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ABSTRACT

This study is an evaluation of the importance of demographic variables, perceived organizational support (POS), role conflict (RC), and role ambiguity (RA) in explaining the organizational commitment (OC) among the faculty members of Jordanian and Algerian universities through a comparative study. The survey consisted of 469 faculty members from eight universities. Findings revealed that the faculty members of Jordanian universities have stronger affective and normative commitment, but lower continuous commitment than those of Algerian universities. The role ambiguity is the main factor that has influence on both faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities' commitment; also the study found that the variance in the education level and income level of faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities are important reasons for the differences in the organizational commitment of the two groups. Some relevant recommendations and future researches were also proposed, including Arab universities need to create a positive working environment for faculty members, effective plans, precision in determining the goals, continuous controls, recognize the academicians' contributions, and should care for their well being in order to achieve the organizations' goals.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Commitment in the workplace is a topic that has attracted the attention of both academics and practitioners. Organizational Commitment is considered to be one of the eight most important elements which investors use when judging the value of an organization (Al-Qarioti and Al-Enezi, 2004). Due to the increased complexity in the educational system, and especially in universities, it becomes probable that no one individual has all the knowledge, skills, and abilities that would enable him/her to accomplish all of his/her tasks, without having a commitment behavior toward his/her work. Organizational commitment plays a central role in the management literature, particularly in organizational behavior research, which argues that organizational commitment is probably one of the most important keys to success (Sivaramakrishnan et al., 2008).

Organizational commitment is a critical predictor of instructors' job performance, as commitment is necessary for instructors to have the motivation to professionalize and pursue changes in their practice, while dealing with the complex demands these changes present (Hulpia and Devos, 2009). Organizational commitment is also influenced by various factors which can explain the differences among faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities regarding their commitment. Hence, the present study is justified in that respect. It examines the level of organizational commitment among faculty members in eight universities in Jordan and Algeria and investigates the effect of perceived organizational support (POS), role ambiguity (RA) and role conflict (RC) on organizational commitment (OC).

1.1 Statement of Problem

Given the progress of Universities in Arab countries in the report issued by Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU, 2011), we note that King Saud University in Saudi Arabia first appears in Top 300; King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals in Saudi Arabia move up in Top 400 for the first time; Cairo...
University in Egypt is back to Top 500 after five years of staggering outside. Neither Jordanian nor Algerian universities are mentioned in this report. The Algerian critics seek to explain the results based on the reality of Algerian universities; also the Jordanian critics attempt to provide logical explanation through the reality of Jordanian universities. Despite the differences of reasons and the clarity of variance on the interests of institutes of high education in Algeria and Jordan, the results are the same. In this regard, the researchers believe that the problem of Arabian universities is not just in the physical negligence but goes beyond to the behavioral and psychological factors that relate to faculty members, those who are responsible for the universities and to ministers of higher education. This study aims to compare between the commitment in Algerian and Jordanian universities and to examine some behavioral factors that can influence faculty members’ commitment. Through this comparison the researchers can determine which factors have common effect in Arabian universities in general. These objectives can be achieved through the response to the following questions:

1. Are faculty members in Jordanian universities highly committed to their respective universities than their counterparts in Algeria? If so, what factors explain the differences in their organizational commitment?
2. Are there any differences between faculty members’ commitment in Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their demographic characteristics?
3. Are there any differences between faculty members’ commitment in Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their perceived organizational support, role ambiguity and role conflict?
4. What is the effect of perceived organizational support, the role ambiguity, and the role conflict on organizational commitment?

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review:

2.1 Organizational Commitment:

Organizational commitment “OC” firstly defined by Becker (1960, p. 33) as a tendency to engage in "consistent lines of activity" or "a person finds that this involvement is a social organization has, in effect, made side bets for him and thus constrained his future". He suggested several broad categories of OC: generalized cultural, expectation about responsible behavior, self-presentation concerns, impersonal bureaucratic arrangements, individual adjustments to social positions, and non-work concerns. Recently, researchers viewed organizational commitment as a cultural concept according to Becker’s (1960) definition, or a psychological concept according to Allen and Meyer (1996) who defined organizational commitment as a relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. This concept is based on three factors that were suggested by Meyer et al. (2002), affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to the employee’s state of emotional attachment to the organization and is especially sensitive to work experiences such as perceived organizational support (Griffin and Hepburn, 2005; Erdheim et al., 2006). Normative commitment refers to an employee's belief that he or she ought to stay with the organization and develops as a result of socialization experiences that emphasize the appropriateness of remaining loyal to one's employer (Griffin and Hepburn, 2005). Continuance commitment might consist of two sub-constructs, one based on the degree of personal sacrifice associated with leaving the organization, and the other based on a lack of other alternatives, often referred to as "sunk costs" (Dawley et al., 2005). Continuance commitment also depends on individuals’ recognition of the availability of alternatives if they were to leave the organization (Namasivayam and Zhao, 2007).

Organizational commitment (OC) is a key factor in teachers’ performance at university settings (Bogler and Somech, 2004). Various studies were conducted on organizational commitment as a crucial element for organizations and employees as well (Al-Qarioti and Al-Enezi, 2004). Moreover, empirical research has been conducted on the relationship between organizational commitment and various independent variables at national level, especially in the United States. Some of the variables that were tested in its relation with organizational commitment were empowerment (Bogler and Somech, 2004), perceived organizational support (Hawkins, 1998), relation-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviors (Brown, 2003), internal marketing (Farzad et al., 2008), organizational citizenship behaviors (Yilmaz and Cokluk-Bokeoglu, 2008) and market-based reward system (Sivaramakrishnan et al., 2008). Nevertheless, on the whole, prevailing trends of thoughts and research are characterized by a lack of comparative studies. In this study the researchers examine the
organizational commitment of faculty members at both Algerian and Jordanian universities. Based on the above, the researchers propose the following hypotheses:

**H1a:** There is a difference among faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their affective commitment.

**H1b:** There is a difference among faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their normative commitment.

**H1c:** There is a difference among faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their continuance commitment.

### 2.2 Antecedents of Organizational Commitment:

According to Hulpia and Devos (2009) teachers are more committed when principals offer feedback, encouragement, acknowledgment and clear school goals. But the characteristics of teachers can also influence their commitment. Following, the researchers seek to investigate some factors that can influence organizational commitment and explain the reasons for the similarity or difference in commitment between the Algerian and Jordanian faculty members.

#### 2.2.1. Perceived Organizational Support:

Organizational Support Theory (OST) is a contemporary social exchange theory which assumes that employees will exhibit positive work-related outcomes in reciprocation for valued resources (e.g., pay, training, socioemotional support) received from the employer (Michael et al., 2005). This theory (OST), suggests that treatment offered by the organization (in terms of fairness, job conditions, and supervisory relationships) serves as a signal to employees regarding the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Zagenczyk et al., 2009).

Michael et al. (2005) believe that the organizational support theory assumes further that employees form beliefs regarding how much the employer values them and their personal well-being; the combination of these intangible benefits forms an attitude in the minds of employees that is known as perceived organizational support (POS). According to Riggle et al. (2009), perceived organizational support represents the employees’ beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being.

Wayne et al. (1997) found that the high level of perceived organizational support creates a feeling of obligation, whereby employees, not only feel that they ought to be committed to their employers, but also feel an obligation to return the favor by putting in more effort into their job. Zagenczyk et al. (2009) are consistent with social exchange theory and the reciprocity norm, where perceived organizational support obligates employees who feel supported to reciprocate by expressing greater affective organizational commitment, performing citizenship behaviors, and exhibiting lower levels of withdrawal. Makanjee et al. (2006) found that the various antecedents of perceived organizational support (Organizational context and characteristics, management style within an organizational context, general working conditions, and trust and support of the supervisor career development) have positive influence on organizational commitment (mainly affective and normative). They distinguish between the "high sacrifice (HS)" and "lack of alternatives (LA)" components within continuance commitment and they posit that the negative correlation between perceived organizational support, found in prior research, is due to the “lack of alternatives” component, and that a positive relationship will be observed with “high sacrifice”. The same results were found by Panaccio and Vandenberghe, (2009) who suggest that perceived organizational support has a positive effect on affective commitment and normative commitment, whereas concerning continuance commitment, they argue that perceived organizational support has a positive effect on high sacrifice (HS), but has a negative effect on lack of alternatives (LA). Chen et al. (2005) found that trust in the organization and organization-based self-esteem fully mediated the relationship between perceived organizational support and the work outcomes of organizational commitment. Riggle et al. (2009) indicated that perceived organizational support has a strong positive effect on organizational commitment and these effects are more pronounced for non-frontline employees. Hochwarter et al. (2003) argue that perceived organizational support is related to affective commitment and job induced tension providing support for mediation. Also Baranik et al. (2010) argue that perceived organizational support was positively correlated with organizational commitment and it partly mediated the relationship between specific types of mentoring support, job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. Based on these, the researchers suggest the following hypotheses:
H2a: Perceived organizational support positively affects “affective commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

H2b: Perceived organizational support positively affects “normative commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

H2c: Perceived organizational support positively affects “continuance commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

2.2.2 Role Ambiguity:

Schulz and Auld (2006) define “role” as the activities expected of a person (the role incumbents) in a particular job or position. Marginson (2006) defines role ambiguity as "deficient or uncertain information about role behaviors available to a given organizational position". Schulz and Auld (2006) believe that role ambiguity occurs when there is a vagueness or lack of clarity in some aspect of a relationship such as power distribution, hierarchy, nature of the tasks or duties, or consequences of an individual's actions and it results in an individual not knowing "what to do to enact the role". In addition, Marginson (2006) argues that role ambiguity is problematic for organizations because the resulting unfavorable personal outcomes (such as stress, lower levels of performance, a desire to leave the role, and poor relations with superiors) are likely to prove dysfunctional to firm performance.

The majority of studies in this area have assumed that role ambiguity is an inherently negative state and, although there are individual differences in terms of the ability to tolerate ambiguity, most people find this uncertainty stressful (Schulz and Auld, 2006). Few studies have examined the effect of role ambiguity and role conflict on organizational commitment, among these studies, Wolverton, and Gmelch (1999) found a negative relationship between role ambiguity and both perceived effectiveness and organizational commitment. Also, Brandt (2008) suggested that organizational commitment was related to the work-related attributes of role ambiguity. Based on these, the researchers suggest the following hypotheses:

H3a: Role ambiguity negatively affects “affective commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

H3b: Role ambiguity negatively affects “normative commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

H3c: Role ambiguity negatively affects “continuance commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

2.2.3 Role Conflict

Pandey and Kumar (1997) defined role conflict as a state of mind, experience or perception of the role incumbent arising out of the simultaneous occurrence of two or more role expectations such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other(s) more difficult or even impossible. Mohrand Puck (2007) suggested that three types of role conflict can be distinguished: (1) inter-role conflicts, when the expectations associated with different roles which the individual plays are incompatible with one another; (2) Intra-role conflicts, are experienced if the different expectations associated with a single role conflict with one another; two different types of intra-role conflict can be distinguished: (a) intra-sender conflicts, which occur if a single role sender has incompatible expectations towards the role incumbent; (b) inter-sender conflicts exist if the expectations of two different role senders towards the role incumbent are incompatible; and (3) person-role conflicts, if the expectations associated with one of the individual’s roles are incompatible with the person's own needs, aspirations, and/or values.

Few studies examined the relationship between role conflict and organizational commitment, among these studies Akintayo (2010) who revealed that there was a significant but negative contribution of work-family role conflict to organizational commitment of industrial workers in Nigeria. Also, Brandt (2008) found negative correlation between role conflict and role ambiguity and organizational commitment in Slovak high Education. Whereas Jackson and Schuler (1985) suggested that the effects of role ambiguity and role conflict on commitment
may be indirect rather than direct. Based on the above the above, the researchers suggest the following hypotheses:

**H4a:** Role conflict negatively affects “affective commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

**H4b:** Role conflict negatively affects “normative commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

**H4c:** Role conflict negatively affects “continuance commitment” of faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. This effect will be stronger among faculty members of Algerian universities than in Jordanian universities.

### 2.2.4 Organizational Commitment and Demographics

Several studies have examined the relationship between organizational commitment and demographics and personal characteristics but had different results. Hawkins (1998) found that there was little correlation between high school principals' age and affective organizational commitment. Hus (2002) suggested that older employees generally would be expected to have more knowledge about organizational operations, stronger commitment, and more loyalty to their organizations than younger employees. Al-Qarioti and Al-Enezi, (2004) indicate that organizational commitment generally tends to decrease as age increases between the Jordanian managers.
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The relationship between organizational commitment and the level of education has been thoroughly researched. Al-Qarioti and Al-Enezi, (2004) reveal a negative relationship between the educational level of managers in Jordan and organizational commitment. A person with more education may be more able to recognize and assess varying kinds of real or implied wrong doing, so higher level of education may be related to stronger organizational commitment (Hus, 2002). As far as the researchers know, no study has examined the relationship between organizational commitment and income level, but the researchers notice there is a variance in the income level of the Algerian and Jordanian faculty members and this variance can make the differences in the commitment of the two groups. Based on the above, the following hypotheses are developed:

**H5a:** There are statistical differences in the commitment of faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to the age.
H5b: There are statistical differences in the commitment of faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to the education level.

H5c: There are statistical differences in the commitment of faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to the income level.

3. Research Methodology:

3.1 Population and Sample:

The target population of this study is faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities. Due to time and cost constraints, a convenience sample of faculty members was selected from four Jordanian universities (Jordanian, Mutah, Al Yarmouk and Hashemite universities) and four Algerian universities (Algeria, Science and Technology, Blida and Ibn Khaldoun universities). A self-administered questionnaire was distributed to 520 sampled faculty members by hand. Of the distributed questionnaires, 469 were successfully returned with a response rate of 90.19% (229 responses from Jordanian faculty members and 240 responses from Algerian faculty members).

Table 1: Operational Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Measurement Dimensions</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>University's encouragement of learning service, training, design of service systems and organizational procedures for optimal service delivery.</td>
<td>Kim et al., 2005</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>The extent to which an individual has sufficient and clear information regarding job tasks.</td>
<td>Allen et al., 2008</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>The conflict between the various role expectations of faculty members’ workplace and the demands placed on their time.</td>
<td>Allen et al., 2008</td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Emotional attachment and positive implications for teachers wanting to stay in their university.</td>
<td>Allen and Meyer, 1990</td>
<td>12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>The feeling of obligation to continue employment within the university.</td>
<td>Allen and Meyer, 1990</td>
<td>16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Awareness of the costs associated with leaving the university.</td>
<td>Allen and Meyer, 1990</td>
<td>20-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Measurements:

Each variable was measured using previously developed components of instruments that have demonstrated good psychometric properties. The study survey consisted of the following sections: 1) demographic information (gender, age, education level, and income level); 2) perceived organizational support, measured using 4 items; 3) role ambiguity, measured using 4 items; 4) role conflict, measured using 3 items; 5) affective commitment, measured using 4 items; 6) normative commitment, measured using 4 items and 7) continuance commitment, measured using 4 items. The questionnaire (see Appendix) was chosen based on the needs of the research to include a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) to measure the study variables. Operational definitions of variables measured in this study were borrowed and were slightly modified from previous studies. These definitions are presented in Table 1.

3.3 Instrument Reliability and Validation

The internal consistency reliability is measured by applying the Cronbach’s alpha test to the individual scales and the overall measure as reported in Table 2. As the alpha values for all the constructs in our study were greater than the guideline of 70% as specified by Baggozi and Yi (1988), except for “role conflict”, which was .577 and it is considered to be acceptable according to Hair et al. (2000). The researchers believe that the reliability value of role conflict is relatively low due to the variance in the perceptions of faculty members. Then, we concluded that the scales can be applied for the analysis with acceptable reliability. The construct validity was tested using item-to-total correlation test. All items should have a significant correlation coefficient at the 0.01 level (Hair et al., 2000). Results in Table 2 indicated that each item had significant correlation (ranging from 0.669 to 0.888) at 0.01 significant levels.
Table 2: Test of construct reliability and validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Correlation of Item-to-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (AC)</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>AC1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.849**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AC2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.814**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AC3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.848**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AC4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.833**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (NC)</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>NC1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.757**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.828**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.888**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NC4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.811**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (CC)</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.791**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.853**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.833**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.821**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support (POS)</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.803**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.835**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.809**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.669**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity (RA)</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>RA1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.790**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RA2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.827**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RA3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.813**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RA4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict (RC)</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.800**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.801**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.607**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Jordanian Faculty Members</th>
<th>Algerian Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level (JD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-1000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Data Analysis and Hypotheses Testing:

4.1 Sample Characteristics

As Table 3 indicates, there are clear differences in the demographic characteristics among the faculty members in the Algerian and Jordanian universities. For the Jordanian sample, we note that, as shown in table 3, 96.9% of respondents were male, and 3.1% was female. The largest percentage was those respondents between 30 and 39 years old (38.9%). All respondents were those
who have a PhD. degree (100%). Finally, the largest number of respondents was those of income more than 1000JD (78.6%). For the Algerian sample, we note that 50.4% of respondents were male, and 49.6% were female. The largest percentage was those respondents between 30 and 39 years old (38.8%). The most respondents were those who have a master degree (70%). Finally, the largest number of respondents was those of income 400JD - 600JD (48.3).

### Table 4-A: Descriptive Statistic of Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC (Affective Commitment)</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>2.7646</td>
<td>.88443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>2.0480</td>
<td>.55989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC (Normative Commitment)</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>3.1938</td>
<td>.81241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>2.0328</td>
<td>.51885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC (Continues Commitment)</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>1.01934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>3.6463</td>
<td>.77932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Likert scale from 1 strongly agree to 5 strongly disagree.

### Table 4-B: Independent Samples T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td>61.94</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.71655</td>
<td>.5815</td>
<td>.8516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td>68.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.1610</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>1.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-6.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.5629</td>
<td>-.7282</td>
<td>-.3978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Hypotheses Testing

#### 4.2.1 Hypothesis H1a, H1b and H1c:

The researchers test this hypothesis by comparing the observed ordering of means for faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities using t-test (Table 4-A and 4-B). H1a, H1b, H1c assumes the existence of differences among faculty members in Algerian and Jordanian universities according to affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuous commitment. T-test findings of the differences between the two groups support the hypotheses 1a, 1b and 1c.

**H1a:** The affective commitment means of Jordanian universities’ faculty members are larger than the means of faculty members in Algerian universities (2.765 versus 2.048; \( F = 61.942; P = .000 \)). So the faculty members of Jordanian universities have stronger affective commitment than those of Algerian universities.

**H1b:** The normative commitment means of Jordanian universities’ faculty members are larger than the means of Algerian universities’ faculty members (3.194 versus 2.033; \( F = 68.201, P = .000 \)). So the faculty members of Jordanian universities have stronger normative commitment than those of Algerian universities.

**H1c:** The continuous commitment mean of Jordanian universities’ faculty members are lower than the means of Algerian universities’ faculty members (3.083 versus 3.646; \( F = 23.295, P = .000 \)). So the faculty members of Jordanian universities have stronger continuous commitment than those of Jordanian universities.
4.2.2 Hypotheses H2a, H3a and H4a

The results of regression analysis to test hypotheses H2a, H3a, and H4a are reported in Table 5.

**H2a:** Perceived Organizational Support (POS) had no effect on Affective Commitment (AC) for faculty members of Jordanian universities ($\beta = .002; t = .037; \alpha = .971$), but had a positive effect for Algerian universities ($\beta = .285; t = 4.34; \alpha = .000$). Hypothesis H2a partially supported.

**H3a:** Role Ambiguity (RA) had a negative effect on Affective Commitment (AC) for faculty members of both Jordanian universities ($\beta = -.185; t = -2.81; \alpha = .005$) and Algerian universities ($\beta = -.187; t = -2.68; \alpha = .008$). Hypothesis H3a was supported.

**H4a:** Role Conflict (RC) had no effect on Affective Commitment (AC) for faculty members of both Jordanian universities ($\beta = -.024; t = -.362; \alpha = .718$) and Algerian universities ($\beta = -.034; t = -.509; \alpha = .611$). Hypothesis H4a was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Results of Regression Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model $^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment (AC).

$^b$*** $p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, based on two-tailed; $t(p<.001) = 3.29; t(p<.01) = 2.58; t(p<.05) = 1.96$.

4.2.3 Hypotheses H2b, H3b and H4b

The results of regression analysis to test hypotheses H2b, H3b, and H4b are reported in Table 6.

**H2b:** Perceived Organizational Support (POS) had no effect on Normative Commitment (NC) for faculty members of both Jordanian universities ($\beta = -.077; t = -1.18; \alpha = .240$) and Algerian universities ($\beta = .100; t = 1.44; \alpha = .310$). Hypothesis H2b was rejected.

**H3b:** Role Ambiguity (RA) had a negative effect on Normative Commitment (NC) for faculty members of both Jordanian universities ($\beta = -.187; t = -2.72; \alpha = .007$) and Algerian universities ($\beta = -.008; t = -.114; \alpha = .910$). Hypothesis H3b was rejected.

**H4b:** Role Conflict (RC) had no effect on Normative Commitment (NC) for faculty members of both Jordanian universities ($\beta = .067; t = 1.02; \alpha = .310$) and Algerian universities ($\beta = .049; t = -.694; \alpha = .488$). Hypothesis H4b was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Results of Regression Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model $^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment (NC).

$^b$*** $p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$, based on two-tailed; $t(p<.001) = 3.29; t(p<.01) = 2.58; t(p<.05) = 1.96$.

4.2.4 Hypotheses H2c, H3c and H4c

The results of regression analysis to test hypotheses H2c, H3c, and H4c are reported in Table 7.

**H2c:** Perceived Organizational Support (POS) had no effect on Continuous Commitment (CC) for faculty members of both Jordanian universities ($\beta = .061; t = 1.18; \alpha = .240$) and Algerian universities ($\beta = .013; t = .194; \alpha = .846$). Hypothesis H2c was rejected.

**H3c:** Role Ambiguity (RA) had a positive effect on Continuous Commitment (CC) for faculty members of Jordanian universities ($\beta = .247; t = 3.81; \alpha = .000$), but had no effect for Algerian universities ($\beta = -.008; t = -.114; \alpha = .910$). Hypothesis H3c was partially supported.
**H4c:** Role Conflict (RC) had no effect on Continuous Commitment (CC) for faculty members of Jordanian universities \((\beta = -0.011; t = -0.170; \alpha = 0.865)\), but had a positive effect for Algerian universities \((\beta = 0.331; t = 4.88; \alpha = 0.000)\). Hypothesis H4c was partially supported.

### Table 7: Results of Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jordanian Faculty Members</th>
<th>Algerian Faculty Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>3.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aDependent Variable: Continuous Commitment (CC).
*b*** \(p < .001\), **\(p < .01\), *\(p < .05\), based on two-tailed; \(t(p<.001) = 3.29\); \(t(p<.01) = 2.58\); \(t(p<.05) = 1.96\).

### 4.3 Univariate Analysis:

Univariate analysis was performed to determine whether the interaction between the faculty member’s universities and demographic variables (age, education level and income level) differs with regard to organizational commitment (see Table 8). The results reveal that there are no significant differences \((p = .189)\) in organizational commitment among faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their age. But there are significant differences in organizational commitment among faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities according to their education level \((p = .005)\) and income level \((p = .006)\).

### Table 8: Univariate Analysis of Variance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>25.737^a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>12.055</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1799.773</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1799.773</td>
<td>6.744E3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality * Age</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>24.620^b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.310</td>
<td>46.305</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3641.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3641.053</td>
<td>1.370E4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality*Education</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>7.969</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>31.035^c</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.207</td>
<td>24.464</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2664.227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2664.227</td>
<td>1.050E4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality * Income</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>7.664</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aDependent Variable: Organizational Commitment (OC)
^a. \(R^2 = .173\); ^b. \(R^2 = .166\); ^c. \(R^2 = .209\)

### 5. Discussion and Recommendations

#### 5.1 Discussion:

This study finds that the faculty members of Jordanian universities have more affective, nonnative, and continuous commitment than faculty members of Algerian universities, and these results are not surprising because the faculty members of Jordanian universities have higher income and education levels than those of Algerian universities. For example, 78.6% of faculty members of Jordanian universities have more than 1000JD versus 6.2% for faculty members of Algerian universities as a monthly salary.

The researchers seek to examine the factors that influence organizational commitment to explain the differences among faculty members of Algerian and
Jordanian universities’ commitment. Perceived organizational support has a positive effect on the affective commitment of faculty members of Algerian universities. Relationship between POS and AC is not surprising, since AC is conceptualized as a response to positive work experiences perceived as being offered by the organization (Panaccio and Vandenberghe, 2009). Results of this study showed that the Algerian university instructors have less experience than Jordanian university instructors. Makanjee et al. (2006) suggests that POS should strengthen the employees' beliefs that the organization recognizes and rewards their performance. These should have favorable outcomes both for the employees (increased job satisfaction) and for the organization (e.g. increased affective commitment and performance, reduced turnover), and perceived organizational support should fulfill socio emotional needs, but this is not possible if the general physical working environment does not meet the needs of instructors (Makanjee et al., 2006). On the other hand, perceived organizational support has no effect on affective commitment for faculty members of Jordanian universities. The researchers believe that perceived organizational support can affect employees’ emotional commitment at the beginning tenure but after the experience organization support doesn't become a motivational factor to the experienced instructors.

Findings indicated that perceived organizational support has no effect on normative and continuous commitment for faculty members of both Algerian and Jordanian universities. The researchers believe that this result does not agree with the result reached by Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2009) who suggest that positive work experiences may lead employees to feel obligated to act for organization’s best interests (NC). For the negative relationship found between POS and lack of alternatives as one dimension of continuous commitment, they suggest that POS contributes to employees' sense of self-worth, thus further demonstrating POS’s importance and value as a resource. The researchers believe that the faculty members of universities who have high education levels and high experience will be able to choose an alternative job in other organizations.

The current study suggests that the role ambiguity has a negative effect on affective commitment and normative commitment for both Jordanian and Algerian universities, because when role expectations are in flux or unclear, their willing to remain within the organization is reduced. The study also finds that the role ambiguity has no effect on continuous commitment for faculty members of Algerian universities, but has a positive effect on continuous commitment for faculty members of Jordanian universities, because the Jordanian instructors don't perceive any conflict between work environment and their remaining in university, and they suggest that any alternative job should be taken into consideration.

In general, the researchers suggest that the role ambiguity is the main factor explaining the differences between faculty members of Algerian and Jordanian universities’ commitment. As for the role conflict, this study finds that it has no effect on affective and nonnative commitment for both samples. However, it has a positive effect on faculty members of Algerian universities' continuous commitment, due to the availability of alternative jobs in Jordan versus Algeria.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 Managerial Implication

This study suggests that universities should always recognize the academicians' contributions, and should care for their well being in order to achieve the organizations' mission of being world class universities that deliver high quality education and produce high impact research outputs. The Arab universities must care for role ambiguity as an important factor in determining their employees’ commitment, which can go beyond to explain the failure of Arab universities. The researchers believe that the Arab universities have the necessary potential to succeed, but they need effective plans, precision in determining the goals, and continuous controls. The study findings have great implications for improving workers' commitment to their organizations. This means that low income level and less education may determine what faculty members want to do for a career. Deciding on a choice of work in life, or for a given period of time may prevent organizational commitment. From the universities perspective, it is important to create a positive working environment for faculty members of universities and to improve their quality of working life, because the role ambiguity and the role conflict could be reduced by having protocols rather than minimize the variation in the standard of the quality of work done.

5.2.2 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

It is important to note some limitations of this study.
First, the convenience sample used in this study consisted of faculty members of eight universities in Algeria and Jordan. The limited sample size compared to the size of population of this study therefore impedes generalizability of the results. A second limitation pertains to the research design, as OC, POS, RA and RC mindsets were measured simultaneously (at time 1), the researchers cannot draw causal inferences with regards to the relationships between these variables. While the direction of these relationships in this research model is based on theoretical considerations according to which faculty members of universities attitudes are influenced by their perceptions of the work environment, studies relying on full longitudinal designs are warranted. The results of this study confirm the differences between the role ambiguity and the role conflict. So, future work must separate between the two concepts. Also there is still a need to examine the antecedents and consequences of role ambiguity and role conflict in organizations using causal designs.
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