "system-missing" in SPSS. Values showing "refusal to answer" were also kept intact and coded as "user-missing" in SPSS.

Data discrepancy

In addition to missing data, there were responses/values that were not logical. For instance, three questions were correlated. These questions asked respondents (1) how many years they had been in their current position, (2) how many years they had been at their IBC and how many years they had been in higher education. Some respondents indicated a higher number of years for question 1 than for question 2 or for question1 than question 3 or for question 2 as compared to question 3. The researcher deleted the problematic values and coded them as "system-missing" in SPSS because should have they been kept intact in the set, they would have skewed the overall mean for the groups.

For the biographical questions, some respondents inserted values that did not correspond to specified categories. One respondent answered "Europe" for the host country value and two responded "European" and "Zulu" for the nationality value. These incorrect answers were corrected in the data set when possible. The "Zulu" value was replaced with "South African" and the value "European" was left blank.

Finally, there was discrepancy with the value related to administrators' rank. As explained in the survey sampling section of this chapter, a self-identifying question was inserted into the questionnaire to determine rank among the third group of non-identified

administrators and entry-level respondents. This strategy was very helpful in excluding respondents who did not qualify for the study, that is, entry-level administrators and this, for all three groups. Unfortunately, this technique generated more confusion for the mid-level administrators group. Sixty-two percent of the mid-level administrator group self identified as upper-level administrators, and only 39% said they were mid-level administrators. In addition, 50% percent of the generic group stated that they were upper level administrators and, 25% indicated that they were mid-level and 25% entry-level administrators. All upper-level administrators self-identified as upper-level except for 2% of them who did not wish to answer. The researcher made two decisions to reduce uncertainty, limit bias and ensure empirical consistency. First, rank would be determined only out of the Scott classification and administrators' answers about ranking would be excluded. Second, the third generic group would be excluded from analysis because it was impossible to rank the respondents. Luckily, this group included only four respondents, which did not reduce overall sample size by much.

Table 8

Frequencies of Completed, Usable and Used Questionnaires

Rank	Completed	Usable	Used
Upper-level	47	42	42
Mid-level	176	163	163
Generic group	11	4	0
Total	234	209	205

Missing data evaluation: Before proceeding with hypothesis testing and analysis, missing data were evaluated using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 21). The researcher conducted a Little's Missing Completely At Random test (MCAR) to check if the data were missing randomly. The test results showed that the data were not missing at random (see Appendix F).

The researcher decided to use the listwise deletion method to deal with the missing data. This method uses only complete cases. If any of the analysis variables have missing values, the case is omitted from the computations. Several reasons motivated this decision: (1) the overall EOC score differences between all values and listwise values were insignificant: difference showed at the 0.01 level with M=4.60 for all values and M=4.61 for listwise values (2) the listwise deletion method provided the researcher with an equal number of cases (175) for each questions and consequently, fair comparisons of scores between each respondent was possible (3) listwise deletion is the most common procedure for dealing with data not missing at random. It is a robust method for regression analysis, especially when the missing at random assumption is violated (Allison, 2001). Regression analysis was used for this study.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics: All Values Means vs. Listwise Means for EOC Questions and EOC Score

	All Values		Listwise	
	N	*Mean*	*N*	*Mean*
Question 1	205	6.75	175	6.74
Question 2	204	6.17	175	6.21
Question 3	203	2.22	175	2.21
Question 4	199	3.52	175	3.61
Question 5	204	5.70	175	5.75
Question 6	204	6.45	175	6.53
Question 7	198	4.25	175	4.16
Question 8	199	5.54	175	5.62
Question 9	195	2.90	175	2.82
Question 10	193	6.05	175	6.10
Question 11	190	3.04	175	2.98
Question 12	195	3.49	175	3.45
Question 13	197	6.47	175	6.51
Question 14	196	5.02	175	5.05
Question 15	195	1.46	175	1.44
EOC Score		4.60		4.61

Characteristics of Administrators and International Branch Campuses

A section requesting demographic and organizational information was appended to the questionnaire. These 15 questions included: gender, age, marital status, nationality and identical nationality (respondents who have the same nationality as their home campus'), residency status (immigrant, expatriate, local resident), education, rank,

experience (number of months on the job, in IBC and in higher education), number of

students (campus size) and host country location.

Results: Frequency of complete and missing responses for administrators' characteristics

and for international branch campuses' characteristics

Table 10

Frequency of Complete and Missing Responses of Selected Characteristics of IBC
Administrators (Original Data)

Characteristics	N (complete)	N (Missing)	Total
Gender	194	11	205
Age	192	13	205
Education	190	15	205
Rank	205	0	205
Marital Status	187	18	205
Nationality			
Nationality	182	23	205
Identical Nationality	190	15	205
Experience			
Months on the Job	189	16	205
Months at IBC	190	15	205
Months in Higher Ed	194	11	205
Residency Status			
Immigrant	202	3	205
Expatriate	202	3	205
Local Resident	202	3	205

Results: Frequency of complete and missing responses for international branch campuses' characteristics

Table 11

Frequency of Complete and Missing Responses of Selected Organizational Characteristics of International Branch Campuses

Characteristics	N (complete)	N (missing)	Total
Campus Size	197	8	205
Host Country Location	204	1	205

Results: Frequency and percentages for participants' characteristics

Table 12

Frequency and Percentage of Selected Characteristics of Administrators

Characteristics	N	Percent
Gender		
Female	72	35.1
Male	122	59.5
PNTA[5]	1	.5
System Missing[6]	10	4.9
Total	205	100
Age		
20-29 years	4	2.0
30-39 years	46	22.4
40-49 years	69	33.7
50-59 years	48	23.4
60-69 years	23	11.2
70 or older	2	1.0

---

[5] PNTA means prefer not to answer
[6] System Missing means blank answers

PNTA	2	1.0
System Missing	11	5.4
Total	205	100.0
Marital Status		
Single	36	17.6
Married	135	65.9
Divorced	14	6.8
Widowed	2	1.0
PNTA	7	3.4
System Missing	11	5.4
Total	205	100
Nationality		
Same nationality as home campus	92	44.9
Different nationality from home campus	98	47.8
System Missing	15	7.3
Total	205	100.0
Residency Status		
Immigrant	21	10.2
Expatriate	120	58.5
Local resident	58	28.2
System missing	6	2.9
Total	205	100
Education Level		
High School only	4	2.0
HS+2 years of higher education	4	2.0
HS+3 years of higher education	9	4.4
HS+4 years of higher education	25	12.2
HS+5 years of higher education	26	12.7
HS+6 years of higher education	32	15.6
HS+7 years of higher education	90	43.9
Total	190	92.7
PNTA	5	2.4
System	10	4.9
Total	205	100.0
Rank		
Upper-level	42	20.5

Mid-level	163	79.5
Total	205	100.0

Please refer to Appendix H for results for Experience, Nationality, Campus Size and Host Country Location.

Interviews Implementation

Data collection

The researcher invited 22 administrators for an interview. Ten of them accepted. Two declined and ten never answered the invitation and its subsequent reminders. As such, the participation rate to this study was 45.5%.

The interviews took place between April 20 and June 19, 2013. Because of difference in time zones or/and of busy schedules, the interviews took place either early in the morning (as early as 6:00AM US EST), late at night (as late as 10:00PM US EST) or on the weekends (Saturday and Sunday). Coordinating and agreeing on times and dates was relatively easy. All interviews except for two, took place at the agreed time and date. One participant rescheduled the interview twice due to work obligations. One participant rescheduled it once due to illness.

The researcher conducted nine interviews via Skype and one interview by phone due to poor internet connectivity. The audio portion of the interview was recorded with the "Audacity" sound recording software. The sound quality was good. All the participants, except for one, completed the interview within 45 minutes, often less. The researcher perceived the participants, except for one, to be candid in their answers,

friendly, professional, helpful and eager to share their experience. One participant was more guarded in his/her answers but still gave relevant and useful data to be used for the study. All the interviews were conducted in English. Three of the respondents were non-native speakers but fluent in English, which allowed information sharing with little misunderstanding. The researcher contacted some of the participants for post-interview follow-up questions. They all answered the additional questions inserted in the transcript. All the administrators, except for one, reviewed the transcript and gave their approval for use. One participant did not proof read the transcript but agreed to let the researcher use it.

Administrators' Characteristics

Gender, age, marital status, nationality and residency status

Table 13

Summary for Gender, Age, Marital Status, Nationality, Residency Status and Years Abroad

Gender	6 males
	4 females
Age	4 (40-49)
	3 (30-39)
	2 (60-69)
	1 (50-59)
Marital Status	9 married
	1 single

Nationality/Geographical Areas	3 from North America
	3 from Europe
	2 from Asia
	1 from Africa
	1 from the Middle-East
Residency Status	6 expatriates
	3 nationals
	1 immigrant
Years of Living Abroad	1 (0-5 years)
	2 (6-10 years)
	2 (11-20 years)
	2 (over 20 years)

Four female and six male administrators participated in the interviews. Their age range was: 30 to 39 years of age (three respondents), 40 to 49 years of age (four respondents), 50 to 59 years of age (one respondent) and 60 to 69 years of age (two respondents).

Nine of the ten respondents were married and one was single.

They held the following nationalities: American (2), British (2), Canadian, French, Indian, Iranian, Malaysian and South African. None of them reported multiple nationalities.

Their immigration status was: immigrant (2), national employee from the host country (3), expatriate worker sent by the home campus for a determined duration (2) and expatriate worker unrelated to the home campus (3). The seven administrators who were expatriates or immigrant had lived outside of their home country for the following number of years: 3 years, 8 years, 10 years, 13 years, 19 years, 26 years and 31 years.

84

Education level and fields of study

Their level of higher education was as follows: two respondents had a 5-year degree (five years of higher education after high school), five had a six-year degree and three respondents had an eight-year degree (corresponding to a Ph.D. diploma level). Three administrators revealed they had double degrees. Two of the ten respondents had a college degree from the home campus they were currently working for (both from the United Kingdom).One alumna was employed with other organizations before working for the alma mater. One completed her degree while working at the home campus and before working at her IBC. Eight respondents completed their higher education schooling in their home country. Two administrators did it abroad: one in the United Kingdom and one in Singapore and Thailand.

Their fields of study in college at the undergraduate and graduate level were: Sociology, Education (two respondents), International Relations, Educational Administration, Journalism, Psychology, Mass Communication, Media Communication, Computer Science, Marketing, Mathematics (two respondents), Accounting and Information Technology.

Professional experience, job tenure and area of expertise

Table 14

Summary for Professional Experience, Area of Expertise and Job Tenure

Fields of Professional Experience Prior to Current IBC Position	Student Affairs
	Registrar Affairs
	Quality Assurance
	Human Resource Management
	Marketing
	Journalism
	Information Technology
	Finance and Corporate Management
	Teaching and Counseling
	Library Services
Areas of Expertise at IBC	Management/General Operations
	Library Services
	Marketing/Recruitment/Admissions
	Registrar Affairs
	Enrollment and Student Services
	Planning and Performance
	Teaching/Learning/Quality Affairs
Prior Experience in IBC Affairs	1 respondent
Prior Experience in Domestic BC Affairs	1 respondent
No Experience in University/College Affairs	2 respondents
Involved in Current IBC since Inception	5 respondents
Years of Experience in Higher Education	1 (0-5 years)
	4 (6-10 years)
	2 (11-20 years)
	3 (over 20 years)

Years in Current Position	6 (1-5 years)
	3 (6-10 years)
	1 (16-20 years)
Recruitment Method	4 referred by a friend
	3 head-hunted
	2 promoted internally
	1 hired doing business with home campus

Before working for their current international branch campus, these administrators had previous professional experience in the following fields of expertise: Student Affairs (2), Registrar Affairs, Quality Assurance, Human Resource Management, Marketing, Journalism, Information Technology, Finance and Corporate Management, Teaching and Counseling, Library Services (2). Three of the ten respondents started their professional career outside the education field: one worked in international business, the second one was a journalist, and the third one worked for an international corporation.

All respondents but two had previous professional experience working at domestic branch campuses, international branch campuses, domestic colleges or/and international business branches. Only one administrator had professional experience in international branch campuses. Another participant had experience in branch campuses but the domestic kind. Two administrators had never been employed by a college or university before working for an IBC: one respondent started her career at an IBC and the second respondent had worked for a business company prior to being employed at an IBC. Their number of years of work experience in higher education, including the time in

their current position, was the following: 4 years, 7 years, 9 years, 10 years (2

respondents), 13 years, 14 years, 23 years, 25 years and 27 years. Half of the respondents

had been involved with their current IBC since inception.

At the time of interview, six IBC administrators had been in their position

between one and five years. Three had job tenure between six and ten years and one

between 16 and 20 years. They made their way to their position in different ways: four

administrators were referred by a friend, three administrators were head-hunted, two were

in a position of leadership at the home campus when they were approached to work for

their university's IBC and one was hired while interacting with the home campus for

IBC-related business matters.

The administrators interviewed for this study worked in management/general

operations (four respondents), library services, marketing/recruitment/admissions,

registrar affairs, enrollment and student services, planning and performance, and

teaching/learning/quality affairs.

Rank

Following the classification used for this study, the group included seven mid-

level administrators and three upper-level administrators. All upper-level administrators

identified as such by the classification reported being upper-level employees. However,

only two respondents correctly self-identified as mid-level administrators while five of

them said they were upper-level employees. Among them, two made the following

comments:

> Researcher: "Would you consider yourself an upper-level or a mid-level
> administrator?"
> MLA[7]: "An upper level administrator….in the branch campus."
> MLA: "I would say probably upper in the sense that I report to the senior person
> on the campus, so I'd be part of the management team of the campus, yeah."

IBC of employment

Table 15

IBC Campus Size (Number of Students)

Between 1-50 students	1
Between 51-100 students	0
Between 101-500 students	5
Between 501-1000 students	2
Over 1000 students	2

The interviewees were employed at IBCs worldwide. They worked in Canada,

Malaysia (2), Nicaragua, Qatar, South Africa, Spain, Thailand and the United Arab

Emirates (2). These IBCs belonged to three American universities, two British college

and universities, two Australian universities, one Canadian university, one Indian

university, and a French one.

The group included mature and young IBCs. Three IBCs were less than five years

old, one was less than ten years old, two IBCs were between 11 and 15 years old and four

---

[7] MLA means mid-level administrator

of them were between 16 and 20 years old. They enrolled the following number of students.

Summary of Administrators' Characteristics

The composition of the group reflected a variety of backgrounds, which allowed the researcher to collect rich data with diverse perspectives. In particular, a diverse array of administrators who worked in environments with high levels of uncertainty was included: one worked for a campus that was closing, another one for a campus that was about to be taken over and three administrators were employed in young and start-up IBCs. Another strength of this group was the variety of professional experience, tenure and expertise. However, the majority (nine out of ten) had no experience with IBC management, which may have biased the collected data.

Coding and analyzing

Data analysis was an ongoing reflecting process (Creswell, 2003). The researcher first read through all the transcripts to get a general sense of the collected information. This overview allowed her to reflect on the overall meaning of the responses. Then, the researcher analyzed the data in details with a coding system (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Merriam, 1998). The first step of analysis consisted of underlining and highlighting key words, segments or sentences in the transcript. In the margin, the researcher jotted down a concept summarizing the words. From the multiple readings and markings in the margins, a large list of concepts was generated. The researcher categorized them into different groups using flashcards. This technique was implemented to identify all the

concepts at once and minimize the risk of omitting some of them. Finally, after reading

the flashcards several times, the researcher used a selective coding strategy to reduce the

categorized concepts into overarching themes. These themes were exhaustive, mutually

exclusive and sensitizing, and they became the answers to the research questions.

Table 16

Summary of Coding System Used

Keywords➔ concepts➔ category➔ themes➔ answers to research questions

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Answer to Research Question 1

To answer the first research question ("What is the level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?"), descriptive statistics of EOC score were used.

Table: 17

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EOC Score	175	4.616	.469	.0354

Table 18

One-Sample Test for EOC Score

			Test Value = 0		
t	*df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*	*Mean Difference*	*95% Confidence Interval of the Difference*	
				Lower	*Upper*
130.120	174	.000	4.616	4.546	4.686

The EOC Score for upper-level and mid-level administrators is 4.616. The standard deviation (SD=.469) shows that the variation between all EOC scores is rather small and is concentrated around a mean of 4.616. The standard error also indicates that the sample mean is a fairly accurate reflection of the actual population mean because it is very small (SE=.0354).

Answer to Research Question 2

To answer the second research question ("What are the differences in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators?"), an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the employee organizational commitment scores of upper-level and mid-level administrators.

Table 19

T-test: Means Difference

	Rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EOC Score	Upper-level	34	4.666	.459	.0788
	Mid-level	41	4.604	.472	.0397

93

To test the means difference, the following hypothesis was stated:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of upper-level and mid-level IBC administrators' organizational commitment.

$$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

H_a: There is a significant difference in the mean scores of upper-level and mid-level IBC administrators' organizational commitment.

$$H_a: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

The Levene's test of homogeneity of variance indicated there was no significant difference in the variances among the two groups with $F(140,33)=.425$, $p=.515$ (See Appendix G). Consequently, the researcher proceeded with an independent t-test assuming equal variances.

Results of the independent t-test indicated there was no statistically significant differences in the scores for the upper-level administrator group (M=4.666) and the mid-level administrator group (M=4.604), $t(173)=.690$, $p=.491$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

In other words, these results suggest that IBC upper-level and mid-level administrators show about the same level of organizational commitment.

Answer to Research Question 3

To answer the third research question ("What is the relationship between selected organizational variables and personal characteristics with organizational commitment of

non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?"), the researcher conducted a series of linear regressions for EOC scores with organizational variables and personal characteristics variables.

Organizational variables included host country location and campus size. Personal characteristics variables included rank, years of professional experience (in current position, at IBC and in higher education), education level, gender, age, nationality, affiliation (same or different nationality from the home campus) residency status (expatriate, immigrant or local resident) and marital status.

Results from simple and multiple linear regressions indicated that campus size was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. No other personal characteristics or organizational variables were found to be significant.

Campus Size

A linear regression analysis was used to test if campus size significantly predicted administrators' EOC scores. Campus size included five different sizes of IBCs (0-50 students, 51-100 students, 101-500 students, 501-1000 students and over 1000 students).

Table 20

Descriptives: Tables of EOC Scores by Campus Size

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
0-50 students	3	4.1778	.37908	.21886	3.2361	5.1195
51-100 students	9	4.4296	.42961	.14320	4.0994	4.7599
101-500 students	80	4.5642	.45252	.05059	4.4635	4.6649
501-1000 students	28	4.6214	.45544	.08607	4.4448	4.7980
Over 1000 students	55	4.7455	.48620	.06556	4.6140	4.8769
Total	175	4.6168	.46937	.03548	4.5467	4.6868

Table 21

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	230[a]	.053	.031	.46214

a. Predictors: (Constant), 51-100 students, 101-500 students, 501-1000 students, over1000 students.

Table 22

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.026	4	.507	2.372	.054[b]
	Residual	36.307	170	.214		
	Total	38.333	174			

a. Dependent Variable: EOC Score

b. Predictors: (Constant), 51-100 students, 101-500 students, 501-1000 students, over1000 students.

The results of the regression indicated the campus size predictor explained 5.3% of the variance at a 0.10 significance level (R^2=.053, F(4,170)=2.372, p=.054).

Table 23

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	(Constant)	4.178	.267		15.658	.000	3.651	4.704
1	51-100	.252	.308	.119	.817	.415	-.356	.860
	101-500	.386	.272	.411	1.422	.157	-.150	.923
	501-1000	.444	.281	.348	1.580	.116	-.111	.998
	Over1000	.568	.274	.563	2.072	.040	.027	1.109

a. Dependent Variable: EOC Score

The regression test showed that campus size significantly increased EOC scores (β= .568, p=.040). This suggests that IBC administrators who worked for the smallest campuses scored statistically significantly lower levels of organizational commitment (with M=4.17, SD=.37) than administrators working for the largest campuses (with M=4.74, SD=.48). In other words, administrators who worked for the largest international branch campuses had a higher level of commitment than administrators who worked at the smallest international branch campuses.

Survey Results Analysis

Analysis for Administrators and International Branch Campuses' Characteristics

Biographical data collected for this study reveal that survey respondents were in majority males (59.5%), between the age of 30 and 59 (79.5%) , married (65.9%) and highly educated (43.9 %) had at least 7 years of higher education after high school.

The majority of respondents were mid-level administrators (79.5%). On average, the administrators' experience was: 4.4 years in their current position, 5.7 years at their IBC and 14 years in higher education.

The majority of participants were expatriates (58.5%) and mostly from North America (26.8%) and Asia (19.1%). Twelve percent of respondents were bi-nationals. Data also indicate that their nationality corresponded to their home campus' country about 45% of the time. Administrators with other nationalities represented 47.8% of the sample.

International branch campuses in the sample were relatively small (52.3% of them enrolled less than 501 students). They were mostly located in the Middle-East (39%) and Asia (28.4%).

Analysis for Research Question 1

The survey (OCQ) was based on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from a low of 1 (strongly disagree) to a high of 7 (strongly agree). A general score was determined by acquiring the mean score from the 15 responses after reverse scoring several negatively phrased questions (Mowday et al. 1979). This score is a summary indicator of employee commitment. The higher the score, the more committed an individual is to the organization. Lower scores are associated with intentions to leave the organization. An average score of 1-2 is an indicator of low commitment, 3-5 is considered average and 6-7 is considered high.

The EOC score for upper-level and mid-level administrators was 4.616. This score shows an average level of organizational commitment among IBC administrators.

Studies about higher education administrators' level of commitment using this OCQ instrument are sparse. Mowday et al. tested their own questionnaire among 2563 employees in nine divergent organizations, including 243 classified university employees. The university employees' score was 4.6, which is considered average (Mowday et al., 1979). Luton (2010) surveyed 99 system business school department chairs at the University of North Carolina. The study indicated an average organizational

commitment level of 3.76[8] . Brown & Sargeant (2007) surveyed 263 faculty members, staff, administrators and sector managers from a Caribbean university. They scored 3.78 on the OCQ scale, which was average. Meehan (2001) surveyed 357 faculty members at ten private colleges and universities in the United States. Their EOC level was average with a score of 4.93. Harshbarger (1988) assessed 485 faculty's commitment at four doctoral-granting universities who scored 4.44, which was again average on the EOC scale. Although these studies seem to show that most often higher education employees are committed at an average level, their modest sample size may bias this result because smaller sample sizes tend to produce less accurate estimates about populations. If nothing else, this study corroborates the fact that the OCQ questionnaire tends to yield average levels of commitment when small samples of higher education employees are surveyed. Finally, it obviously indicated that IBC administrators were *not* highly committed and were *not* uncommitted, which has implications that will be discussed in chapter 5.

Analysis for Research Question 2

Results from this study show that there is no significant difference in levels of commitment between upper-level and mid-level administrators. Upper-level administrators scored 4.66 and mid-level administrators scored 4.60. Both groups scored an average level of commitment.

Previous empirical research on the effect of rank on organizational commitment show that position level correlates positively with commitment and that upper-level

---

[8] EOC score was deduced from data displayed in Luton's answers to research questions.

employees have higher levels of commitment than employees in lower or entry-level

positions (Coble, 2004; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

One may speculate that the reason both administrator groups scored the same

way, is because they both hold managerial functions, as the hierarchical ladder at an IBC

is much more compressed. Working for an IBC involves managerial duties at the mid-

level rank that are not experienced at most domestic campuses. In other words, a mid-

level IBC administrator operates at the upper-level function even though the definition

used for this study labeled this group as mid-level. Consequently, the fact that both

groups are committed at the same level would make sense.

Analysis for Research Question 3

Although campus size was found to be a factor in EOC levels, a word a caution

about this significant result is necessary: because the sample size for the small campus

group was small (with N=3), one cannot say that this is a conclusive significant result.

More testing with a larger group of small campuses would be needed in order to confirm

this result.

Research on the effect of organization size alone on organizational commitment is

sparse and offers mixed results. Mathieu & Zajac's foundational study (1990) found firm

size to be an inconclusive factor in employee commitment. It looks like researchers are

split on the effect of firm size: some think that employees in small organizations have

higher level of commitments because small size firms allow for greater teamwork with

colleagues and a closer relationship with supervisors (Moates &Kulonda, 1990). Other

studies indicate that employees working for large firms are more satisfied because of better pay and benefits (Bailey & Schwenk, 1980; Dunn, 1986; Gibson & Stillman, 2009).

Based on these findings, one may speculate that larger campuses may offer better benefits and salaries, which would make administrators more satisfied because pay has been found to correlate with EOC (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). However, because of the paucity of research about IBCs, this hypothesis cannot be verified and one can only speculate. For the purpose of this study, one may hypothesize that campus size may be linked with environmental uncertainty. Administrators of large IBCs operate at lower levels of perceived environmental uncertainty because these campuses are mature, growing and face less challenges than small ones, especially branches with less than 50 students, which most likely correspond to start-up campuses and possibly failing or closing IBCs. As such, high levels of uncertainty render administrators' work more difficult and may contribute to their decision to leave their campus.

Finally, despite the statistically significant difference in EOC level, both groups still show an average level of commitment. Campus size did not split the groups, with, for instance, categorizing one group with a high level of commitment and the other one with a medium level of commitment. As such, if campus size does effectively have an impact on EOC levels, its effect is at best marginal.

Answer to Research Question 4

"How do non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators make sense of their organizational commitment in the context of perceived environmental uncertainty?"

Perceived Environmental Uncertainty

Before presenting the results for this first research question, the concept of perceived environmental uncertainty (PEU) needs to be clarified. For this study, PEU refers to an individual's perceived inability to predict the organizational environment accurately. There are two particular types of uncertainty: (1) State Uncertainty: administrators experience state uncertainty when they perceive the organizational environment, or a particular component of that environment, to be unpredictable; and (2) Effect Uncertainty: an inability to predict what the nature of the impact of a future state of the environment or environmental change will be on the organization (Milliken, 1987, p.136). There are varying levels of PEU: high, medium and low. In the context of IBCs, a high level of PEU corresponds to start-up operations, campuses in transitions (being taken-over or with declining student enrollment) as well as IBCs in the process of closing. An IBC with medium PEU is an organization that is growing but still needs to prove itself, by increasing its enrollment numbers and affirming its place in the local IBC market. Branches with low PEU level are campuses that are established, mature, stable, growing and do not face the threat of impending closure or declining enrollment numbers in the near future. In this study, four participants worked at IBCs with a high PEU level: one campus was closing, one was in the midst of a take-over and two were start-up

operations. Four respondents belonged to campuses with medium level PEU. Two

administrators worked for IBCs with low level PEU. All ten administrators reported

varying levels of environmental uncertainty when they talked about the factors

influencing their organizational commitment.

Answer 1: IBC Administrators' Relationship with the Home Campus Influences Their

Organizational Commitment

All ten respondents reported the relationship with their home campus as a primary

factor influencing their organizational commitment. Relationship with the home campus

was the topic most discussed during the interviews. It generated a high volume of data

centered on the following emerging themes:

- Home campus' lack of awareness in operating a campus abroad

Respondents expressed the feeling that the home campus did not understand the

realities of IBC management.

An ULA[9] stated: "I still don't think the parent institution fully understands. I think
it is difficult when I first came out here, your I.T. goes wrong, you know, and you are the
only person who can get it right and if there is something wrong…we had a flood here a
few weeks ago and when that goes wrong in [home campus' country] you've got a whole
team of people behind you, you don't have to think about it...so, I think it is more of a
challenge".

Another ULA commented: "I think also universities have not traditionally had a
lot of experience of entities overseas whilst international companies have many years of
experience with subsidiaries or joint-ventures in other countries and therefore people in
the head office, understand that it's a different currency and a different time zone, you
know, just the basics [laughs]".

---

[9] ULA means upper-level administrator

A MLA shared that the home campus' lack of awareness had implications in their

ability to retain staff at the IBC level:

"They're much less understanding of the local economy or….the local environment in terms of hiring, …so they can be much less responsive, because if the H.R. gets approval from [home campus' city]…[…]…as opposed to a local university which will know the market value much better and is able to respond much better. So we have lost a lot of staff to other universities."

Another ULA said: "I'm the bridge person, when they [the home campus] have a problem, when they need a solution….they give me a [a call]…of course immediately, because for them, the Lous[10] campus, they don't know. They understand of course but they have no expertise. "How can we resolve that?", for very small things, or for very important things. It's different realities".

The administrator emphasized the home campus' inability in understanding how

differences like campus and staff size impacts the IBC. He gave the example of home

campus staff who are used to implementing programs for large number of students and do

not understand that the same model cannot be applied the same way to the IBC campus

because of its small number of students.

The home campus' lack of awareness leads to unrealistic expectations. An MLA

describes working for an international branch campus more challenging because "we also

have expectations coming from the home campus…and those can be extremely

unrealistic at times". This administrator explained that to deal with these expectations, it

was important to communicate with the home campus in a pro-active way: "the

benchmarking exercises that I conduct are to inform the home campus about the local

conditions…a lot of what I do, we have to fight a two-front war sometimes".

_____

[10] To protect the administrators' identity, all country names have been replaced by made-up names like Eoro, Lous, Apola, Ita, Riss, Criet, Delt, Vol and Lais.

In addition to benchmarking, two MLAs mentioned visits to the home campus as a way to build a connection with the home campus.

Several administrators mentioned the difficulty in having to abide by both the host country and the home country laws at the same time. They described it as a very frustrating experience, especially when the home campus was not attuned to legal realities of the host country.

- Home campus' level of commitment to its IBC

Another factor influencing the administrators' organizational commitment was either the home campus' perceived lack of interest or its strong support in the IBC.

Perceived lack of support was particularly pervasive in the conversations with respondents working in environments with a high level of uncertainty. At the time of the interview, an MLA explained there were rumors of a take-over by a new home campus. This would be the second take-over during the administrator's tenure. Here is how the relationship with the current home campus was described:

"The last several years under that campus have been somewhat stressful because we are sort of the unwanted relative who is living in the house and…they don't really want to…to be dealing with us…there is very little empathy…you know they [the home campus administrators], really, they are not very interested in our campus…
Researcher: why do you think that is?
MLA: "I am not really sure…they seem to be very narrowly focused on their goals".

ULA: "Always there is this feeling that the main campus lives its life and does its things and sometimes…Oh! They remember they have a [branch] campus![laughs]".

A MLA, who was facing campus closure, described the lack of support from the home campus in the following terms: "I felt 100% committed [before the campus closure announcement] but not anymore. Because commitment has two parts… so it takes two to tango… You cannot say that I am committed when the other part is not… but during the way that they handled [the closure], I can say I did not feel them committed".

The administrator added that if any research should be conducted on commitment, it would have to focus on "how committed the main campus is towards the branch campus".

At the other end of the spectrum, two administrators who worked for IBCs with a medium level of PEU described their home campus' commitment in a more positive manner:

This MLA said: "I have no slightest doubt about their [the home campus] commitment because they have acquired land here, infrastructure, you know they have spent a lot of money and a huge amount of investment…I think in terms of commitment, I think they are very committed as far as the infrastructure, logistic, you know…in term of probably manpower also. They have spent a lot of money to develop this university."

Another MLA: "I don't think we feel that we are some …you know…I would say….second hand campus of the main organization […] we don't feel that way".

- Home campus leadership

A major component of the relationship between the home campus and its IBC administrators is the home campus leadership.

Leadership interpersonal dynamics

The interviewees talked about the impact of home campus interpersonal relationships as a factor influencing their commitment.

An MLA described the home campus hierarchy in these terms:

"We were in contact with one person [at the home campus]… [the] vice president international, and that person also was a person who appreciated the things that the staff, faculty members and students were doing locally here. But when it went to the higher management, the provost and the president and vice chancellor… all these people …so… it was not the same". The reason given was that the VP International was not in good terms with the president and provost. The administrator concluded that it influenced how home campus management perceived the IBC and biased their decision about the IBC closure: "when you're biased and you listen to a report, definitely you cannot make a good decision".

Another MLA said: "I had another really good boss for a year or so but he wasn't really in-sync with the rest of the administrators, so he was sort of left out of a lot of things and so, there was that tension there".

She explained that this person later resigned when the branch was taken over by a

new university with a different religious affiliation.

Leadership transitions

The administrators mentioned staff changes at the home campus level as an

important factor in their perception of the home campus.

She said: " […] later after I was recruited, I remember that the vice president of the university… […] said that he would like to have me on the main campus to work with them because of the ways that I handled the things and that I managed the things…during the first months of my work here […] but after the VP International was changed, everything basically was changed, many things were changed".

This MLA explained how leadership transitions have affected the quality of her

experience at her IBC:

"[…] there has been quality loss because of these challenges that are not always met properly…and we have had a lot of transitions and administrations and I think that has made it so stressful as far as staying…because we have not had continuous good quality administration".

This administrator explained how home campus leaders appointed to the IBC on a

short-term basis affected her work environment:

"There have been occasional good people there but people don't intend to stay
very long and some, some…we will have somebody good there for a couple years and
then they leave….and that has made it somewhat stressful as far as staying, making me
think that well, maybe it is time for you to leave too".

Leadership decisions

Different types of decision at the home campus level affected the organizational

commitment of the IBC administrators. The first type was related to the decision to have

an IBC in the first place. A lack of consensus about the IBC's legitimacy seemed to

influence the way IBC administrators view the home campus and in turns, affected their

commitment.

This MLA explained it in these terms:

"A couple of the [home campus] administrators got the idea of getting our
campus onboard and that was not really their main planning for that campus…and so, a
few people were in agreement but a lot of the people were not in agreement that our
campus be part of their campus…and so, that, that has always been a struggle…[…] and
right now, […] I don't think there is any administrator on the main campus that really is
sympathetic to our campus. There are a couple of faculty members who have been down
to our campus, faculty members who are kindred spirits and like our campus but basically
they have no power […], and so basically we are dealing with the administrators up there
who really don't care about us….so if there is a transition, it may be for the best…that's
the way I am looking at it right now…".

One reason for colleges' lack of commitment may be because many branches do

not meet their profit goals. This MLA explained:

"If there's a realistic expectation by the home campus that there is a cushion, that
there is a trade-off between the international prestige and a minor loss, if they treat a

branch campus like they treat a law school or a medical school, or an architecture school whereas you need it for prestige and it can lose a little bit of money but it kind of bumps you into that next orbit, that's fine. The problem is with this rush of branch campuses they never saw it like that. They saw it as a way to pay for their failing medical school [laughs]".

This administrator hypothesized that setting up an IBC has become a thing to do

and not too much thought is put into it, which leads to low commitment. He joked:

"As I get older, I realize it's not money that makes the world go around but egos and a lot of [IBCs] are really set up for the ego of presidents of universities. When I started off as an undergraduate, a university president would build a library or a stadium and then move on to the next, and now they need a global presence overseas".

In addition to decisions related to legitimacy, the majority of administrators

expressed the feeling that decisions made at the home campus level were often in conflict

with the IBC's interests. This was particularly evident with administrators from

environments with high PEU.

This is an ULA's reaction when asked if she thought about leaving her IBC:

" [laughing] oh, I have my moments when I think: "oh, this is ridiculous!" you know…and certainly when you feel the parent institution does not fully understand the situation or there have been sometimes decisions made at the parent institution that are frustrating because you weren't there, you weren't able to be there to sort of put your point across in how it would affect us…and those are the frustrating times but it's momentary really, it's just annoyance meaning "oh, why am I here? you know, "it's ridiculous, I am leaving!" you know…but no, it comes back to the fact to the loyalty of the staff and where I would be leaving them".

A MLA said:

"At the beginning, I thought that for example the kind of appreciation and appraisal that I get that this international branch campus is different than domestic organizations…but now, I don't believe so. Because of the things that I saw, the way

they [the home campus] handled to close down the campus. I am not happy with… So this is not the factor which now keeps me working there but it used to be."

This administrator added that it was not the closing that bothered her the most but the way things were handled. She felt the home campus leadership did not give valid reasons to justify closure. The administrator also mentioned the importance of having clear communication channels and transparency:

"I think transparency and trust and telling the truth is the main thing and keeping each other informed for the things which are happening on the main campus and about the things which are happening on the local campus".

Another MLA explained how her former home campus' decision to sell the branch campus affected her commitment:

"[when the take-over happened], it was a huge problem on our campus…[…] I was seriously looking for jobs […] because the transition was very stressful. A lot of students left, a lot of faculty left, a lot of staff left and …it was just a very, very stressful time…I was not sure whether I wanted to continue to work, if I could continue…so…but I am still there [laughs]".

Another MLA had a more positive take on home campus leadership decision-making.

"We have an annual meeting in [home campus' city] where we are able to take part in critical strategic decisions. We are encouraged to share free and frank opinion and most often these suggestions are taken up seriously and are incorporated".

Several administrators mentioned leadership decisions as a *potential* factor influencing their decision to leave or to stay in the organization.

This ULA said:

"If they [the home campus] tell me that I have no more margin of freedom to imagine and solve problems or all …I have just to respect all the procedures, all the process defined from the group…and not just because basically… I don't want to follow

procedures, I'd leave because I will say that it will never run, it is not possible. So I can't be the guy who tries to do that".

This administrator also mentioned a strong disagreement on strategy as a factor

that would make him leave the branch campus.

Another ULA said:

"I think it would be if my job was made untenable by the parents, if they did something that affected here things so badly or affected my staff…that would seriously make me consider [leaving my position]".

A MLA concurred:

"I think if [home university's name] in [home campus' country] or in the main country of operation, if that becomes too prescriptive, if a strategic direction for instance is forced on the campus, and there's no flexibility or room for adaptability and adjustment to the *Apolan* environment, then I would definitely leave. Up to now, it has not been a problem, but if in the future, you know, there is not a consideration of the local environment and context, then that would basically make me leave".

- Home campus' employee professional development strategy

Recognition, appraisal and succession planning were mentioned as factors

influencing the administrators' commitment to their organization.

Recognition and appraisal

A major factor in IBC administrators' level of commitment was recognition and

appraisal from leadership at the home campus level.

A MLA, who worked for an IBC at a medium PEU level said:

"I used to have much more direct contact with the senior people in [home campus location], where they knew more about what I was doing and giving more direct feedback, verbally and through email. It doesn't take a lot, just a nice comment along the way to know that they know and appreciate what you are doing. It is always important to

remember to say thank you. As we have grown, the direct contact doesn't happen as much. I tend to hear more about issues, as opposed to achievements."

The administrator attributed this change mostly to new reporting procedures but

he also noted that "a lot though has to deal with personal leadership style of the

individuals involved." The administrator mentioned that the lack of recognition made him

think about leaving the IBC:

"You know there were times that I felt really unappreciated. You know, the amount of work that was being put in and there was a lot of criticism at the beginning as we were trying to get our enrollment targets going and you know, doing your best to try to keep things going and I think it's really, really important that… you have to acknowledge people all along the way because you really have to draw so much for your inside motivation….and…and then you need that pat in the back…and I think if there is any weakness that I feel, I think, is that I don't feel I get enough recognition from some of the senior administrators in [home campus' state]".

A MLA from an IBC with medium PEU level indicated that the home campus offered several centralized employee recognition programs. However, he stated: "the individual feedback of the home campus is not there….I mean, we know that we are a part of the same organization but at the end of the day, my vice-president of recruitment does not always evaluate me…[…] but I am still reporting to the branch campus director who is extremely good for his part….but you know you still want to be dealt by the boss, appreciated by the boss who is the big boss and that does not happen…and I think that would motivate and would give commitment".

A MLA who was facing a take-over at the time of the interview laughed when

asked about the role of recognition in her job:

"Oh that's a big one…..the current boss does some effort to do appreciation things right now but it is usually very …uh….it's not enough….it's like right now they are in the process of having appreciation dinners or lunches at the end of the year for the faculty or for the directors for whatever….and you know [….] they say the things that you want to hear, how wonderful you are…how dedicated you are…it's wonderful to have you here and all this stuff….but during the year, it's pretty much hell [laughs]."

An ULA stated:

"I still find it really frustrating that academics always get the accolades, the titles, […] I think it is beginning to get through to the university because I do receive now acknowledgements about my commitment in things that I have done, but that did not happen in the beginning and I still think universities in general, not just my university…yeah, I remember my boss saying to me at one point, when I was explaining this frustration:"oh, you need to bask in the reflective glory"… and […]it does not do it for me [laughs]. I am sorry, it just does not do it for me…so that...I find that a real frustration".

Succession planning

Three respondents mentioned that the home campus did not have long-term vision

for their professional career.

This ULA said:

"I think as I said the universities could make you feel more committed […]…if it was not just about they had not identified somebody for me coming out to replace me, neither have they given any consideration to what I might do when I go back. You know you would think that with the wealth of knowledge and new skills I have achieved since I have been out here…that you know that they'd be trying to already think: "oh what can we give [administrator's first name] when she gets back?" But it's just not raised, it's not mentioned at all!". The administrator added that "in some respects, some of the academic staff that have returned back and have already finished their assignments… haven't been treated particularly well". She expressed concerns that if universities do not recognize it, "there is going to be a problem in the future because they won't find people to come out here and set things up, they won't find people to come out and carry the good work on".

When asked what the home campus could do to better retain its IBC employees,

an MLA said:

"I think they should provide for succession planning. Being a smaller campus than the parent institution or some of the other campuses, there's also, there's always the issue of economies of scale, so there's fewer staff taking responsibility for more aspects within our portfolios. Because you have the linkage back to the main campus and some

support being provided from there, so, if something happens to me the question would be what happens after that…so definitely, succession planning, promotion possibilities, opportunities".

Another MLA said:

"If I went to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor International and say, you know I want to move to [home campus city] and live in [home campus city], they really would not have a place for me […] they would not know how to reabsorb people administratively".

Answer 2: IBC administrators' Relationship with the Host Country Influences their

Organizational Commitment

Administrators mentioned the host country, more precisely factors associated with

the host country, as a factor influencing their organizational commitment. Several sub-

themes emerged:

Location and country type

Several administrators mentioned location as a factor in deciding to work for their

IBC.

This MLA explained:

"*Vol* […] is a tropical country so with living in [city in *Vol*] is very hot and this area is a little cooler, although it is still tropical of course…and so, that helped influence my decision to take [this job]".

Another MLA said:

"The location is very strategic and the distance factor because this university is closer to my hometown, so that's the second reason why I choose this university".

An ULA explained he took the job for a combination of reasons and also because he liked the Middle-East.

Administrators who worked in developing countries mentioned location as a limiting factor in their work life. Administrators who worked in developed countries did not express any opinion on the effect of location in their work.

A MLA talked about physical isolation in these terms:

"That part has been a challenge because I can't run over to the next town and visit another college library that is similar to ours….and I don't get to library conferences very often. I have been…maybe once every six years or so…on the average…so that's not good enough for me…I would like to go every other year and I can't do that".

Another MLA who worked on an island said:

"I think that one of the biggest drawbacks of the international campus is the academic community…the opportunities are much lesser, it seems than what is there for the main campus…for us in particular, the location is quite remote….and the possibilities of doing active research or being a part of a larger academic community is not there much…so at some point of time, we end up losing our good faculty because we have limitations with what we can offer. The only way we can solve it is by not having our campus here". He added: " *Criet* does not offer a lot of security for people who would immigrate like...I am not going to stay back in *Criet* when, if I retire from here or if I…you know, I leave my job….so there is that lack of…lack of things which is beyond the university's control".

Economics

The economic environment in the host country was another factor influencing IBC administrators' commitment. Countries hit the hardest by the current economic downturn offer fewer options to IBC employees.

A MLA explained it in these terms:

"There're really not that many places where you could go and find a similar job. So, there are a couple campuses in [city in *Vol*] but it's all part-time work….it's all mainly in Spanish although there are a few that are in English courses….but there is very little…very little ….hardly any place to go…so, people feel like they are trapped".

Another MLA said:

"Here to retain people, we don't have a lot of problems because there is quite a critical economical situation here ….but we have the same problems as other companies to retain high-performing people".

Another administrator mentioned that because he was an expatriate it was difficult

to find a job in his industry of choice in the host country and consequently "ended up

doing education administration".

At the other end of the spectrum, countries with more stable economies tended to

offer more options to administrators. A MLA who worked in the Middle-East explained

that the plentitude of jobs made staff turnover extremely high and that it was difficult to

retain administrators for an extended period of time, combined with the fact that they are

expatriates and untied to the host country.

History and politics

Another factor mentioned was political uncertainty in the host country.

This MLA explained:

" When I was recruited for this position, it was quite attractive for me to get out of the public university sector in *Apola* because at that time, it was unstable and it's quite politically charged […] that time in higher education was quite disruptive in terms of politics of the elections interfering with the business of higher education, so it was attractive for me to move to an international institution being more outward-looking than to be within a public institution that is wrapped up in the political situation of the country at that time. So, I felt that the international institution would give me a broader exposure to higher education internationally, and not only focusing on *Apola*".

This administrator also shared that she and her colleagues at the IBC have high commitment levels because the IBC " is providing a different kind of environment than to work in a local or a domestic university because of the political aspects that are driving most of those institutions and that causes a lack of commitment of administrators at those institutions but as [home campus' name], obviously we can move beyond that a little bit, which I think provides a high level of commitment".

Higher education landscape

Administrators mentioned the higher education market as a factor in making their job more challenging on a daily basis. A MLA talked about working in a competitive market:

"Well, I have to admit here that in *Riss*, it is very stiff competition because we are a private university and not only are we competing with local public universities but also with private universities and international branch campuses […]. There are about 20 public universities in *Riss*, more than 40 private universities and 450 colleges operating under the *Rissan* Law, so the competition is great, people have ample choices and options on where to go and study".

Two administrators mentioned the difficulty of working for a private entity in a higher education market that has a history of promoting public higher education.

A MLA said:

"A lot of my work now I have been […] cultivating the reputation of the campus in the community because [city in *Delt*] and [state in *Delt*] and *Delt* in general is very hostile towards private and external education coming in here, setting up campuses. So, a lot of my work has been building relationships with other institutions, with government organizations, with other private institutions…and I've done a lot of work in that area".

He gave more details how this hostility pervaded his daily work:

118

" I now sit on [a] board as a private institution rep but at the beginning, we hosted a meeting here and as [peer administrators from *Delt*] are kind of going around, talking about "the privates" and, you know, how they were going to contaminate the educational system here. I said that you know, I'd like to remind you that, you know, there are a few reasonably good private institutions like Stanford, Harvard and Yale".

He also said: "it's something that we are consistently doing and doing at every level is continuously trying to improve and prove yourself as an outsider you have to work harder to prove yourself".

A MLA explained that in her host country, not only are parents very much fixated on public education but they also are wary of sending their children to a private university because there is a lot of fly-by-night institutions, that disappear overnight. Interestingly, she explained that fighting to gain legitimacy made her even more committed to her IBC:

"I've really invested in making or creating an acceptance of a foreign institution in *Apola*. It's a private institution, it's viewed as or classified as a private institution in *Apola* because it's owned by a foreign institution and so, I've invested a lot in the brand awareness and creating awareness about what the institution is about and what we do, and also the acceptance of the government of a foreign institution, so that has really led me to believe in the academic project that is happening here".

An ULA talked about the host country's view of what a business school is: "there is not a lot of strong brand about business school". He added:

"So, all our processes in [home country's name], based in the potential and the power of the brand of business school are completely inoperative. You need to invent other things".

119

Laws and regulations

Many administrators complained about the laws and regulations of their host country and how that complicated their work life. This was probably the factor most often cited when they talked about the challenges of working for a branch in a foreign country.

A MLA said that things would be much easier if there were not so many legal differences between the home and host country such as visa regulations. She explained:

"Visa is a legality that we have a lot of problems with… especially during the last few years… [home country's name] citizens cannot get visit visas on arrival…. they have to go for security checks to be able to get a resident visa… Once they want to leave they have to get their visa canceled before they leave the country… Because they cannot let the visa die out by itself … because once the visa expires, still they cannot get another visa to enter the country… they have to clear the previous one".

This has created confusion among the faculty and the administrator said her job is to manage faculty's expectations and sometimes, it is not easy.

Administrators also complained about the amount of bureaucracy they face to run their IBC.

This ULA said:

"*Ita* is very, very bureaucratic [laughs]. If it is the one thing that drives me insane it is the amount of bureaucracy that I have to put up with […] I will give you an example […]. We have to abide by the *Itan* Medical Council's laws and their entry requirements, and that's fine. So, when they make a change, we then write to the Ministry of Higher Education, who then sends my request on to the *Itan* Qualifications Agency who then gets in touch with the *Itan* Medical Council to see whether they're happy to approve and then it goes back to the chain, and things can go wrong and things are recorded incorrectly, so I have spent a lot of my time writing very frustrating letters to people [laughs]".

This administrator even said that bureaucracy would be a weighing factor in her decision to leave her position, should the ministry or government make changes to rules that would make her job even more difficult.

Another ULA explained that one way to improve staff commitment was to have "a more flexible structure of governance with less bureaucratic procedures".

"[…] It's quite important to do that because one of the main complaints of my colleagues is they are completely burdened by stupid bureaucratic procedures and, […] they have the power, they are able to decide but they can't because of the procedures. They [have the power to] decide but there is no effect, [because] you need to sign 12 documents to be effective in something".

In addition to bureaucracy, specific regulations were also mentioned. A MLA outlined how working in a free zone put his branch campus at a disadvantage, as some of his competitors did not have to abide by licensing laws in the free zone. As a result, his IBC had a hard time recruiting students because they could earn an undergraduate degree in three years at their competitors instead of four years at his IBC. He put it in this way: "So, it's really hard to recruit students if we are telling them it's another year of study".

A MLA also said:

"The labor law in *Apola* is very different from labor law in [home campus' country]. So, HR policies need to be customized for the country of operation, so there is a continuous process of ensuring consistency but also making provision for different legislative contexts. There is also different requirements in different countries for program approval and engagement with the government, so another challenge would be, that you have to satisfy the requirement quality assurance framework of the…within the country of operation, but in the broader institution, so there is an added level of regulatory aspect that you have to attune to. For instance, policy development is more

121

challenging because it's a range of considerations, in different countries that need to be considered when policy is developed".

Language and culture

Language was mentioned by three administrators. Two expressed language barrier as an additional challenge in their work. One thought about language as an advantage. A MLA said that the IBC had a hard time retaining faculty and staff because not only of isolation but also because of the language used. Another MLA explained: "I am the only one from a bilingual campus, from an English language campus and so that's a challenge right there".

This MLA stated that speaking English in the workplace was "a rather motivating factor". He explained it in these terms:

"Being a non-native speaker and trained in my own mother tongue, I was so motivated to take-up a challenge to work in an environment where people communicate in English. The delivery in teaching and learning is in English, the management meeting is in English, daily business operations are all conducted in English. Despite my non-English speaking background as my higher secondary school to my first degree level was purely in my own mother tongue, I have great opportunity now to work in an English language speaking community".

Culture was also an important factor impacting the administrator's work. A MLA said: 'Well, the families of students here are very pragmatic….and they don't really want their children to have a liberal arts degree. That's not part of their culture and so, we are very limited in the amount of programs that we can run successfully". These students preferred business type degrees that can be completed in a timely manner.

A MLA mentioned that because her students were from various countries, they did

not necessarily have the same academic background as their American counterparts.

She said part of her job was " trying to get students to do research with academic
databases rather than using Google…that's part of our instruction, is to try to get them to
use our academic databases that we do spend good money on and that we get from our
main campus so…[…] students come in and basically they go on the internet, they go to
Google, and they try to write a paper using that and we try to fight that…that's one of the
things that we…my staff and I do…and we have been able to get incorporated into
what's called the Freshman Seminar here…so, we give library instruction during the
Freshman Seminar class every semester".

Summary of Answers to Research Question 4

To summarize, IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators shared that

their organizational commitment was influenced by the relationship with the home

campus, and to some extent, by their relationship with the host country. In particular, they

mentioned the home campus' level of commitment, its organizational awareness in IBC

management, home campus leadership and employee development strategy as factors

influencing their commitment. Administrators also talked about how the host country's

location, type, economics, history, culture and education framework affect their jobs. The

host country's laws and regulations seemed to be the most important factor affecting their

commitment. However, the host country's relationship has a lesser impact on their

commitment than the relationship with the home campus.

Answer to Research Question 5

"In what ways do selected organizational variables and personal characteristics influence how non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators perceive their organizational commitment?"

Answer 1: How 6 Personal Characteristics Influence IBC Administrators'

Organizational Commitment

Interviews indicated that IBC administrators have common personal characteristics that influence how they perceived the world around them, including their commitment to their organization. Five personal characteristics have been found to have a positive influence on their commitment overall. A sixth personal characteristic (labeled as personal circumstances) appeared to be a limiting factor for most of the respondents.

Personal characteristic #1: They like challenges

IBC administrators said they like challenges. They are the type of people who are not afraid of taking risks and confronting difficult situations.

ULA: "I very much …I love challenge….which is just as well actually [laughs]".

Another ULA explained that the challenges of managing an IBC drew him to the position:

"Of course, I am a director of a branch campus but I am a boss of a company too and I need to manage this company, manage the people, I need to ensure the balance of the economic aspect, I need to be perfectly […] okay with all the legal, institutional, cultural rules of the country, etc...etc…so it's very interesting because really, you are director of a business school campus and a director of a branch. These are the two main challenges for me and this challenge for me is my motivation".

An ULA noted:

" I am a manager…so my job is to make things work in difficult…or sometimes difficult climates…with a number of factors that I might not be expert in….that's really what I've made my career in so, and that was the attraction of [working for this IBC]".

This MLA said:

"I think, in general, if I think of a broader than myself, […] what I have observed from my colleagues is high levels of commitment because the brand is unknown in *Apola*. Everybody is working together to really establish it and giving it a good name and make people aware of it".

Five of the ten administrators interviewed said they had been involved in the IBC

since the bricks-and-mortar stage and that they liked this aspect of building things from

the ground up and the challenges it brings:

ULA: "I like the idea of setting something up from scratch".

MLA: "I was the first staff, I was the first local staff of the branch […] and it had a lot of challenges at the beginning because this university, the branch, did not have anything basically…so, they just had the campus and the campus was arranged via a local partnership with one local organization here. So they had just the space, nothing more".

MLA: 'I…really like the challenge. You know, it is very stimulating to be part […] of a challenging work place, and the variety and that it's creating something… and I think maybe that's just my characteristics because the jobs I've had, have been start up operations. I have been involved from the ground level. The last place I was at, I was there for 17 years so I saw it but I think the excitement and the idea that you're doing something, you know you are creating stuff all the time is what drives me along".

When asked what keeps him in his position, an ULA stated:

"For me… is the challenge to build something and to face the challenge". He also said that head-hunters try to recruit him on a regular basis but so far, he had not seen any added value to their propositions. But this would change if it was a job offer to start a new campus: "what could make me leave is for example another institution [that] tells

me: "okay, we have this project to build a big campus in…I don't know… Vietnam […] you are this person to help us, to set up, manage and launch this campus…probably I think to leave".

Personal characteristic #2: They are tenacious and willing to withstand criticism

Tenacity and being thick-skinned were mentioned as useful personal traits when working for an IBC:

An ULA said it was important "not being daunted by things, […] and having the tenacity to see things through. People used to call me a bit of a Terrier when I was in [home country's name] because I don't let go [laughs]".

A MLA revealed that "being very thick skinned" was necessary: " again then it is maybe more start up than branch campus, but I think as you are working new ideas, you know, you're always going to be subject to criticism".

Personal characteristic #3: They are hard-workers

The job of running an IBC involves putting in long hours. The participants shared they were willing to work hard for their IBC.

ULA:
"you know when you manage a branch, not only a branch campus, it's a little bit like your company…so, for 10 years, I have been working 60 hours per week and it's not a problem for me".

A MLA said that when working for a new IBC, you have to "be prepared to put in the hours".

When asked about her commitment, an ULA asserted:

"Oh, I am 100%, in fact probably 200% maybe more. I am very committed. I work very long hours here and you know, I want to see success. We are still in our

126

infancy, we are not built to capacity yet and I really, really want to see my first group of students graduate".

Personal characteristic #4: They have clearly defined values

Administrators explained that their values, work philosophy and personal ethos

affected how they conducted their job. Several participants mentioned that their

organization's mission fit their own philosophy about what international higher education

should be. This philosophical fit motivated them in their work.

MLA: "Having a good philosophical fit, that's probably one of the most important things when going into a position". He added: " if you look at what makes this campus' experience different from most other ones, I think that is the strongest thing, is that it's being a very mission-driven campus from the beginning… […] that's what appealed to me to work here…it wasn't just the job, it just wasn't, you know, coming in here to set up a place to collect tuition fees but this was actually part of the university wanted to do, it was one of their goals". He concluded: "I think that's what drives me and the sense of a mission and the purpose. We know, we are not just doing the ordinary, we are doing something really unique here".

Another MLA believed that passion and interest in education was very important:

"Well, the ultimate reason [for working at this IBC] is that because my passion and my interest for education, to be specific, higher education…so I love so much higher education…so therefore I think …it goes without saying, that when I have an opportunity to work for an university in a higher learning institution, I will accept the offer".

Two administrators mentioned that making a difference for students was an

important source of commitment.

Another MLA really liked working with students:

"Because when I see them happy… because you know, everything can be compensated… whatever you lose, you can get it back…if you lose for example you money, you can get it back… But when you request your time, and when you lose your time you cannot get it back. So, our students are those who are giving us their time. So we are responsible for that. This responsibility keeps me motivated and keeps me that I

want to work with them. Because when someone gives you her time or his time, it means that they are giving you the resource they cannot compensate it. So it is very valuable".

This MLA revealed that although she does not feel very committed to her home campus administration, she does feel committed to students:

"[…] my real commitment there I think, is to try to keep the place going because there are so many students who have benefited from the campus and have had a really good experience…that I would like to do what I can to …to make that continue…to be feasible for the next few years…so I don't think that I will be working there five years from now but I do hope to continue working for another few years".

An ULA talked about making a difference.

"I do like setting things up. I'm…I am very much interested in that…I also like the opportunity to maybe change some things slightly that's…with old institutions, things become a bit engrained, habits and practices…so I like the idea of coming out and doing something to change. I also like the idea of working in a different environment and trying to make a difference. So, I guess those are my main motivations really".

A few administrators shared their personal philosophy on work-related matters. A MLA stated that he would leave his position, should he no longer be efficient in his delivery. An ULA believed that expatriates should stay no longer than 5 years in their position to be effective workers. Like another administrator, he also said that he was willing to stay in his position until the job gets done. Finally, another MLA maintained that organizational commitment is, after all, a personal choice:

"I think [organizational commitment] is a personal choice and the commitment comes from your own commitment towards your job. So, I really don't know how to rate your commitment but I feel that I am committed….but as we do, I feel we are also looking every day for a better option, so I don't know if at the same time you think that is also a lack of commitment but …I am committed to myself [laughs]'.

The administrators also seemed to value educational prestige and ranking.

128

One administrator who worked in the corporate sector for many years said that although he liked working for private companies "it is more inspiring to work for a university than a manufacturing company". He explained that what influences to stay in his position was "the joint attraction of being part of something that is in [home country's name] and is a very prestigious operation whilst facing challenges in another country and still remaining in the higher education element".

A MLA mentioned working for a "reputable" university as an important factor in his career advancement.

Finally, another MLA explained that he came from a private college that was not accredited and that for him "it's been really exciting to be involved more in the mainstream fully-accredited university".

Personal characteristic #5: They like working in a culturally diverse environment

Not surprisingly, the administrators said they liked working with people from diverse backgrounds. They saw staff diversity as an added value in their work life.

MLA:

"The multicultural dimension of the work is something that I like because I'm working with different people from different nationalities and different cultures… So this is something that I think is unique to international branch campuses".

Another MLA:

"It has been very interesting to be on the campus because of the make-up of the staff and the faculty…it is an international staff and faculty. In the past we had more faculty and a couple staff from the United States, now there are very few…very few […] I mean, that has made it a nice experience to have that variety".

This MLA explained how diversity affected his job and made him stay in his

position:

"I think my commitment is related to the fact of my subordinates and my colleagues…they are a bunch of very exciting people to work with. I have my team from…my own team […] comprises of 8 different nationalities…[…] and we are working with close to 25 different nationalities in the organization…so…our student body is of almost 60 different nationalities…so, even though we are only 500 students, a small campus…but we do have that mix and great people to work for…so I think that is something that your commitment comes from".

The administrator added that in his experience, a diverse and multinational staff

was usually of better quality because of their academic credentials, their experience and

the various perspectives they bring into the organization.

An ULA too liked her colleagues as she expressed her appreciation for her host-

country employees: "The thing that really gets me going are the staff. *Itans* are lovely

people".

Another ULA explained how being an expatriate made him appreciate diversity

and how it became an integral part of his identity:

"I have friends in France and Portugal, in America, Australia and Croatia…you know. I have friends that I have more in common with even though they are from different nationalities than I do with people at home. Partly, because I have only spent a few years in the last 25 in [home country's name], but partly I think once you have worked in a different country, you have a kind of something in common with other people who worked overseas often with a very different background and I find that very satisfying".

Personal characteristic # 6: Their personal circumstances affect their commitment

IBC administrators talked about how personal factors influenced their decision to work for an international branch campus. Several mentioned location as a factor with two administrators already living in the host country where the IBC operated.

This MLA said:

"I was interested in staying back in *Criet*, so I was interested in working at a place where I graduated. I studied in *Criet*. I studied abroad and I wanted to find a job in the country where I was".

Family constraint was also cited as a factor. One accepted to move abroad and work for an IBC only because his/her spouse was also employed there. One thought at some point she would have to leave her position because her spouse had been laid off from the IBC where she worked. Another participant said his family could not move and as such, he had to find work locally. One administrator decided to work abroad because his children were all grown up. Finally, career-related factors were also suggested. One administrator reported that he would leave his current IBC if he could find another IBC that would lead to a job back home, as he was thinking of repatriation in the next few years. One administrator explained that he neared retirement and that he would probably leave his position soon. One administrator whose IBC was closing mentioned a lack of work visa as a factor preventing her from working in her home campus' country.

Answer 2: How 4 Organizational Variables Influence IBC Administrators'

Organizational Commitment.

Four variables have been found to have an influence on administrators'

commitment. These are: the nature of subsidiary work, campus size and growth phase,

the role of economics and career advancement.

Organizational variable #1: The nature of subsidiary work

The nature of working for an international branch campus influenced

administrators' commitment in many ways.

Compliance: The participants explained that working for a branch organization is

inherently frustrating because they have to conform to their home campus'

instruction and direction, which gives them less freedom to innovate. At the same

time, they also get logistical and infrastructure support from the home campus,

which facilitates their work.

A MLA said:

"I have less flexibility than I would if I was at an independent campus. For
example, when I worked at an independent university, I wrote the policies and procedures
manual. You know, […] I figured out all the schemes for evaluating instructors, whether
it be community service or research or teaching time…whereas at the branch campus, we
have to use the model of the home campus. Then again if I were stuck at the home
campus, I wouldn't be able to make many decisions at all because everything would be
part of a committee. Here, we don't have time for committees. We have the government
telling us one thing, the home campus telling another, we have to resolve issues, we have
to keep the plates spinning […] so, it's kind of a compromise between the two. So there's
a little bit…less autonomy and yet there's little bit more security".

A MLA, who used to work for a domestic campus, contrasted the pros and cons

of working for a branch campus:

"If you are in the mother campus, in my position, it is very easy to make some
changes….for example, if I want to introduce a new program I can start it, initiate it and

132

it's much simpler…the bureaucracy is less…but if I am looking at a branch campus, then you know….it must satisfy the needs of the mother campus, you know, in order to get started". He added: " So I think there is a little bit of pull back I would say in freedom […]…you cannot […] expand your wings totally…that is the drawback…but on the other end, these same drawbacks are the biggest strengths so…in a home campus, you don't have any reference frame, you don't have any help…you don't know where to look for information but when you are working for a branch campus, you have a lot of resources already available , which is being done by somebody else. So, it looks like you have a framework, you have support and…sometimes it comes very handy like….today, let's say I was supposed to turn in something and I just looked through archives and I found something very interesting and I just modified and gave it …so it saves work"

An ULA said that the biggest reason why it is more difficult to operate a branch campus than a domestic one is because of the number of stakeholders involved in the operation such as not only the home campus, but also councils, government, parents, students and in his case a partner foundation. He stated:

"So, that's quite a large number of people to keep on site with major initiatives. So, if you try to do something new or big or a major change, that's quite a large number of people who…they might not have quite a veto but they can have a big say in things".

Autonomy: The necessity to comply was counterbalanced by the opportunity to have more autonomy, especially when administrators were involved in starting a new operation.

Another ULA summed up this balance between compliance and autonomy in these terms:

"It is not quite acting independently because obviously I act to [home university's name], you know I still have to report back to them…but it is being able to do things your own way without somebody breathing down your neck, it is the having the freedom to set things up". She also said: "I was very lucky. I don't know how other universities do it, but I was really given just open access to get on and do things. I mean the whole thing".

MLA:

   "[IBCs] are places where you can have your own small kingdom […] you can [laughs], you can have your own career path…now when I say kingdom I don't mean you are creating your fiefdom but [laughs] you know…you, you still have your domain…[…] so that growth factor is a tremendous factor for motivating you to stay".

An ULA said that what kept him working for the branch campus was the freedom to

build something while doing it "inside the security of a group".

Another ULA made the following comment about being a mid-level administrator at

a branch campus:

   "[IBC administrators feel like they are upper-level administrators] and that's a very important factor and it may be something to add to what motivates staff to work in a branch campus…and that is, that people who are sometimes not in a senior role at their home campus, take on a great deal more responsibilities and often much wider responsibilities overseas and therefore they get experience that's both more satisfying but also quicker than they would have….and therefore from a career point of view, it is really beneficial in that sense."

Variety: Eight of the ten administrators interviewed mentioned being a Jack-of-All-

Trades as a motivating and positive factor in their commitment.

ULA:

   "Well, I think the biggest thing is that I am a bit of a Jack-of-all-trades and the master of none. I can really sort of turn my hand to anything".

A MLA said that what made her stay in the position is "the variety of what I have

been doing in the job has been really stimulating".

Another MLA said:

   "It's […] more interesting [to work at an IBC] because you're getting a lot of ad-hoc projects that you have to solve through developing official processes and procedures. We also joke that it's kind of like dog years over here, is that people come over here and they

are shocked in how many decisions they have to make every single day. So, you make more decisions here that you would in 7 years back at the home campus".

MLA:

"[…] In a start-up mode, you have to be able to do everything, you have to be a generalist and you have to be…I think very driven and just prepared to put in the hours. At the beginning when I first started, I also did all the marketing and recruitment as we got going. I did all the marketing plan. I used to travel to do the recruitment because I didn't have a lot to do on campus until we got students here. So, and…and there was a void there and they needed some leadership and I stepped in on that".

When asked if she was thinking of leaving her position, a MLA answered that she was not prepared to leave her IBC yet because they were still building something new.

Another MLA said: "Every day I am learning something new".

When asked what skills and qualities were needed to work as an IBC administrator, the participants mentioned: adjusting to change, creativity and innovation, strategic thinking and leadership vision, a sense of humor, tenacity, good communication, being a self-learner, multi-tasking and cultural sensitivity. They also specified three areas of expertise vital to their daily work: legal, financial and computer knowledge.

Organizational culture: Organizational culture also made an impact on the participants' commitment. Several mentioned their interaction with their peers and colleagues as a factor.

MLA: "I have enjoyed my professional contacts on campus […] …I have good relations with most of the faculty and that has really been very good for me…very stimulating".

Another MLA reported that what kept her working for her IBC were her colleagues and the good relationship with her direct supervisor.

An ULA said that she worked with loyal and committed staff, which strengthened her own commitment: "It is the loyalty, that's really what gets me going".

As a supervisor, another ULA was aware of the importance of organizational culture. He said it was important "to create a very strong culture, a company culture here. I mean for all my team and people from my group are surprised to see that. This school is their school. This business school is their business school because they launched it".

Comments about organizational culture also included the divide between administration and academia.

ULA: "There is also the academic and the professional who see things in different ways and I think that's another factor that has to be managed when you are…well in any higher education institution but typically when you are overseas because people overseas are more stressed in those circumstances". He added: "I think that the academic staff have less patience with policies and procedures, particularly local policies and procedures that have to be followed for the smooth running of an organization. I think professional staff are more used to dealing with procedures as a way in achieving ends rather than getting in their way. I think that, that can lead to tensions which have to be managed quite carefully".

Another ULA said:

"I don't think that admin is recognized really. I still think the attitudes exist in university…that universities are all about academics you know…I had somebody just yesterday actually say to me: "[…] if we haven't got the academics, we can't function" and my response to that is "well if you haven't got the admin, you can't function either [laughs]".

A MLA mentioned that visiting faculty "wanted to get the most out of a great time" and were not motivated to teach at the branch campus. She described them as being "spoiled".

Organizational variable #2: Campus size and growth phase

The administrators said that campus size and growth phase had a major impact on their work. Those who worked for smaller branches had positive remarks to share:

> MLA: "So I think because we are small and, and close, you know, everybody knows each other here and I know the students, we have a personal attachment to them, more of an attachment to the students and what we are doing, because of the size of the small campus, sort of engagement with the institution and therefore there is a stronger bond".

> ULA: "[Despite IBC management challenges] I still look forward to working with the students because we are small out here, I actually teach as well".

> MLA: "I work in a lot of areas…yeah, we are a small university of only less than a thousand students…so we have to take a lot of multiple functions, that's how we work".

> Another MLA: "[…] a branch campus [has the] same ecosystem as a business school but in [a smaller] environment, so all is much more connected, all is much more linked. There is much more interaction than in a big business school with 5,000 students".

A MLA who worked for a larger and mature campus explained that because of the IBC's success, administrators receive a lot of visits from the home campus leadership:

> "It's amazing. You meet the president a lot more than you would if you are at the home campus. You spend time with the president at graduation ceremonies. People come out and they just talk about the politics of the home campus at the Board of Trustees' level, which you would never about if you were at the home campus. So, in a way, your view of the home campus is actually better than it would be at the home campus".

Another MLA spelled out how his IBC's development stage affects his commitment:

"[…] a factor that helped me for staying instead of leaving is that the international campus that I am working on is in a growth phase, okay? […] and when there is a growth phase, I see a lot of possibilities, the saturation is not yet here….I see there is a career path for me…I can become a vice-rector, even a rector of the campus at one day…now the competition is much more fierce in the home campus…[…] so, I think in a way, I want to be riding the growth".

Administrators who worked at small campuses also expressed how arduous organizational growth was.

ULA: "[…] we are a start-up. [My home university] has been going for 180 years and normally it turns away students. It has a lot more applicants than places. We're new, so people are still finding out about us. So, that's more of a kind of marketing challenge".

A MLA made the same type of remark about the fact that his campus had been operating for less than two years and that the student intake was still modest. It impacted his commitment as he said he needed "to redouble his efforts" to make the campus successful.

Another MLA explained that there are inherent disadvantages in being a small institution like not having an economy of scale. If a new program fails, the financial impact on the branch is bigger than at the home campus and as such, the risks on the institution's vitality are higher.

An administrator whose IBC was closing, was left in a state of uncertainty:

"I am not sure [when my last day on the job is] because the campus will be open until August and I believe I will be there until the end of the campus going to close…so I was the first one so, hopefully I will not be the last one [laughs] because it is not something nice".

138

Organizational variable # 3: The role of economics

Economics were an important factor influencing the administrators' commitment.

Several variables were mentioned: operating budgets and compensation and benefits

Operating budgets: Many said that their job duties had been fluctuating over the years

based on the branch campus' financial capacity to hire support staff.

MLA: "Over the years, my staff has varied from two, then up to three, then up to four then up to five…we did get up to six and then we are back down to four now […] When my assistant's position was eliminated and that was sort of a crisis period because it took me two years to get another position approved to take over a lot of the responsibilities that she had".

The administrator said that when she got a new assistant again, "it really helped"

so that she was able concentrate on institution-wide level projects.

Like her but at a different IBC, another MLA's position involved into a

managerial function as the IBC was able to hire more staff.

Compensation and benefit: Salary and benefits came up in the discussions as important

factors of commitment. Many administrators were satisfied with their compensation.

MLA: "I think the compensation also is quite good for the time being, I think quite attractive. The package is good and then also the incentive is quite good at least for the time being, and we have to admit the fact that benefits or package in the higher education sector not as good as in the corporate or business sector."

A MLA said that she is still in the position because " I like my job, because I get a good salary, because I have been getting *Eoro* benefits which has helped me…since it is a branch campus, it is a *Eoro* campus…it gets similar benefits although probably a lower salary than if I were working on the main campus…so that has helped me, you know, looking toward retirement…getting to post-retirement age".

A MLA said laughing:

"The pay is good! so…certainly salary…compared to the domestic organizations what they would pay… is a very motivating factor [for me to stay in the position]".

He also said that the IBC offered "excellent compensation for a contributory provident fund".

Another MLA said that increasing pay, paying overtime and providing bonuses improved commitment among her IBC staff.

Another one shared that he "would leave for the right salary". He also mentioned that because standard of living was higher in the host country, remuneration needed to be increased.

Organizational variable #4: Career advancement

Combined with salary, career advancement was a major point of discussion during the interviews.

ULA: " I think oversea salary are important to people but what matters to people I think in terms of getting up in the morning to go to work is the opportunity to play an important role, to have that role recognized, to be respected, to be assisted in developing their ambitions…you know all of the things that we all like about working and the organization has to engender that and it's quite easy for organizations to get that wrong, but if they get them right, if they have a good team spirit and good organizational power and people feel fulfilled and go on in terms of their careers…and I think that's what motivates people to stay with organizations".

Working at an IBC offers many advantages, including career advancement at a faster pace than at a domestic campus.

A MLA said:

"One of the advantages of working in a branch campus is it's kinda like being a wartime army. In that, there is high turnover and you can move up the ranks much faster at a branch campus".

ULA: "I think people come out for different reasons. There is the challenge, but you know it is for your career advancement that's certainly one of the reasons that I ended up doing it".

A MLA said that she accepted to work for her IBC because it had good prospects for her professional future.

Another MLA explained that his motivation to work at his IBC was to get the *Eoron* university experience, which was important for future carrier development. In addition, it allowed him to move up the rank quickly:

"I think I started as an associate director looking only after the [home country] market with just myself in the team….I mean I was part of the team…and now 4 ½ years later, I find myself heading the entire three departments …so you can see already there is so much growth possibility that is there". He also said: "[name of home university] by nature is already rated as one of *Eoro*'s best universities to work for and it is very true…Because for example, we receive tremendous amount of support in our career advancement".

A MLA stated: "If I feel that there is no career progression for me at this institution that… that might be a reason to leave". She also pointed out that working for an IBC allowed for professional exposure to international standards, which was a good tool for career advancement.

Another MLA mentioned how training for their staff development was important: "we have to ensure that our staff enhances their skills and knowledge by providing them adequate training programs".

Summary of Answers to Research Question 5

To summarize, IBC administrators' commitment was found to be influenced by six personal characteristics: they like challenge, they are tenacious, hard-workers, they have strong work ethics, they like working in a diverse environment but at the same time they are limited by personal circumstances. In addition, four organizational variables did influence their commitment: the nature of subsidiary work, campus size and growth phase, economic factors and career advancement motivations.

Interview Results Analysis

This section includes analyses of answers to the research questions and to the biographical information collected during the interviews. These analyses center around the following themes: administrators' personal characteristics, perceived organizational support, specific organizational and structural characteristics.

Administrators' Personal Characteristics

Expatriation

The majority of administrators were either immigrants or expatriates (1 immigrant and 6 expatriates). Among the latter group, three were self-initiated expatriates, that is, they were not sent abroad by their home campus but got hired independently. The study participants were veterans of overseas living as six of the seven expatriates had been living abroad for a minimum of six years. The fact that the majority of administrators were expatriates has implications for this study. Indeed, the expatriation literature reveals that employees on international assignments need a high level of commitment to make

their work and personal experience successful (Liu & Ipe, 2010). Living and working abroad is inherently stressful because it has a significant impact on personal and family life (Caligiuri, 1997). Being an expatriate often means living with a high level of uncertainty because an expatriate depends on termed employment and work permits. This is especially salient for self-initiated expatriates who cannot be repatriated to the home organization after their international assignment ends. These limitations make expatriation a risky and transient endeavor (Richardson & Zikic, 2007). This high level of uncertainty adds an additional layer of stress to the life of expatriates, who face the challenge of adapting to a new country, a new culture and a new position. Expatriation studies show that poor adjustment to these conditions deteriorates organizational commitment and motivation (Gregersen & Black, 1992). The interviews with IBC administrators corroborated the expatriation literature's findings. For instance, a self-initiated expatriate shared that he would commit to a different IBC if it would give him the chance to be repatriated to his home country later on. This clearly shows that expatriation affects commitment in unique and pragmatic ways, in this case, committing to an organization for repatriation purposes. A second self-initiated expatriate revealed that a lack of work permit would prevent her from working at the home campus after her IBC closure. Her situation was precarious and filled with uncertainty. These examples show that factors related to expatriation differentiate expatriate employees from their domestic peers. The three administrators who were local residents did not express the same level of concern regarding job security and stability.

This study also revealed that the IBC administrators interviewed who work at international branch campuses have common personal characteristics. They like challenge, they are hard-workers, they can take criticism, work in a very diverse environment and they have a well-defined work philosophy and values. These characteristics did apply to both local residents and expatriates but interestingly, these personal characteristics are corroborated in studies about expatriation. Chew & Zhu (2002) found a correlation between entrepreneurial personality and expatriates' decision to work abroad. Self-initiated expatriate academics tend to be less risk adverse (Selmer & Lauring, 2010). Research also shows that the communicational ability of expatriates is an important determinant of performance (Holopainen & Bjorkman, 2005). Communicational ability refers to expatriates' willingness and desire to become involved in communications with host nationals, which promotes understanding, reduces uncertainty and improves work performance. The interviews show that IBC expatriate administrators were willing and able to communicate with host nationals as they commented about the benefits of working with people from different backgrounds.

Another aspect of expatriation is non-work related factors like family. Several administrators mentioned family circumstances as a determining factor for working at, staying and leaving their IBC. This is consistent with prior research findings about the influence of family on organizational commitment for all types of employees, including expatriates. Expatriates usually struggle to maintain balanced relationships between work and family domains. Family-related matters are a predictor of early

repatriation (Shaffer et al., 2001). Ryan (2012) found that non-work related factors were recorded as the main reason for expatriate academics to leave the United Arab Emirates within one year of arrival and also to extend their initial contract. These findings are especially salient for women who are willing to expatriate but are not able to pursue an international career because of family factors (Tharenou, 2008). It was confirmed in the interviews: only two of the six expatriate administrators were females. Both had no children, one was single and the other one worked with her spouse at the branch campus.

Experienced in higher education administration but not in IBC management

Collected data on administrators' professional experience highlighted several key factors: although the vast majority of the participants were experienced with the field of higher education, they were inexperienced with IBC-related matters when they first started (only one administrator had previous IBC experience); their tenure in their current position was short (six of the administrators had been on the job for less than five years); half of the administrators started working at the IBC at its inception. These facts are reflected in their comments as they talked about the struggles and challenges of building a campus from the grounds up and how it affected their commitment. This is a major factor in this study of organizational commitment as they had no frame of reference based on their professional experience on how to tackle the challenges of IBC management. In a sense, they were new to the experience, and this was the case for nine of the ten interviewees.

The three administrators who were local staff had previous experience with domestic universities. Their perspective on the differences between an IBC and a domestic campus also impacted their commitment as they could compare and contrast the pros and cons of being employed at a foreign entity. Interestingly, two expatriate administrators were alumni of their IBC's home campus. This may indicate that working for an IBC of their alma mater showed their attachment to the values and mission of their home university. This may also point to their propensity for wanting to work for an organization they were familiar with.

The voice of educated Westerners

The administrators were highly-educated: they all had degrees above the traditional American Bachelor's degree. It indicates that the positions at the mid-level and upper-level in IBCs probably require at least a high-school degree plus five years of higher education, which in some countries correspond to a Master's degree. The data reveals that administrators were educated in various fields of study and that there was no common area of interest.

Their nationality shows that the majority of participants were more likely to hold a "Western" perspective on ways of looking at the world because eight came from developed countries in North America and Europe.

<div align="center">

Perceived Organizational Support

</div>

This study revealed that the relationship with the home campus was a major factor in IBC administrators' organizational commitment and its influence was even greater than

the relationship with their host country. Basically, IBC administrators developed a belief

about how the home campus cared about their well-being at the branch level: their overall

assessment was that the home campus was somewhat supportive at best, often detached

and sometimes uncaring. Even administrators who worked for stable and thriving IBCs

reported the relationship with the home campus as somewhat problematic and as a source

of frustration. This finding relates to research on perceived organizational support (POS).

POS is a construct defined as employees' general belief about the extent to which

their organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger

et al., 1986). POS has been found to have important consequences on employee

performance and commitment. A meta-analysis of 70 studies indicated that high POS is

associated with increased job satisfaction, positive mood, reduced stress, increased

affective commitment, increased desire to remain in the organization, increased

performance and reduced turnover (Flynn & Kelloway, 1995; Rhoades and Eisenberger,

2002). A study from Fuller et al. (2006) found that higher education administrators value

POS more than faculty members. This is congruent with findings from IBC

administrators' interviews. POS was the main topic discussed when they were asked

about the factors influencing their organizational commitment.

Rhoades & Eisenberger's meta-analysis (2002) emphasizes that employees, who

perceive their organization as supportive, have higher levels of affective commitment.

Studies have also found that perceived organizational support had a significant impact on

expatriates' affective commitment, which in turn was linked to intentions of quitting their

147

international assignment (Guzzo et al., 1994; Shaffer et al., 2001; Liu & Ipe, 2010). Consistent with these findings, IBC administrators expressed how low POS split their own organizational commitment: two administrators shared that they were no longer committed to the administration but only to students. Many said that if their home campus were to take decisions against the branch campus' interest or would complicate their work, it would make them think about leaving their position.

As described in the literature, POS is a two-way phenomenon: employees with high POS level tend to reciprocate perceived support with increased commitment, loyalty and performance. Conversely, if organizational support is perceived as low, employees would have lower EOC. This was confirmed for the administrators who worked for IBCs with high environmental uncertainty. The administrator whose campus was closing had low commitment and the administrator who mentioned an impending take-over was "somewhat committed". Clearly, campus closure and take-over show a lack of commitment from the home campus. Because "it takes two to tango" as one of the administrators eloquently put it, EOC is damaged when the organization itself is not committed. These two administrators expressed this dynamic and their ambivalence when they both indicated they were committed to students, not to the administration. However, it does not explain why the other eight administrators said they were committed or very committed *despite* the fact that they rated their home campus' support as average or inadequate. This may show that although the relationship with the home campus is a

148

prevalent factor in their commitment, additional factors (presented in this section) influence their organizational commitment.

Interestingly, employees have been found to truly appreciate organizational support when the organization's behavior was discretionary rather than imposed by external constraints like labor laws or governmental regulations (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995). This means that when IBC administrators evaluate the home campus for POS, they would be attentive to discretionary treatment received by their home campus representatives. This was confirmed in the interviews as administrators mentioned the amount of freedom allowed on the job (be it small or large) and personal recognition from home campus representatives (or lack thereof). Confirming the research about genuine organizational support, one administrator questioned her organization's yearly employee recognition luncheons. She perceived them as superficial exercises because employee recognition was pretty much absent the rest of the year.

Eisenberg et al. (1997) reported that systematic differences in POS were found among employees who believed to be under high control of their organization. In a study by Aube et al. (2007), results show that the more control individuals feel they exercise over their work environment, the weaker the effect of POS on their level of affective commitment. Consistent with these empirical findings, this study found that the administrators' POS from the home campus was influenced by how tightly controlled the administrators felt. Working for a branch organization inherently places IBC administrators in a situation of being controlled by the home campus. During the

149

interviews, administrators talked about finding a balance between freedom to innovate and create at the branch campus while at the same time, respecting the home campus' rules and regulations.

Eisenberg et al (2002) found that support from high status supervisors strongly influences POS. This suggested that supervisors contribute to POS and, ultimately, to organizational commitment. This finding was corroborated by the administrators' interviews. Many mentioned the importance of being recognized by "the big boss" as an important factor of commitment and how much this type of recognition was lacking. They shared that they had a good relationship with their direct supervisor but that somehow, recognition from the home campus was central to their commitment. Their comments are in line with prior findings about POS from home organization versus POS from branch organization: expatriates do distinguish between POS from the home organization and the branch organization. However, the interviews did not confirm what POS research suggests about direct supervisor relationship at a branch organization. POS of home organization was found to be related to POS from direct supervisor (Danserearu et al, 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liu & Ipe, 2010). This means that a positive relationship with a direct supervisor would moderate an administrator's POS of the home campus. This was not the case for this study. All administrators, including those with high level of commitment, reported a good relationship with their direct supervisor but still rated POS from the home campus as fair or inadequate. One possible explanation for their strong commitment is the fact that many of the administrators were involved in their

IBC since inception. Their attachment to the branch may be even stronger than to the home campus because they put so much of their time and effort into the new venture. In this sense, their response about their level of commitment may be interpreted as how much they are committed to their branch campus, not necessarily to the home institution. This is not to say that they are uncommitted to the home campus. Indeed, several administrators mentioned they were proud to represent and promote their home institution and that they were "a great believer in the parent university" although they felt they did not get enough home support. This dichotomy was very present with the administrator whose branch campus was being taken over. Despite all the uncertainty of her environment and her negative perception of the home campus, she still stayed in her position because of her commitment to students. This shows that her commitment to the branch campus moderated the impact of home campus' low support and commitment. This hypothesis can be supported by research about employees working for multinational corporations. Employees tend to identify more with their subsidiary than with their home organization (Becker, 1992; Gregersen & Black, 1992; Reade, 2001; Zaccaro & Dobbins, 1989).

Finally, POS studies show that demographic characteristics like age, education, gender and tenure were not strongly related to POS. In line with these findings, data from the interviews did not point to a difference in the administrators' answers based on these criteria. Their POS was about the same across the board. This may also be partly explained by the relative homogeneity of the group as they were all highly educated, had

151

experience in higher education and most of them were in the same age range (between 30 and 49 years of age).

<p align="center">*Specific Organizational and Structural Characteristics*</p>

Compensation and career advancement

During the interviews, it became clear that IBC administrators were overall satisfied with their salary and benefits. One possible explanation for this fact is that people on international assignments are often motivated by financial incentives. A study of British academics and administrative staff working at campuses worldwide identified money as a primary driver of expatriation (Richardson & McKenna, 2001). Self-initiated expatriate academics were also found to be motivated by money and opportunities to change their life (Selmer & Lauring, 2010). As such, expatriates usually hold positions that pay well. This fact seems to be confirmed by the interviewees. The two IBC administrators who were less satisfied with their salary were a local resident and an immigrant. This may suggest that salary was probably not their main driver for working at an IBC, but most probably convenience and geographical proximity as they confirmed in the interviews.

A few of the administrators interviewed for this study expressed concerns about career advancement. This concern is consistent with findings from prior research. Indeed, research shows that expatriates worry about returning home to a position that under-employs them or is not challenging enough (Kraimer et al., 2009; Kohonen, 2008; Osman-Gani & Hyder, 2008).

<p align="center">152</p>

Expatriation studies also found that employees who see their international assignment as an opportunity for future career advancement are more likely to be satisfied on the job and tend to stay with their organization (Dunbar & Ehrlich, 1993; Feldman & Thomas, 1992; Kreng & Huang, 2009; Lazarova & Cerdin, 2007; Reiche et al., 2011; van der Heijden, van Engen, & Paauwe, 2009). It has been shown that the more repatriation support the home company provides, the more likely it will be able to retain its repatriates (Lazarova & Cerdin, 2007). Retention of IBC administrators is important for a university. Because they acquire valuable tacit knowledge during their assignments, they must be given the chance to transmit that knowledge to contribute to the organizational learning of their home university. Unfortunately, such knowledge is lost when repatriates leave their organization (Downes & Thomas, 1999; Lazarova & Tarique, 2005). Indeed, turnover rates among repatriates are high with an estimated 20 percent to 50 percent of repatriates leaving their corporations within one year of termination of the international assignment (Baruch et al., 2002; Stroh et al., 2000; Tyler, 2006; Yeaton & Hall, 2008). Turnover rates for higher education repatriates could not be found. Because repatriation concerns and perceived career advancement opportunities within the organization are predictors of turnover intentions, it is essential that university leaders focus on repatriation support and career support for IBC administrators. Such support programs will have a have a direct impact on employee satisfaction and intention to stay in the position (Rosser, 2004).

Campus size, growth phase and the role of perceived environmental uncertainty

153

Data collected from the interviews show that campus size and its growth phase shape how administrators make sense of their commitment and how they perceive environmental uncertainty. Respondents were mostly employed at small or medium-size campuses. Eight out the ten administrators worked for campuses with less than 800 students. The other two were employed at much larger branches enrolling three to four thousand students. Campus size was a factor in the way administrators related to students, faculty and staff, which in turn affected their commitment to the institution. For instance, administrators who worked for small campuses mentioned the close relationship they had with students and how their academic success was a rewarding and motivating factor in their daily work. They also mentioned campus size as positive factor on their commitment because they were given a lot of responsibilities, which made their job more interesting. These findings resonate with prior research on the effect of organizational size on employees. For instance, evidence shows that organizational size influences entrepreneurial competence and commitment (Sorensen & Phillips, 2011). Employees who work for smaller firms have more opportunities to become a Jack-of-All-Trades and develop entrepreneurial competencies. At the same time, administrators also perceived campus size as a challenging factor, which was certainly the case for employees at start-up branches and growing IBCs. They were concerned about growing their student enrollment and the difficulty to do so, which in turn created a high level uncertainty for the branch's future and their future as administrators. Administrators who worked for mature and large campuses did mention enrollments as a challenge but they did not

154

express the same level of uncertainty. They talked about it as an organizational challenge among others while administrators from young and small campuses framed it as an essential factor for the survival of their institution. Not surprisingly, the administrators who worked at a branch that was being closed or taken over reported higher level of environmental uncertainty. No previous empirical research could be found to validate the administrators' perception about campus size and its effect on environmental uncertainty. Nevertheless, results from this study point to the fact that perceived environmental uncertainty affected *all* administrators. This may be explained by the fact that working for an IBC is inherently risky (American Council on Education, 2008; Becker, 2009; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007) and as such, all IBC employees face many challenges to start and grow a branch campus, be it small or large.

Conclusion to Interviews Analysis

As presented in chapter 1, the theoretical framework of this study was that organizational identity affects how higher education administrators perceive their commitment to their international branch campus. It is based on the premise that organizational interactions and processes shape employees' perception of their organization. Their individual perceptions affect their reactions and motivation. It assumed that when individuals identify with and extend effort towards organizational goals and values, organizational commitment occurs.

Organizational identity theory proved to be a useful construct in explaining this dynamic. The collected data supported the theory's premise that an employee's response

155

to one's organization is influenced by the degree to which he or she identifies with the organization. The data collected for this study confirms this empirical assumption: IBC administrators' commitment to their branch campus is influenced by their perception of the home campus. The data is in line with the assumption that identity is an aspect of psychological processes that take place within the minds of individuals but it is also a relational construct formed in interaction with others (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). IBC administrators' perception of the home campus was based on interactions with its leadership, but was also a psychological interpretation of its actions. This was the case for the relationship with the host country as well but to a lesser extent. While the challenges of working in a different country did impact the administrators' commitment, they framed it as an expected and accepted part of their job. However, they perceived their difficulties with the home campus as unnecessary and incongruent. This dichotomy between their assessment of the home campus and the host country support the theory that organizational identification is not only formed out of interactions but also out of psychological processes (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; O'Reilly, 1989).

The interviews also reinforced the dual identification theory: at an IBC, administrators are simultaneously members of their branch campus and of their home campus. Evidence suggests that although they identified with both units, they drew a distinction and attached to each unit in different ways. In this case, IBC administrators were more attached to their branch than their home organization. This resulted in strong

commitment to their branch campus. Applying the organizational employee commitment definition, they indeed believed and accepted their IBC goals and values; they exerted effort on behalf of their IBC and had a strong desire to remain a member of their branch campus (Porter et al., 1974). At the same time, they identified less with the home campus because they perceived the home campus as less supportive than they expected it to be. This was particularly evident with administrators working in environments with a high level of uncertainty. For all administrators, it resulted in mixed patterns of commitment towards the home institution.

CHAPTER 5:

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The creation of international branch campuses (IBC) has been a recent and significant development in international higher education, with a 23% increase of branches in the last three years for a total of 200 IBCs worldwide (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). Despite this growth, there is a dearth of research on employees managing these new operations. To fill this gap, this doctoral study featured IBC higher education administrators. This work was based on a mixed-methods design to measure and explain organizational commitment of international branch campus administrators. Organizational identity was the theoretical construct of this dissertation.

The goals of this research study were twofold. Its first purpose was to measure the level of organizational commitment among upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators at international branch campuses. It also explored the relationship between specific organizational variables, personal characteristics and levels of organizational commitment.

To answer the research questions, an Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979) was completed by 205 administrators.

The research questions were:

1. What is the level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators?

Answer: The level of organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators is average.

2. What are the differences in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level administrators?

Answer: There is no significant difference in levels of organizational commitment between non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level administrators.

3. What is the relationship between selected organizational variables and personal characteristics with organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper-level and mid-level higher education administrators?

Answer: There may be a relationship between one organizational variable (campus size) and organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators. Administrators working for large campuses (with over 1,000 students) have significantly higher levels of commitment than administrators working for small campuses (with less than 50 students). However, because of the modest size of the small campus group, this result is inconclusive.

No other relationship was found between organizational variables and personal characteristics with organizational commitment of non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators.

The second goal of this study was to investigate and describe how upper-level and mid-level administrators perceived their organizational commitment to their international branch campus. More specifically, it sought to uncover how perceived environmental uncertainty, organizational and personal characteristics influence their organizational commitment. To answer the research questions, ten administrators were interviewed. The research questions were:

4. How do non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators make sense of their organizational commitment in the context of perceived environmental uncertainty?

Answer: Based on the 10 interviewed IBC administrators, their level of organizational commitment was found to be mostly influenced by the parent institution's actions. The relationship with the home campus was the primary factor influencing their commitment. Other factors, such as the challenges of operating in a foreign country, do influence their commitment too, but in a lesser way. Administrators were affected by the home institution's lack of commitment towards their IBC and were sensitive to how the parent institution defined the branch campus' legitimacy. Their frustrations came from the home campus' lack of awareness and its disconnect to the branch campus. At the individual level, administrators pointed to a lack of recognition and of vision in planning their professional future. These remarks were made by administrators working in environments with high, medium and low uncertainty levels.

5. In what ways do selected organizational variables and personal characteristics influence how non-faculty IBC upper and mid-level higher education administrators perceive their organizational commitment?

Answer: Based on the 10 interviewed IBC administrators' comments, their commitment was found to be influenced by six personal characteristics: they are people who are challenge-driven, tenacious, hard-workers, who have strong work ethics, and like working in a diverse environment but at the same time are limited by personal circumstances. In addition, four organizational variables were found to influence their commitment: the nature of subsidiary work, campus size and growth phase, economic factors and career advancement motivations.

Discussion

This study Confirmed Previous Research Findings on

Organizational Commitment

The findings of the study clearly indicate and confirm that IBC administrators' employee organizational commitment is a complex phenomenon. One cannot point to one determining factor that will make an administrator more or less committed, although some factors are more prevalent than others. In the case of administrators working at international branch campuses, perceived environmental uncertainty (PEU) and perceived home campus support (POS) seemed to be the most important ones. However, every administrator brings unique personal and professional characteristics to the branch campus that mitigate PEU and POS. Combined with these different factors is the

presence of dual identification processes that allows administrators to split their commitment between the branch and the home campus. This research study highlighted this dynamic and supported it with clear evidence.

The study also revealed that the EOC level of IBC administrators is average. This finding was in line with other studies of university administrators. However, considering that working for an IBC requires a high level of commitment, it would improve branch campuses' chances of success if their administrators had higher levels of commitment. At least, the study showed that IBC administrators did *not* have low level of commitments, which would have been even more problematic.

Finding that campus size may be a factor in commitment was an inconclusive result in both this study and others. As such, one may only speculate that size would affect commitment because the level of stress, frustration and uncertainty that inherently come with working for a start-up operation.

Finally, the quantitative part of this doctoral work did *not* confirm many of the significant factors that predict organizational commitment, in particular age, gender, education, marital status, experience, rank (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). It also did *not* uncover new significant factors that were tested in this work. They were: nationality and identical nationality (respondents who have the same nationality as their home campus'), residency status (immigrant, expatriate, local resident) and host country location. One may speculate that sample size may have been a reason explaining this absence of significance, especially for the variables that have been found significant by previous

studies but not in this work. It may also mean that nationality, residency and host country location may not be predictors of EOC.

The qualitative part of this study did *not* confirm that age, gender, education, marital status, experience, rank, nationality, field of study, area of expertise were influencing factors of commitment. However, it did confirm other factors that are categorized as antecedents and correlates of EOC in the literature. They were: family constraints, residency status, work ethics and values, appreciation for diversity, personal qualities, host country characteristics and organizational characteristics. Organizational size, which is classified as an antecedent in the literature, did influence EOC but in an indirect way because it was linked to administrators' perceived level of environmental uncertainty. The model below presents a conceptual overview of these findings for IBC administrators' employee organizational commitment. This model, adapted from Mathieu & Zajac's work, is novel because it integrates POS and PEU as correlates of EOC for IBC administrators.

Table 24

Classification of Selected Antecedents and Correlates of Organizational Commitment for Upper-Level and Mid-level International Branch Campus Administrators

ANTECEDENTS		CORRELATES	EOC
Personal characteristics (Age) (Gender) (Education) (Marital status) (Experience) (Nationality) (Identical nationality) (Field of study) (Area of expertise) Residency status** Personal constraints** Work ethics & values** Appreciation for diversity** Challenge-driven** Tough to criticism**	**Environmental characteristics** Host country type** Host country location** Host country history & politics** Host country higher education landscape** Host country laws** Host country language & culture** **Organizational characteristics** (Rank) Campus size*** Role of economics** Career advancement** Task autonomy** Challenge** Job scope** Skill variety** Nature of subsidiary work**	**PEU** **(Perceived Environmental Uncertainty)** IBCs with low levels of PEU: mature and thriving IBCs** IBCs with medium levels of PEU: growing IBCs** IBCs with high levels of PEU; start-ups, struggling and closing IBCs** **POS** **(Perceived Organizational Support)** Home campus' lack of awareness** Home campus' level of commitment** Home campus leadership** Home campus' employee development strategy**	**Employee Organizational Commitment** IBC administrators scored an average level of organizational commitment*

Adapted from Mathieu & Zajac's *Classification of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment* model (1990)

(…) indicates that it is not a significant factor in the survey and it is not an influencing factor in the interviews
*indicates it is a significant factor in survey only
**indicates it is an influencing factor in interviews only
*** indicates that it is a significant factor in the survey and it is an influencing factor in the interviews

This Study Contributed New Data to an Under-Researched Population

This dissertation's greatest contribution is in IBC research. First, it provides important biographical data about IBC administrators which has not been collected before. It shows that IBC's workforce composition is diverse. It includes immigrants, local residents with a preponderance of expatriates. Among the latter, there are expatriates who are home campus transfers and self-initiated expatriates untied to the home campus. This diversity in employee type is of importance because administrators have various needs dependent on their residency status, which in turn affects commitment. For instance, self-initiated expatriates and local residents may relate to the home campus differently because they have not been acculturated the same way home-grown administrators have. If expatriates and local residents perceive the home campus is not reciprocating their commitment, it will affect their performance and intention to stay at the branch campus.

Finally, data collected for this study shows that the job of IBC administrator is a balancing act. On one end, the home campus' expectations need to be managed while on the other end, administrators need to comply with their host country's regulations and navigate a foreign education system. This dissertation highlighted the complexity of their task and the choices they have to make to carry their duties.

This Study Provided a Multi-Dimensional Perspective on Organizational

Commitment of IBC Administrators

166

The strength of this work was to provide a complete picture of EOC and IBC administrators by using mixed-methods. The interplay of survey and interviews enriched the findings and the analysis process. When one aspect of the problem was missed in one method, it was found in the other method. For instance, when administrators self-classified as upper-level in the survey, the researcher understood why after finishing the interviews. Because of the nature of IBC work, employees were more inclined to rank themselves at a higher level. The survey alone could not have explained this discrepancy. Another example among others, was with levels of commitment. Based on the interviews alone, it looked like IBC administrators were highly committed except for those with high levels of PEU. However, the survey provided support for an average level of commitment, which allowed the researcher to infer that commitment level needs to be addressed in order to improve IBCs' chances of success.

<center>Limitations</center>

There were several limitations of this research that need to be addressed.

First, was the absence of Iranian IBC administrators in both the interviews and the survey sample. The interviews included administrators from the United States, France, the United Kingdom, India, Australia, Malaysia and Canada (7 out of the 8th largest exporters of IBCs). Although every effort was made to include Iran, which is the 7th largest exporter of IBC (OBHE report, 2012), it proved impossible to do so. Second, 68 of the 200 IBCs listed in the report could not be surveyed. In addition to Iran, these missing international branches were predominantly from France, India, Malaysia and

Uganda. The third limitation was the sample size for the survey. Considering that the survey request came from a doctoral student with no affiliation to IBCs, a return of 205 questionnaires was honorable. However, this was still a modest sample size, which may have limited statistical power, especially for results about the factors influencing EOC. Fourth, the survey design involved some minor flaws: the identical-nationality-question was poorly crafted which resulted in a high rate of missing data; the nationality question and host country questions were open-ended. It resulted in a large number of answers. Because more answers for each question mean more opportunity for errors, it would have been valuable to have a multiple-choice answer for this question, to categorize the different nationalities and host countries by geographical area; the OCQ used American phrasing that may have biased and impaired some respondents' ability to understand the questions and give accurate answers. In addition, the researcher believes some respondents may have forwarded the survey invitation to other administrators, which may have introduced some bias into the data's integrity.

As for limitations regarding the interviews, it is important to note that most of the participants were from developed nations, and the views from administrators from developing countries were limited, which again, could have introduced some bias.

Finally, the researcher's professional and personal background may have biased results' analysis and interpretation by being sympathetic to the expatriation experience.

Despite these limitations, this study still made important contributions to the body of literature on the employee organizational commitment and international branch campuses.

Implications and Recommendations

Based on the previous discussion, the implications of the findings are:

- IBC administrators' commitment is a multi-dimensional construct, which is influenced by numerous factors. As such, improving commitment entails addressing not one but many aspects of its components such as home campus perceived level of support, career advancement and leadership relationships among others.

- Organizational support is vital to the success of international assignments. The home campus relationship with the branch campus needs to be cultivated.

- IBC administrators' workforce is diverse: immigrants, expatriates and local residents working at IBCs have different needs.

- Because of the dual identification phenomenon, it cannot be assumed that the factors promoting identification with the home campus domestically will also promote identification at the international branch campus level.

These implications give rise to recommendations for policy and practice.

Recommendations for Policy

- Design human resources policies that include all three phases of expatriation: pre-departure preparation, home and branch campus support during the assignment and repatriation support.

- Create human resources policies that take into account the IBC's stage of development as employee support and needs will vary throughout the process, be it for a branch in growth or in decline.

- Develop policies that credibly demonstrate the home campus values international experience of its administrators by having a career advancement plan upon their return.

- Assess branch campus perception of the home campus and address areas that need to be improved.

- Devise plans to enhance perceptions of organizational support.

- Devise plans to enhance communication with the branch campus.

- Put policies in place that increase branch campus administrators' level of input in decisions made at the home campus level.

- Differentiate employee recognition programs by organizational level: employees should be recognized separately by both the home campus and the branch campus leadership.

- For administrators working in environments with high levels of uncertainty (such as start-ups), devise financial reward plans to recognize achieved goals and foster employee retention.

Recommendations for Practice

- Prepare administrators to expatriation with pre-departure preparations that address professional and personal needs (like family support).

- During the assignment, offer performance appraisal systems, personal and professional development opportunities.

- During the assignment, offer mentoring programs to prepare the expatriate for re-entry.

- Schedule systematic trips to and from the home campus to create more personal relationships with the IBC staff.

- Schedule regular all-IBC staff meetings with home campus management via online conferencing.

- Set-up training visits to the home campus for local residents and self-initiated expatriates to acculturate them into the home campus' values and traditions.

- Offer re-entry career development planning at the start of the international assignment.

- Promote high commitment for all employees with pay for performance plans.

- Communicate employee achievement internally, both at the branch level and most importantly, at the home campus level via e-mail, memos and university website.

- Increase visibility by publicizing personal and organizational achievement at the external level via newspapers, advertising and higher education publications.

Suggestions for Future Research

Further research may try to eliminate some of the weaknesses of the current study as well as extend its scope. For instance, the sample for the survey could be enlarged and include administrators from Iran. The present work could be replicated and expanded by adding entry-level administrators to check if results would be equivalent.

Also, further research is needed about the relationship between POS and IBC administrators' commitment.

Because research on self-initiated expatriates is sparse (Bonache et al., 2001), it may be of interest to study the difference between this population and local residents and expatriates sent from the home campus to investigate how it affects the workplace of IBCs. Furthermore, future studies may want to focus on repatriation of IBC administrators because repatriation is an under-researched topic (Bonache et al., 2001).

An additional area worthy of investigation could be the organizational identification patterns of local residents and self-initiated expatriates versus those of expatriates sent from the home campus.

It would also be interesting to conduct more research on the role of campus size in organizational commitment.

Finally, the following research questions are presented to stimulate the investigation of IBC administrators:

172

- What are the different levels of support provided by universities to their employees working at IBCs?

- In what ways does the EOC of self-initiated expatriate administrators differ from home campus transfer expatriates and nationals?

- In what ways does EOC differ between IBC administrators working at large size campuses and those working for start-up branches?

REFERENCES

Abelson, M. A., & Sheridan, J. E. (1981). Catastrophe model of employee withdrawal leading to job termination among nursing home staff. Paper presented at the *National Academy of Management Meetings*, San Diego**.**

Agarwal, S., & Ramaswami, S. N. (1992). Choice of organizational form in foreign markets: A transaction cost perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Academy of International Business*, Brussels.

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. (Eds.). (2000). Organizational identity and identification: charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Journal, 25*, 13–17.

Albert, S. *, &* Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. *In* L. L. Cummings *&* B. M. Staw*(Eds.),* Research in organizational behavior (*Vol. 7, pp.* 263-295*).* Greenwich, CT*:* JAI Press*.*

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.

Allison, P.D. (2001) *Missing Data*. Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative

    Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-136. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Altbach, P. (July 15, 2011). The Branch Campus Bubble? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved

    fromhttp://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/07/15/essay_on_the_challenges_

    facing_international_branch_campuses

Altbach, P.G. (2009).Why branch campuses may be unsustainable. *International Higher*

    Education, 58, (Winter 2010). Center for International Higher Education, Boston

    College.

Altbach, P. G. (2007). Tradition and transition: the international imperative in higher

    education. *Center for International Higher Education.*

Altbach, P.G. (2004). Higher education crosses borders. *Change*, (2), 18-25.

Altbach, P. G. (2002). Knowledge and education as international commodities.

    International Higher Education, 28, 2-5.

Altbach, P.G. & Knight J., (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education:

    Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11(3),

    290-305.

175

American Council on Education (2008). *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses.* Washington, DC.

Anderson, J. E., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Morrell, J. S. (2000). Factors that influence satisfaction for student affairs administrators. *New Directions for Institutional Research,* 105, 99-110.

Anderson, T. N., Jr., & Kida, T. E. (1985). The effect of environmental uncertainty on the association of expectancy attitudes, effort, and performance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125: 631-636.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-13.

Armeli, S., Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Lynch, P. (1998). Perceived organizational support and police performance: The moderating influence of socio-emotional needs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 288-297.

Ashforth, B.E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20–39.

Aubé, C., Rousseau, V., Morin, E., (2007). Perceived organizational support and
organizational commitment: The moderating effect of locus of control and work
autonomy, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22 (5), 479-495.

Bailey, W. R., & Schwenk, A. E. (1980). Wage rate variation by size of establishment.
Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 19(2), 192-198.

Baruch, Y. & Altman, Y. (2002). Expatriation and repatriation in MNCs: a taxonomy,
Human Resource Management, 41(2), 239-59.

Bateman, T., & Strasser, S. (1983). A cross-lagged regression test of the relationship
between job tension and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
68, 439-445.

Becker, H. S. (1960) Notes on the concept of commitment. *The American Journal of
Sociology*. 66, 32-42.

Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: are they distinctions worth making?
Academy of management Journal, *35*(1), 232-244.

Becker Rosa (2009). *International Branch Campuses: Markets and Strategies*. London: Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE).

Becker, T.E., Billings, R.S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N.L. (April, 1996). Foci and Bases of Employee Commitment: Implications for Job Performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 464-482

Beerkens, E. & Van der Wende, M. (2001). *The paradox in international cooperation: Institutionally embedded universities in a global environment.*

Begley, T.M. & Czajka, J.M. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 78 (4), 552-6.

Bess, J. L. & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice.* Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Blau, G.J. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 277-288.

Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). The theories of turnover: Causes, effects, and meaning, *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 1, 75 - 128.

Bok, D. (2003) Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education. *New Jersey: Princeton University Press.*

Bonache*,* J., Brewster*,* C. & Suutari*, V. (2001*). Expatriation: a developing research agenda. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 43 (1), 3–20.

Brett, J. F., Cron, W. L. & Slocum, J. W. (1995). Economic dependency on work: A moderator of the relationship between organizational commitment and performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 261-271.

Breton, G., & Lambert, M. (2003). *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust*. Université Laval.

British Council (2013). The shape of things to come: the evolution of transnational education: data, definitions, opportunities and impacts analysis. Going Global 2013. Retrieved from https://ihe.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/import-content/the_shape_of_things_to_come_2.pdf

Brown, D., & Sargeant, M. (2007). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and religious commitment of full-time university employees. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*. 2007, 16(2), p211-241.

Brown, S.P. (1996), A meta-analysis and review of organisational research on job involvement, *Psychological Bulletin*, 120 (2), pp.235-55.

Brooks, J. L., & Seers, A. (1991). Predictors of organizational commitment: Variations across career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 38(1), 53-64.

Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. (1995), Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468-78.

Caligiuri P.M. (1997). Assessing expatriate success: Beyond just "being there." In Saunders DM, Aycan Z (Eds.), *New approaches* to *employee management,* 4, 117-140. Greenwich, CT*:* JAI Press.

Canaan, J. E. & Wesley, S. (2008): *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University,* New York: Routledge.

Cheney, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification, *Communication Monographs,* 50, 343–362.

Cheney, G. & Tompkins, P. K. (1987). Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. *Central States Speech Journal*, 38(1), 1-15.

Chew, I., *& Zhu, W. (2002).* Factors influencing Singapore managers' international aspiration. *Career Development International*, 7, 96-108.

Choudaha, Rahul. (2012, August 05). Could MOOCs lead to the decline of branch campuses? *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120731104930428

Coble, D. F. (2004) Employee commitment and organizational influences: A study of the ways in which tenure, work group, and job level influence employee commitment. Ph.D. diss., Fielding Graduate Institute,

http://search.proquest.com/docview/305049968?accountid=14678 (accessed
November 13, 2013).

Cohen, A. (1991). Career stage as a moderator of the relationships between
organizational commitment and its outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of
Occupational Psychology,* 64, 253-268.

Colarelli, S.M., Dean, R.A. & Konstans, C. (1987). Comparative effects of personal and
situational influences on job outcome of new professionals. *Journal of Applied
Psychology,* 72**,** 558–566.

Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S.J., Wall, T.D., & Warr, P.B. (1981). The experience of work A
compendium and review of 249 measures and their use. London Academic Press.

Currie, J., & Newson, J. A. (1998). *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*.
Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W., (February 1975) A vertical dyad linkage
approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation
of the role making process, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,
Volume 13(1), 46-78.

DeCotiis, T.A. & Summers, T.P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*. 40, 445-470.

Deem, R. & Brehony, K. (2005) Management as ideology: the case of new managerialism in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217–235

Denholm, Andrew (2012, September 07). Equality call for lecturers in overseas campuses. *The Herald Scotland*. Retrieved from http://www.heraldscotland.com/news/education/equality-call-for-lecturers-in-overseas-campuses.18816645

Denman, B. (2002). *Globalization and its impact on international university cooperation.* Retrieved April 16, 2008 from: http://globalization.icaap.org/content/v2.1/04_denman.html

Dhaka Tribune (2013, August 31). Foreign university policy finalized. *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130830183821645

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Dillman, D. (2007). *Mail and Internet surveys: the tailored design method*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Downes, M. & Thomas, A. (1999). Managing overseas assignments to build organizational knowledge. *Human Resource Planning*, 22 (4) 33–48.

Dubin, R., Champoux, J.E. & Porter, L.W. (1975). Central life interests and organizational commitment of blue-collar and clerical workers. A*dministrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 411-421.

Dukerich, J. M., Golden, B. R., & Shortell, S. M. (2002). Beauty is in the eye of the beholder: the impact of organizational identification, identity, and image on the cooperative behaviors of physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 507–533.

Dunbar, E., & Ehrlich, M. H. (1993). Preparation of the international employee: Career and consultation needs. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 45, 18-24.

Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 370-380.

Dunn, L. F. (1986). Work disutility and compensating differentials: Estimation of factors in the link between wages and firm size. *The review of Economics and Statistics*, 67-73.

Dutton, J. & Dukerich, J. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 517–54.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239–263.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Ameli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I., Rhoades, L. (June 2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 87(3), 565-573.

Farrugia, C. A., & Lane, J. E. (2012). Legitimacy in Cross-Border Higher Education: Identifying Stakeholders of International Branch Campuses. *Journal of Studies in International Education*.

Feldman, D., & Thomas, D. (1992). Career management issues facing expatriates. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23, 271-293.

Ferris, K. R. (1977). Perceived uncertainty and job satisfaction in the accounting environment. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 2, 23-28.

Ferris, K. R. (1982). Perceived environmental uncertainty, organizational adaptation, and employee performance: A longitudinal study in professional accounting firms. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 7, 13-26.

Fischer, K. (2012, May 6). What's in a Name? For Yale in Singapore, a Whole Lot. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Whats-in-a-Name-For-Yale-in/131794/?sid=wb&utm_source=wb&utm_medium=en

Fuller, J.B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., & Relyea, C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and perceived external prestige: predicting organizational attachment for university faculty, staff, and administrators, *Journal of Social Psychology* , 146, 327-347.

Gellatly, I.R. (1995). Individual and group determinants of employee absenteeism: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 16**,** 469–485.

Gibson, J., & Stillman, S. (2009). Why do big firms pay higher wages? Evidence from an international database. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *91*(1), 213-218.

Gordon, M. E., Philpot, J. W., Burt, R. E., Thompson, C. A., & Spiller, W. E. (1980). Commitment to the union: Development of a measure and an examination of its correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph*, 65, 479-499.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, *6*(2), 219-247.

Green, M.F. (2002). Joining the world: The challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education. *Change*, 34(3), 13-21.

Green, M., Kinser K. & Eckel, P.D. (2008) On the Ground Overseas: U.S. Degree

    Programs and Branch Campuses Abroad, *American Council on Education*,

    Washington D.C.

Gregersen, H. B., & Black, J. S. (1992). Antecedents to commitment to a parent company

    and a foreign operation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*, 65–90.

Gul, F., & Chia, Y. (1994). The effects of management accounting systems, perceived

    environmental uncertainty and decentralization on managerial performance: a test

    of a three-way interaction. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 19(4/5), 413–

    426.

Guruz, K. (2008) *Higher education and student mobility in the global knowledge*

    economy. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the

    psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 617– 626

Harding, L. M., & Lammey, R. W. (2011). Operational considerations for opening a

    branch campus abroad. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 155, 65-78.

Harshbarger, D. B. (1988). Assessing faculty commitment at four doctoral-granting universities. Ph.D. diss., The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, http://search.proquest.com/docview/303576672?accountid=14678 (accessed November 12, 2013).

Holopainen, J. & Björkman, I. (2002): The personality of the successful expatriate: A critical review of the literature and an empirical investigation. In Larimo, J. (ed.): Current European Research in International Business. Vaasa: Vaasan Yliopiston Julkaisuja: 284-300.

IAU Global Report Survey (2005) *Internationalisation of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges*. Paris.

Institute of International Education (2007). *Open Doors 2007: Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York.

Iverson, R.D. (1996). Employee acceptance of organizational change: the role of organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7(1), 122-49.

Jaros, S. T., Jermier, J. M., Koehler, J. W., & Sinich, T. (1993). Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equation models. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 951-995.

Jaschik, S. (2013, March 5). Branch Anxieties. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/03/05/educators-consider-future-international-branch-campuses

Jason, L. & Kinser, K. (January 2, 2013). Looking ahead: 5 international trends for 2013. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Jenvey, N. (2013, September 14). Laureate "buys" Australian campus in South Africa. *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130913162033720

Jermier, J. M., & Berkes, L. J. (1979). Leader behavior in a police command bureaucracy: A closer look at the quasi-military model. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 1-23.

Johanson, J., & Vahlne J.-E. (1977). The Internationalization Process of the Firm: A

    Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitment,

    Journal of International Business Studies, 8 (1), 23–32.

Jones, B., Flynn, D. M., & Kelloway, E. K. (1995). Perception of Support from the

    Organization in Relation to work stress, satisfaction, and commitment,

    Organizational Risk Factors for Job Stress, Washington D.C.: American

    Psychologial Association, 41-52.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment

    Mechanisms in Utopian Communities. *American Sociological Review* 33, 499-

    517.

Ketchand, A.A, & Strawser, J.R (2001). Multiple dimensions of organizational

    commitment: implications for future accounting research. *Behavioral Research in*

    Accounting, 13,1-26.

Ketchand A.A., & J.R. Strawser (1998). The existence of multiple measures of

    organizational commitment and experience-related differences in a public

    accounting setting, *Behavioral Research in Accounting.* 10, 109–137.

King, R., & Bjarnason, S. (2004). *The university in the global age*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Kinser, K., & Levy, D. C. (2006). For-profit higher education: US tendencies, international echoes. In *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 107-119). Springer Netherlands.

Knight, J. (1997). Internationalization of higher education: A conceptual framework. In J.Knight and H. de Wit (Eds.). Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries (5-19). Amsterdam: European Association for International EducationPublications.

Knight, J. (2002). The impact of GATS and trade liberalization in higher education. In S. Uvalic-Trumbic (Ed.). *Globalization and the market in higher education*, 191-212, UNESCO.

Knight, J. (2003) *Higher education and trade agreements; what are the policy implications?* (81-105) in Breton, G., Lambert, M., & Université Laval.Universities and globalization: private linkages, public trust. Université Laval, Economica.

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.

Kohonen, E. (2008). The impact of international assignments on expatriates' identity and

    career aspirations: Reflections upon re-entry. *Scandinavian Journal of*

    Management, 24, 320-329.

Konovsky, M. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing

    as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, 76, 698-707.

Kraimer, M. L., Shaffer, M. A., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). The influence of expatriate and

    repatriate experiences on career advancement and repatriate retention. *Human*

    Resource Management, 48, 27-47.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of educational and social science research: An*

    Integrated approach (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Kreng, V., & Huang, M. (2009). A discussion on international assignments performance

    and the constructing mechanism of career success development. *International*

    Journal of Human Resource Management, 20, 1487-1502.

Lane, J. E., & Kinser, K. (2013). Five Models of International Branch Campus Facility

    Ownership. *International Higher Education*, *70*, 9-11.

Lane, J. E. (2011). Global expansion of international branch campuses: Managerial and leadership challenges. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2011*(155), 5-17.

Lane, J.E. & Kinser, K. (Eds.). (2011). Multi-national colleges & universities: leadership, administration, and governance of international branch campuses. (New Directions for Higher Education). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawton, W., & Katsomitros, A. (2012). International branch campuses: Data and developments. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*.

Lazarova, M. B., & Cerdin, J. L. (2007). Revisiting repatriation concerns: organizational support versus career and contextual influences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *38*(3), 404-429.

Lazarova, M., Westman, M., & Shaffer, M. (2010). Elucidating the positive side of the work–family interface on international assignments: A model of expatriate work and family performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 93-117.

Lazarova, M., & Tarique, I. (2005). Knowledge transfer upon repatriation. *Journal of World Business*, *40*(4), 361-373.

Lewin, T. (December 28, 2009). *University branches in Dubai are struggling.* Retrieved

    April 15, 2010 , from http://melibeeglobal.com/2010/01/ny-times-article-dubai-

    campuses-are-struggling/)

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindsey, U. (2013, November 18). Qatar Sets Its Own Terms for U.S. Universities. *The*

    Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Qatar-

    Welcomes-American/143087/?cid=wb&utm_source=wb&utm_medium=en

Luton, B. (2010). *Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment: A*

    Study of UNC System Business School Department Chairs. ProQuest LLC. 789

    East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, & M., Aheame, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and

    consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of*

    Marketing, 62, 87-98.

McBurnie, G. & Ziguras, C (2007) *Transnational Education: Current issues and*

    future trends in offshore higher education, London: RoutledgeFalmer.

McInnis, C. (1998). Academics and professional administrators in australian universities:

Dissolving boundaries and new tensions. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management, 20*(2), 161-173.

Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education*, 52, 1-39.

Marginson, S. (March 28, 2010). *Research: a force for globalization*. Retrieved April 15, 2010, from

http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20100326113121559

Marginson, S.& Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: a gloconal agency heuristic. *Higher Education.* 43, 281-309

Marsh, R. M. & Mannari, H. (1977) Organizational commitment and turnover: a predictive study. *Administrative Science Quaterly*, 22, 57-75.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mathieu, J.E. & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171–194.

Mayer, R. C. & Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production

    outcomes through a two-dimensional model of organizational commitment,

    Academy of Management Journal, 35, 671-684.

Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1998). Differentiating antecedents of organizational

    commitment: A test of March and Simon's model. *Journal of Organizational*

    Behavior, 19, 15-28.

Mazzarol, T., Norman Soutar, G., & Sim Yaw Seng, M. (2003). The third wave: future

    trends in international education. *The International Journal of Education*

    Management, 17(3), 90-99.

Meehan, M. J. (2001). Decision-making and organizational commitment: A comparison

    of faculty perceptions at unionized and non-unionized private colleges and

    universities. Ph.D. dissertation, Seton Hall University.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*.

    San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, (1997) Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and

    Application *Advanced Topics in Organizational Behavior.*

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of

   organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1,* 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational

   commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied*

   Psychology, 69, 372-378.

Meyer, J. P**.**, & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general

   model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D**.**, & Jackson, D. N. (1989).

   Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the

   commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 152-156.

Milliken, F.J., (1987). Three types of perceived uncertainty about environment: state,

   effect, and response uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review* 12 (1), 133–

   143.

Mills, A. (December 14, 2009). *Economic Crisis in Dubai Hits American Branch Campuses*. Retrieved April 15 from http://www.careernetwork.com/article/Economic-Crisis-in-Dubai-Hits/49489/).

Mishra, A. (2013, September 12). Access for foreign campus as legislation "abandoned". *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130912115621960

Moates, W. H., & Kulonda, D. J. (1990). An examination of differences between supervisors in large and small companies. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *28*(3), 27-36.

Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 6,* 209-225.

Morris. J.H. & Sherman, J.D. (1981) Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *Academy of Management Journal,* 24, 512-526.

Morshidi. S. et al (May 21, 2009). Trade in services and its policy implications: the case
of cross-border/transnational higher education in Malaysia. *Journal of Studies in
International Education OnlineFirst.*

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of
organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*(2), 224-247.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L.W. & Dubin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors,
and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behavior
and Human Performance*, 12, 231-248.

Mowday, R.T. Porter, L.W. & Steers R. M. (1982) *Employee-organization linkages: the
psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic
Press.

Naidoo, V. (Winter 2010). *Transnational higher education: why it happens and who
benefits?* CIHE Newsletter, Number 58.

Neave, G. (2001) The European dimension in higher education: An excursion into the
modern use of historical analogues. In: Jeroen Huisman, Peter Maassen and Guy
Neave (eds) *Higher Education and the Nation State*. (13-75) Oxford: Pergamon.

Odin, J. K., & Manicas, P. T. (2004). *Globalization and higher education*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

OECD (2004). On the edge: securing a sustainable future for higher education. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. In McBurnie, G. & Ziguras, C (2007, p.38-39) *Transnational Education: Current Issues and Future Trends in Offshore Higher Education*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.

OECD (2009) Educational Research and Innovation *Higher Education to 2030*, Volume 2, Globalisation. OECD Publishing.

O'Reilly, C, & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499.

Osman-Gani, A. A. M., & Hyder, A. S. (2008). Repatriation readjustment of international managers: An empirical analysis of HRD interventions. *Career Development International*, 13, 456-475.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45,* 849-874.

Penley, L.E., Gould, S. (1988). Etzioni's model of organizational involvement: a

perspective for understanding commitment to organizations. *Journal of
Organizational Behavior*, 9, 43-59.

Porter, L.W.,Crampon, W. & Smith, F. (1976). Organizational commitment and

managerial turnover: A longitudinal study. *Organizational Behavior and Human
Performance*, 15, 87-98.

Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T. & Boulian, P.V. (1974) Organizational

commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians.
Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.

Reade, C. (2001). Dual identification in multinational corporations: Local managers and

their psychological attachment to the subsidiary versus the global organization.
International Journal of Human Resource Management, *12*(3), 405-424.

Redden, E. (2013, March 11). Global Ambitions. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from

http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/03/11/nyu-establishes-campuses-and-
sites-around-globe

Reiche, B., Kraimer, M., & Harzing, A. (2011). Why do international assignees stay? An organizational embeddedness perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42, 521-544.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465-476.

Reilly, N. P., & Orsak, C. L. (1991). A career stage analysis of career and organizational commitment in nursing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39,* 311-330.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698-714.

Rhodes, S. R., & Steers, R. M. (1981) Conventional vs. worker-owned organizations. *Human Relations*, 34, 1013-1035.

Rhoads, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2006). *The university, state, and market : The political economy of globalization in the Americas.* Stanford University Press.

Richardson*, J., & Zikic, J. (2007)* The darker side of an international academic career, *Career Development International*, Vol. 12 (2) 164 -186.

Richardson, J., McKenna, S.(2002). Leaving and experiencing: why academics expatriate and how they experience expatriation. *Career Development International*, 7 (2), 67 - 78

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 257-266.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). A national study on midlevel leaders in higher education: The unsung professionals in the academy. *Higher Education, 48*(3), 317-337.

Rotondi, T. (1975). Organizational identification: Issues and implications, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 13, 95–109.

Rumbley, L. E. & Altbach, P. G. (2007, July). International Branch Campus Issues. Memorandum submitted to the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration in conjunction with Dr. Philip G. Altbach's testimony at the committee's July 26, 2007 hearing, "The Globalization of R&D and Innovation, Part II: The University Response."

Ryan, Gerard D. (2012). Persistence in expatriate academic assignments in the United

    Arab Emirates: A case study. Ph.D. diss., Northcentral University,

    http://search.proquest.com/docview/1021196898?accountid=14678 (accessed

    November 6, 2013).

Sager, J. K. & Johnston, M.W. (1989). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational

    commitment: a study of salespeople. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales*

    Management, 9 (Spring), 30-41.

Salancik, G.R. (1977). Commitment and control of organizational behavior and belief. In

    B. Staw & G. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior.

    Chicago: St. Clair Press, 1-54.

Scott, P. Ed, (1998) *The globalization of higher education*. Society for research into

    higher education. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Scott, R. A. (1978). Lords, squires and yeoman: collegiate middle managers and their

    organizations. *AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report no. 7.*

    Washington, DC: American Association of the Higher Education.

Scott, R. A. (*1979*). *Robots or reinsmen*: Job opportunities and professional standing for collegiate administrators in the 1980's. ASHE Annual Meeting 1979 Paper.

Scholl, R. W. (1981). Differentiating organizational commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 589-599.

Selmer, J., & Lauring, J. (2010). Self-initiated academic expatriates: Inherent demographics and reasons to expatriate. *European Management Review*, 7(3), 169-179.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance amid turbulence on international assignments: Work-family conflict, support and commitment, *Journal of Management*, 27(1), 99-121.

Sharma, Y. (2010, March 28) . Global: three nations tops in collaboration. University World News, Issue 117. Retrieved April 15, 2010 from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20100326124228117

Sharma, Yojana. (2011, May 08). Middle-East: Branch campuses face leadership issues. University World News. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20110507091932503

Sheldon, M. (June 1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 2,143-150.

Shore, L.M. & Shore, T.H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In Cropanzano, R.S. & K.M. Kacmar (Eds.). *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace*, 149-164. Westport, CT: Quorum

Slaughter, S. (1998). National higher education policies in a global economy. In Currie, J., & Newson, J. A. (pp. 45-70). *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Slaughter, S & Leslie, L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Smerek, R., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(2), 229-250.

Sørensen, J. B., & Phillips, D. J. (2011). Competence and commitment: employer size and entrepreneurial endurance. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *20*(5), 1277-1304.

Stallworth, L. (2004). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment to accounting organizations. *Managerial Auditing Journal*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Staw, B. M. (1977). Motivation in organizations: Toward synthesis. In B. M. Staw(ed.),P*sychological foundations oforganizational behavior* ,77-89.

Steers, R.M. (March 1977). Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1),46-56

Steers, R.M. (1975). Effects of need achievement on the job performance-job attitude relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 678-682.

Stroh, L.K., Gregersen, H.B. and Black, J.S. (2000), Triumphs and tragedies: expectations and commitments upon repatriation, *International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 11(4), 681-97.

Teather, D. C. B. (2004). *Consortia : International networking alliances of universities*. Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Publishing.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46,* 259-293.

Tharenou, P. (2008). Disruptive decisions to leave home: gender and family differences in expatriation choices. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 105(2), 183-200.

Tyler, K. (2006), Retaining repatriates, *HR Magazine*, 51(3), 97-102.

Vakola*, M. & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards Organizational Change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment? *Employee Relations, 27,* 160-174.

Van der Heijden, J. van Engen, M., & Paauwe, J. (2009). Expatriate career support: Predicting expatriate turnover and performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20, 831-845.

Van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational* Psychology, 73, 137–147.

Van Maanen, J. (1975) Police socialization: a longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 207-228.

Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(3), 149-171.

Weber, L. & Duderstadt, J. (2008). *The globalization of higher education*. London: Economica Ltd.

Wiener, Y. (1982) Commitment in organizations: a normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.

Wildavsky, B. (2012). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world*. Princeton University Press.

Wilhelm, I. (2011, May 25). Duke's China Plan Sparks Doubts on Campus. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Dukes-China-Plan Sparks/127640/?sid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en

Wilkins, S., & Huisman, J. (2012). The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education. *Higher Education*, *64*(5), 627-645.

Woodfield, S. & Middlehurst, R. (January 2009) *Universities and international higher education partnerships: making a difference*. Center for Policy and Change.

Yeaton, K. & Hall, N. (2008), Expatriates: reducing failure rates, *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, 19(3), 75-78.

Young, B.S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, D.J. (1998). Organizational commitment among public service employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(3), 339-348.

Yung, A. & Sharma, Y. (2012, December 07). Opposition, US professors weigh into Yale-NUS freedom debate. *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20121207122955740

Zaccaro, S. J., & Dobbins, G. H. (1989). Contrasting group and organizational commitment: Evidence for differences among multilevel attachments. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *10*(3), 267-273.

APPENDIX A

The Observatory
On Borderless Higher Education
—————————

International Branch Campuses
Data and Developments

William Lawton
Alex Katsomitros

January 2012

—————————

In Association with Eversheds LLP
EVERSHEDS

A copy of the report can be purchased at
http://www.obhe.ac.uk/documents/view_details?id=894

APPENDIX B

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979).
The measurement of organizational commitment.
Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14(2), 224-247.

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the international branch campus for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by clicking one of the seven alternatives beside each statement:

Organizational commitment questions

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for
3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar
8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined
11. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees
13. I really care about the fate of this organization

14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part(R)

The responses include – Strongly disagree; Moderately disagree; Slightly disagree; Neither disagree nor agree; Slightly agree; Moderately agree; Strongly agree; scored 1 to 7 respectively. For each question, respondents had the option to select "I prefer not to answer".

Demographic questions

How many students attend your international branch campus?
Less than 50
Between 51-100
Between 101-500
Between 501-1000
Over 1000

Please respond to the following demographic questions by clicking on the appropriate answer. All answers are confidential.

What is your rank?
I am an upper-level administrator
I am a mid-level administrator
I am an entry-level administrator
I prefer not to answer

What is your level of education?
I have a high school degree
I have a high school degree+2 years of higher education
I have a high school degree+3 years of higher education
I have a high school degree+4 years of higher education
I have a high school degree+5 years of higher education
I have a high school degree+6 years of higher education
I have a high school degree+7 years of higher education
I prefer not to answer

What is your gender?
I am a female

I am a male
I prefer not to answer

Are you an expatriate?
For the purpose of this study, expatriates are defined as administrators who work outside their native country temporarily and plan to return to their home country.

Yes
No

Are you an immigrant?
For the purpose of this study, immigrants are administrators who work outside their native country permanently and do not plan to move back to their home country

Yes
No

Is your nationality the same as the home country of your branch campus? (for instance, you are from Canada, you work in France for a Canadian branch campus)

Yes
No

What is your age group?
I am 19 or younger
I am between 20-29
I am between 30-39
I am between 40-49
I am between 50-59
I am between 60-69
I am between 70 or older
I prefer not to answer

What is your marital status?
I am single
I am married
I am divorced
I am widowed
I prefer not to answer

APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol and Questionnaire

Before the interview starts:

1. Thank respondent for taking the time to participate

2. Introduce myself

3. Explain the reasons and the purpose of interview

4. Explain protection of privacy (review and approval of transcript)

5. Go over the logistics (sound recording testing; time check)

Questions

1. Can you please tell me about your professional background and how you got to work for this international branch campus?

2. Please describe your motivation for working at an international branch campus.

3. Can you describe your job duties and function?

4. What are the skills and qualities necessary to succeed in your position?

5. Do you think it is more challenging to work for an international branch campus than a domestic campus? If so, why?

6. What specific factors keep you working for this international branch campus?

7. Have you thought about leaving this international branch campus? if so, why?

8. If you have not thought about leaving, which factors could potentially influence your decision to leave?

9. In your experience, what are the factors <u>unique</u> to international branch campuses that have influenced your decision to stay or leave?

10. How committed to your international branch campus do you feel?

11. What kind of things do you think your institution should do to retain staff?

12. Is there any other information you would like to add regarding employee commitment at your institution?

———

1. How long have you been in your current position?

2. How long have you been working for this international branch campus?

3. What is your nationality?

4. If you are an expatriate, how long have you been living in your country of employment?

5. If you are an expatriate, how long have you been living outside your country of birth?

6. What is the highest degree you have earned?

   High School diploma/HSD+2/3/4/5/6/7/8 years

7. What is your age range?

   20-29/30-39/40-49/50-59/60-69/70-79

8. What is your gender?

9. What is your marital status? (Single/married/divorced/widowed)

10. How many students are enrolled in your IBC?

11. What is your rank? (upper-level or midlevel administrator)

APPENDIX D

Survey Pre-Notices, Invitations and Reminders

Survey Pre-Notice

Dear Colleague:

In a few days, you will be asked to participate in an important research study that I am conducting at the University of Virginia in the United States. The study is about higher education administrators and how they feel about working for an international branch campus. The email will ask you to complete a short survey based on your experience as an administrator in international education.

I am emailing you in advance because I have found many people like to know ahead of time that they will be contacted. This study is important because it will help researchers and higher education leaders learn more about international branch campus administrators and their motivations for working in an international setting.

The survey is confidential. Results from the survey will be presented in aggregate; no individuals will be identified. It will take you about 6 minutes to complete the survey.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It is only with the generous help of people like you that my research can be successful.

Sincerely,

Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Virginia, U.S.A.
Murielle@virginia.edu

Survey Invitation

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to ask your help in a study of administrators working for international branch campuses. I am contacting a sample of administrators worldwide to ask about their organizational commitment. Organizational commitment refers to the ways administrators identify with their international branch campus's goals and values.

In other words, I would like to know about your motivations for working at an international branch campus and how you feel about it.

Your participation in the survey will contribute to a better understanding of administrators employed at international branch campuses. It will also help uncover the dynamics of organizational commitment in the international higher education context.

This survey is confidential. Results from the survey will be presented in aggregate; no individuals will be identified. It should take you about 6 minutes to complete the survey.

If you would like to participate, please click on the link at the bottom of the screen. Otherwise delete this message.

Thank you very much for your help with this important study.

Sincerely,
Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Virginia, U.S.A.

This is What Appeared When Respondents Clicked on The Link:

Informed Consent Agreement

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

The purpose of this research study is to measure organizational commitment among administrators working for international branch campuses.

What you will do in the study is to fill out an electronic survey. It includes 15 short questions. A few demographic questions are also included. You can skip any question that makes you uncomfortable.

The time required for your participation in this online survey is about 6 minutes.

There are **no anticipated risks** in this study.

There are **no direct benefits** to you for participating in this research study.

The information that you give in the study will be handled **confidentially**. Your information will be assigned a code number. The list connecting your IP address to this code will be kept in a locked file. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, this list will be destroyed. Your IP address will not be used in any report.

Your participation in the study is completely **voluntary**.

You have the **right to withdraw** from the study at any time without penalty. If you want to withdraw from the study, use the X at the upper right corner to close this window and disconnect.

You will receive **no payment** for participating in the study.

If you have questions about the study, contact:
Murielle de Wekker
murielle@virginia.edu

Faculty Advisor:
David W. Breneman, Ph.D.
University Professor, Newton and Rita Meyers Professor in Economics of Education and Public Policy

Senior Associate Dean, Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904
434 924 0965
dwb8n@virginia.edu

If you have questions about your rights in the study, contact:
Tonya R. Moon, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences
One Morton Dr Suite 500
University of Virginia, P.O. Box 800392
Charlottesville, VA 22908-0392
Telephone: (434) 924-5999
Email: irbsbshelp@virginia.edu
Website: www.virginia.edu/vpr/irb/sbs

If you agree to participate in the research study described above, please press the arrow button at the bottom right of the screen.

Otherwise use the X at the upper right corner to close this window and disconnect.

Thank you

You may print this out for your records if you wish

First Reminder

Dear Colleague:

About a week ago, I sent you a survey via email. I am asking administrators like you about their motivations for working at an international branch campus.

As of today, I have not received a completed survey from you. I realize this is a busy time of year. However, I have contacted you and others in hopes of obtaining the insights only international administrators like you can provide.

As I mentioned before, this survey is confidential. Results from the survey will be presented in aggregate; no individuals will be identified. It should take you about 6 minutes to complete the survey.

In case the previous survey has been deleted from your email account, I have included it again. Please click on "take the survey" at the bottom of the screen.

Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me (Murielle de Wekker) by email (Murielle@virginia.edu). Thank you for your cooperation.

Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Virginia

Second and Final Reminder

Dear Colleague:

During the last 3 weeks, I have sent you several email messages about an important research study I am conducting at the University of Virginia in the United States. To the best of my knowledge, you have not completed the survey yet. If you have completed the survey, thank you for your responses and please disregard this message.

My research goal is to help the higher education community understand how administrators and leaders feel about working for an international branch campus and what their level of organizational commitment is.

There are a wide variety of responses in the survey so far, and trends are beginning to emerge. I think the results are going to be very useful to higher education leaders and administrators. Although I sent the survey to a large number of people, it is only by hearing from the majority of respondents that I can be sure that the results are truly representative.

The study is drawing to a close, and this is the last contact that I will make with you.

I appreciate your willingness to consider my request as I conclude this effort to better understand organizational commitment and other issues facing international branch campus administrators.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Virginia
Murielle@virginia.edu

Interview invitation and reminders

Invitation

Date

Dear….
I am writing to ask your help in a study of administrators working for international branch campuses. I am contacting a sample of administrators worldwide to interview them about their organizational commitment. In this study, organizational

commitment refers to the ways administrators identify with their international branch campus's goals and values.

Your participation in this interview will contribute to a better understanding of administrators employed at international branch campuses. It will also help uncover the dynamics of organizational commitment in the international higher education context.

The interview will take about 45 minutes of your time and it will be conducted over the internet via Skype. If you do not have access to Skype, it will be conducted over the phone. If you would like to participate, please fill out the consent agreement below, sign it, scan it and email it back to me. I will contact you by email to schedule the interview.

Thank you.

Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Virginia, U.S.A.

Informed Consent Agreement

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

The purpose of this research study is to understand organizational commitment among administrators working for international branch campuses.

What you will do in the study is to answer questions via Skype. It includes 18 short questions. A few demographic questions are also included. You can skip any question that makes you uncomfortable and stop the interview at any time. The interview will not be videotaped. The conversation will be recorded.

The time required for your participation in this online interview is about 45 minutes.

There are **no anticipated risks** in this study.

There are **no direct benefits** to you for participating in this research study.

The information that you give in the study will be handled **confidentially**. Your information will be assigned a code number. The list connecting your name to this code will be kept in a locked file. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, this list will be destroyed. Your name will not be used in any report. The digital copy of the interview (sound only) will be destroyed after the publication of research results.

Your participation in the study is completely **voluntary**.

You have the **right to withdraw** from the study at any time without penalty. Should you withdraw from the study, the audiotape of our conversation will be destroyed. If you want to **withdraw from the interview while** it is being conducted, please tell the interviewer to stop the interview. The researcher will stop the interview and will disconnect from Skype. If you want to withdraw from the study **after** the interview has been conducted, please email the researcher **within a week** of the interview.

You will receive **no payment** for participating in the study.

If you have questions about the study, contact:
Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
The Curry School of Education
EDLF Program
Bavaro Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903
murielle@virginia.edu

Faculty Advisor:
David W. Breneman, Ph.D.
University Professor, Newton and Rita Meyers Professor in Economics of Education and Public Policy
Senior Associate Dean, Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904
434 924 0965
dwb8n@virginia.edu

If you have questions about your rights in the study, contact:
Tonya R. Moon, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences
One Morton Drive Suite 500
University of Virginia, P.O. Box 800392
Charlottesville, VA 22908-0392
Telephone: (434) 924-5999
Email: irbsbshelp@virginia.edu
Website: www.virginia.edu/vpr/irb/sbs

Agreement:
I agree to participate in the research study described above.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

You will receive a copy of this form for your records.

Reminder

Dear…

About two weeks ago, I mailed you an invitation letter to participate in a study about international branch campuses. I am interviewing administrators like you about their motivations for working at an international branch campus.

As of today, I have not received a response from you. I realize this is a busy time of year. However, I have contacted you and others in hopes of obtaining the insights only international administrators like you can provide. As I mentioned in my letter, the interview is confidential. Results from the interview will be presented in aggregate; no individuals will be identified.

Please let me know if you would like to participate in my study. Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me (Murielle de Wekker) by email (Murielle@virginia.edu).

Thank you for your cooperation.

Murielle de Wekker, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Virginia

APPENDIX E

Institutional Review Board Approval

March 26, 2013

Murielle de Wekker
David Breneman
Leadership, Foundations & Policy

Dear Murielle de Wekker and David Breneman:

The Institutional Review Board for the Behavioral Sciences has approved your research project entitled "Higher education administration at international branch campuses: A mixed methods research study on organizational commitment." You may proceed with this study. Please use the enclosed Consent Form as the master for copying forms for participants.

This project # 2013-0104-00 has been approved for the period March 26, 2013 to March 25, 2014. If the study continues beyond the approval period, you will need to submit a continuation request to the Review Board. If you make changes in the study, you will need to notify the Board of the changes.

Sincerely,

Tonya R. Moon, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences

APPENDIX F

Little's MCAR Test

Little Test

				Univariate Statistics				
				Missing		No. of Extremes[a,b]		
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Count	Percent	Low	High	
Q1	05	6.756	.5593	0	.0	.	.
Q2	04	6.172	1.2575	1	.5	21	0
Q3	03	2.227	2.0314	2	1.0	0	41
Q4	99	3.528	2.1738	6	2.9	0	0
Q5	04	5.701	1.4121	1	.5	8	0
Q6	04	6.451	.9988	1	.5	12	0
Q7	98	4.253	1.9992	7	3.4	0	0
Q8	99	5.543	1.5913	6	2.9	15	0
Q9	95	2.908	1.9189	10	4.9	0	0
Q10	93	6.057	1.3470	12	5.9	30	0
Q11	90	3.042	1.9649	15	7.3	0	0
Q12	95	3.497	2.1137	10	4.9	0	0
Q13	97	6.477	1.0574	8	3.9	12	0
Q14	96	5.020	1.6671	9	4.4	9	0
Q15	95	1.462	1.0660	10	4.9	.	.

a. Number of cases outside the range (Q1 - 1.5*IQR, Q3 + 1.5*IQR).

b. . Indicates that the inter-quartile range (IQR) is zero.

Summary of Estimated Means

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Listwise	.749	.217	.217	.611	.754	.531	.166	.623	.823	.103	.989	.451	.514	.057	.446
All Values	.756	.172	.227	.528	.701	.451	.253	.543	.908	.057	.042	.497	.477	.020	.462
EM	.756	.166	.240	.533	.704	.454	.240	.536	.924	.048	.057	.516	.474	.989	.468

Summary of Estimated Standard Deviations

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15
Listwise	572	.188	.033	.132	.318	.80	.985	.452	.843	.273	.902	.078	975	.603	.009
All Values	559	.257	.031	.173	.412	998	.999	.591	.918	.347	.964	.113	.057	1.667	1.066
EM	559	.258	.034	.177	.411	998	.997	.589	.926	.349	.956	.136	.066	.697	1.071

Listwise Statistics

								Listwise Means							
Number of cases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
175	.749	.217	.217	.611	.754	.531	.166	.623	.823	.103	.989	.451	.514	.057	.446

EM Estimated Statistics

							EM Means[a]							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
.756	.166	.240	.533	.704	.454	.240	.536	.924	.048	.057	.516	.474	.989	.468

a. Little's MCAR test: Chi-Square = 347.657, DF = 264, Sig. = .000

APPENDIX G

Levene's Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
EOC Score	Equal variances assumed	.425	.515	690	173	.491	.06194	.08981	-.11533	.23921
	Equal variances not assumed			701	51.158	.486	.06194	.08833	-.11538	.23925

APPENDIX H

Results for Experience, Nationality, Campus Size
and Host Country Location

Frequencies and Percentages for Experience:
Months on The Job

Number of Months	N	Percent
2	2	1.0
3	2	1.0
4	2	1.0
6	2	1.0
7	2	1.0
8	3	1.5
9	2	1.0
10	2	1.0
12	8	3.9
14	1	.5
15	5	2.4
16	1	.5
17	5	2.4
18	1	.5
19	1	.5
20	2	1.0
21	1	.5
24	23	11.2
27	3	1.5
29	3	1.5
30	2	1.0
32	1	.5
33	1	.5
36	19	9.3
37	1	.5

41	1	.5
46	1	.5
48	22	10.7
51	1	.5
53	1	.5
54	1	.5
60	17	8.3
72	10	4.9
84	9	4.4
96	3	1.5
108	2	1.0
120	7	3.4
144	6	2.9
156	4	2.0
161	1	.5
168	2	1.0
180	2	1.0
204	1	.5
216	2	1.0
276	1	.5
Total	189	92.2
System	16	7.8
Total	205	100.0

Frequencies and Percentages for Experience:
Months at International Branch Campus

Number of Months	N	Percent
2	2	1.0
3	2	1.0
4	2	1.0
6	2	1.0
7	2	1.0

8	1	.5
9	2	1.0
10	1	.5
12	5	2.4
14	1	.5
15	5	2.4
17	5	2.4
18	1	.5
20	2	1.0
21	1	.5
24	16	7.8
27	3	1.5
29	3	1.5
30	2	1.0
32	1	.5
36	13	6.3
41	3	1.5
46	1	.5
48	17	8.3
51	1	.5
54	1	.5
56	1	.5
60	26	12.7
65	1	.5
72	13	6.3
77	1	.5
84	7	3.4
96	7	3.4
108	5	2.4
120	7	3.4
144	5	2.4
156	5	2.4
168	2	1.0
180	3	1.5
185	1	.5

	Frequency	Percent
192	1	.5
204	2	1.0
216	2	1.0
228	2	1.0
252	1	.5
276	1	.5
348	1	.5
360	1	.5
Total	190	92.7
Missing System	15	7.3
Total	205	100.0

Frequencies and Percentages for Experience:
Months in Higher Education

Number of Months	Frequency	Percent
3	1	.5
4	1	.5
7	1	.5
8	1	.5
12	2	1.0
15	1	.5
17	1	.5
20	1	.5
24	5	2.4
27	2	1.0
36	6	2.9
41	1	.5
48	7	3.4
53	1	.5
56	1	.5
60	8	3.9

72	10	4.9
84	7	3.4
96	7	3.4
108	10	4.9
113	1	.5
120	14	6.8
132	3	1.5
144	14	6.8
156	5	2.4
168	1	.5
180	11	5.4
185	1	.5
192	4	2.0
204	2	1.0
216	6	2.9
228	2	1.0
240	10	4.9
252	5	2.4
264	4	2.0
276	2	1.0
288	1	.5
300	10	4.9
312	3	1.5
324	1	.5
336	1	.5
348	1	.5
360	6	2.9
372	2	1.0
384	1	.5
408	1	.5
420	1	.5
432	2	1.0
444	1	.5
456	1	.5
480	2	1.0
540	1	.5

Total	194	94.6
Missing System	11	5.4
Total	205	100.0

Frequencies and Percentages for Nationality

Nationality	Frequency	Percentage
Albanian	1	.5
American	41	20.0
American and Australian	1	.5
American and British	1	.5
American and Croatian	1	.5
American and Greek	1	.5
American and Indian	1	.5
American and Lebanese	1	.5
American and Spanish	2	1.0
American and Swiss	1	.5
Australian	13	6.3
Australian and Irish	1	.5
Australian & New Zealander	1	.5
Austrian and Kenyan	1	.5
Belgian	3	1.5
British	11	5.4
British and Australian	3	1.5
British and Bahraini	1	.5
British and Canadian	1	.5
British and Irish	1	.5
Burmese	1	.5
Canadian	14	6.8
Canadian and Azerbaijani	1	.5
Canadian and Iraqi	1	.5
Chinese	1	.5

Dutch	4	2.0
Emirati	1	.5
Filipino	3	1.5
French	4	2.0
German	1	.5
Greek	1	.5
Indian	13	6.3
Iranian	1	.5
Irish	2	1.0
Kosovar	1	.5
Latvian	3	1.5
Lebanese	2	1.0
Malaysian	18	8.8
Malaysian and Chinese	1	.5
New Zealander	1	.5
Pakistani	2	1.0
Qatari	1	.5
Singaporean	2	1.0
Slovak	2	1.0
South African	9	4.4
Spanish	1	.5
Swedish	2	1.0
Swiss and Italian	1	.5
Thai	1	.5
Total	182	88.8
Missing System	23	11.2
Total	205	100.0

Results: Frequency and percentages for international branch campuses'
characteristics

Frequencies and Percentages for Campus Size

Number of students	*Frequency*	*Percent*
Less than 50	4	2.0
51-100	12	5.9
101-500	91	44.4
501-1000	31	15.1
Over 1000	59	28.8
Total	197	96.1
System	8	3.9
Total	205	100.0

Frequencies and Percentages for Host Country Location

Host Country	Frequency	Percentage
Australia	9	4.4
Austria	2	1.0
Bahrain	6	2.9
Canada	5	2.4
China	7	3.4
Croatia	3	1.5
Finland	1	.5
France	2	1.0
Germany	2	1.0
Greece	2	1.0
India	2	1.0
Indonesia	1	.5
Italy	4	2.0
Japan	3	1.5
Kosovo	3	1.5
Latvia	6	2.9
Malaysia	25	12.2

Mauritius	1	.5
Netherlands	2	1.0
Nicaragua	1	.5
Qatar	41	20.0
Singapore	10	4.9
Slovakia	1	.5
South Africa	11	5.4
Spain	5	2.4
Switzerland	2	1.0
Thailand	5	2.4
UAE	33	16.1
UK	4	2.0
Vietnam	5	2.4
Total	204	99.5
Missing	1	.5
Total	205	100.0