University staff commitment to quality: case study of American University of Culture and Education

*Обеспечение качества образования университетским персоналом
(на примере Американского университета культуры и образования)*

Mourtada Tayssir, PhD student at Minsk Innovation University, Lecturer at American University of Culture and Education

Муртада Тайсир, аспирант Минского инновационного университета, преподаватель Американского университета культуры и образования

e-mail: mourtada.tayssir@gmail.com

Gedranovich Alexander, PhD in Economic sciences, Associate professor, associate professor of the Department of Information Technologies of Minsk Innovation University

Гедранович Александр, кандидат экономических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры информационных технологий Минского инновационного университета

e-mail: gedranovich@gmail.com

Аннотация

Статья посвящена вопросам обеспечения качества образования персоналом университетов и, в частности, влияния системы вознаграждения. В экспериментальной части приведены основные результаты исследования, проведенного в Американском университете культуры и образования. Показано, что в условиях существования должной системы нематериальных вознаграждений присутствуют значительные изменения в обеспечении качества образования персоналом.

Ключевые слова: университет, приверженность персонала, качество, система вознаграждений, Ливан.

Abstract

The article is devoted to the problem of staff commitment to quality of education in universities, and specifically reward system influence to staff commitment. In experimental part major results from the study of The American University of Culture and Education are presented. It is shown that there are significant changes in staff attitude to quality of education if proper intangible reward system exists.

Keywords: university, staff commitment, quality, reward system, Lebanon.

Introduction

High quality of provision has been one of the key aims of the current reforms in Lebanese higher education system, has led to the increasing demand for quality assurance (QA), and become on the top of the Ministry's agenda [1]. Higher education institutions (HEIs) are ideally expected to develop internal quality cultures which take into account their institutional realities and are related to their organizational culture [2].Quality is no longer the responsibility of a separate quality assurance department, it is the responsibility of every employee, and so the commitment of employees to the goal of quality is fundamentally important to the sustainability of TQM [3]. Studies of total quality management (TQM) have shown an emphasis on the skills and motivations of employees rather than on tools and techniques [4]. It has been noted that many quality development attempts in educational organizations have been motivated through pressure from the outside market or new legislation [5], there is still a lack of staff and student attachment and active involvement in the quality assurance processes [6].

Most higher education institutions have an implicit or explicit mission statement to offer a high quality learning experience to all their students [7]. Academic staffs are the main interface with students, and their motivation is crucial in determining the quality of this interface. In addition, Employee identification with the organization's goals and values has gained increasing recognition [8], Since they are 'makers' and 'shapers' in the policy implementation process, not mere recipients, the success of a quality assurance system may be more dependent on its contingent use by actors, how they view and interpret this system [6], the discretion exercised by 'front-line' workers, or 'street level' bureaucrats [9, 10]. And the different degrees of commitment of the academic staff concerned with implementing suggested changes [11].

Commitment to quality is a strong indicator of that ownership and a key prerequisite for both personal and organizational effectiveness [12]. Given the importance of staff commitment to quality in higher education, it is notable that there are no plethora measures of it that can be used in empirical studies within higher educations area. Drawing on Jackson's conceptualization of quality commitment construct [12], this paper has two main aims:

1. To examine staff attitude toward quality based on Jackson's conceptualization of quality commitment construct, using cross-sectional data from staff performing a variety of roles within three contrasting faculties at a Higher Educational Institution (*M0*); and

2. Using data from a second phase examination, to estimate the change in staff attitude toward quality after implementation of intrinsic/extrinsic rewards (*M1*).

1. Conceptualization of quality commitment

The starting point for defining key components of employees' commitment to quality is the psychological literature on the construct of organizational commitment. Although a number of taxonomies of organizational commitment have been proposed, the most influential analysis is that of [13] who defined three elements:

1. Identification;
2. Involvement; and
3. Loyalty.

They incorporated these elements in the widely used Organizational Commitment Questionnaire [13, 14] and [15] developed them further in distinguishing the core construct of affective commitment from what they called continuance commitment, which reflects constraints on the individual's opportunities to move to another organization.

This attitudinal construct of commitment implies a composite of affective, cognitive and behavioral components as indicators of employee commitment to organizational values (see [16, 17]). Affective commitment is defined as employee emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization and its goals. It results from and is induced by an individual and organizational value congruency. As a result, it becomes almost natural for the individual to become emotionally attached to and enjoy continuing membership in the organization [15, 18, 19, 20]. [21] and [22], identified factors which help create intrinsically rewarding situations for employees to be antecedents of affective commitment. These factors include such job characteristics as task significance, autonomy, identity, skills variety and feedback concerning employee job performance, perceived organizational support or dependence (the feeling that the organization considers what is in the best interest of employees when making decisions that affect employment conditions and work environment), and the degree that employees are involved in the goal-setting and decision-making processes.

Affective indicators include pride in affiliation to the company's goals, and feelings of satisfaction derived from involvement with the company's goals. Cognitive indicators include identification with the organization's goals and values, and a shared sense of importance of the company's goals. Behavioral indicators include active participation in the goals of the organization, and willingness to exert effort towards goal accomplishment. Table 2 summarizes the components and indicators of employee commitment to organizational values.

2. Models of the role of quality commitment within total quality programs

The success of total quality strategies depends on a combination of organizational systems, technical systems and people [23]. TQM initiatives are associated with changes in technology, HR practices and reward systems. The primary role for worker commitment within the quality literature is as a mediator of the impact of these changes on individual and organizational performance. For example, [24] propose a variety of methods for motivating employees in total quality programs: bonuses for high quality, quality campaigns, economic rewards, quality control circle activities and job rotation.

[23] also proposed other methods support total quality initiatives through human resources best practices;

1. Communicate the importance of each employee's contribution to total quality,
2. Stress quality –related synergies available through teamwork,
3. Empower employees to make a difference, and;
4. Reinforce individual and team commitment to quality with a wide range of rewards and reinforcements.

[26] used the Quality Motivation Survey (25 items) to measure employee perceptions of the motivating effect of different aspects of TQM. Two scales were found: technological (visible benefits in efficiency, effectiveness, reductions in scrap & rework) and personal (career advancement, enhancement of personal relationships). The implied model in both studies is that management HR practices and work design are factors which increase motivation, and motivation in turn leads to improved performance (both quantity and quality).

Similarly, [27] has argued that system factors such as reward systems and leadership processes and job design have an impact on work performance through aspects of motivation. He proposed that TQM emphasizes extra-role behaviors and that "internal work motivation derived from enriched work will lead to extra-role performance behavior, including engaging in teamwork and continuous improvement activities" [27, p. 523]. Fit between personal goals and values and those of the organization is also likely to be conducive to greater extra-role work performance [27, 28]. Thus, two perspectives on individual work values motivation and individual identification with organizational goals – are associated with the same outcome, greater willingness to perform outside the job role and lead to greater work performance.

[23] studied the quality management strategies of nine Swedish organizations, and identified three kinds of quality strategies:

1. Control;
2. Motivation; and
3. Reorganization.

Table 1 – Dimensions of organizational commitment

Elements	Dimensions
Identification	– A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values.
Involvement	– A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization.
Loyalty	– A strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Source: Adapted from [13, p. 604]

Table 2 – Dimensions of organizational commitment

Elements	Dimensions
Affective	– Pride in affiliation to the company's goals, and feelings of satisfaction derived from involvement with the company's goals.
Cognitive	– Identification with the organization's goals and values, and a shared sense of importance of the company's goals.
Behavioral	– Active participation in the goals of the organization, and willingness to exert effort towards goal accomplishment.

Source: Adapted from [13]

The control strategy represents a technical systems solution, while the other two are seen as TQM strategies which differ in detail but share the common characteristic of seeking to develop employee commitment to the organization's quality goals. Then, "*All individuals and groups within a company should commit themselves to the interests and goals of the entire company*" [23, p. 358]. The difference is that the motivation strategy seeks to influence motivation directly through training, involvement programs and initiatives such as quality circles; while the reorganization strategy seeks to influence motivation through modifying work processes and work design, which is considered as main aspects of intrinsic motivation in reward systems [29, 30].

3. Reward System and staff commitment to quality

The role of reward system as an antecedent of employee motivation and commitment has been highlighted in the work psychology literature. Commitment to quality is an evident outcome of effective reward system. It stimulates employees toward goal achievement and commitment to objectives [31, 32, 33, 34, 35], invokes feelings of accomplishment of self-worth from employees who have done some quality work [36], reinforces team identity and esprit de corps [37], motivates employees to improve the process and boosts morale in the work environment by creating a healthy sense of competition among individuals and teams seeking recognition [38], leads to a desire to attain high standards [39], and acts as a source of motivation for faculty and operate as an important source of extrinsic motivation for faculty [39].

One aspect of reward system from this literature is included in the present study: the intrinsic/extrinsic rewards.

It is seen in the literature that reward practices of organizations are mostly analyzed under the classification of intrinsic rewards (those related to feelings of accomplishment or self-worth) and extrinsic rewards (those related to pay or compensation issues- are external to the job itself) [29, 30]. Extrinsic rewards are used to show that the company is serious about valuing team contributions to quality [40, p. 581],but, were shunned by a number of quality leaders, including Ishikawa, Crosby, Juran and Deming, and by many organizations that adopt their recommendations [25].

Intrinsic rewards are derived from the content of the task itself and include such factors as interesting and challenging work, self-direction and responsibility, variety, creativity, opportunities to use one's skills and abilities, sufficient feedback regarding the effectiveness of one's efforts [29, p. 366], sense of

achievement, variety, challenge, autonomy, responsibility, and personal and professional growth. They also include status, recognition, praise from superiors and co-workers, personal satisfaction, and feelings of self-esteem [30, p. 43].

Most firms implementing TQM have traditionally relied heavily on intrinsic rewards [36, p. 80]. Intrinsic rewards are used to provide recognition to a team for making a quality contribution, help reinforce team identity and "esprit de corps" [41, p. 44], to motivate individuals toward specific behaviors toward specific behaviors [42], reinforces individual and team commitment to quality [38], increase feelings of self-esteem and accomplishment [43], and provide recognition to a team for making a quality contribution [37]. Employees are thought to be motivated to work hard to produce quality results when they have pride in their work, they believe their efforts are important to the success of the team, and their jobs are fun, challenging, and rewarding [30].

4. Research methodology

4.1. Sample

Data were obtained from academic staffs of the American University of Culture and Education in Lebanon, and drawn from contrasting faculties: faculty of Education, faculty of Business and faculty of Engineering at two phases, before (*M0*) and after launching reward schemes (*M1*) to the target sample. A variety of lecturer roles were included in the samples, in order to give a broad distribution on the intrinsic/extrinsic rewards characteristics. The university had well developed quality programs, yet didn't have a well-developed reward system.

The American University of Culture and Education (AUCE) is a private higher Education institution, Founded in 1983, AUCE's degree programs are accredited and certified by the Lebanese Ministry of Education and Higher Education in Lebanon, and by the Ministry of Education & Scientific Research in Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Qatar, and most of the Arab Countries. On 15 April 2010, the American University of Culture & Education got the accreditation of the British Accreditation Council for Independent Further and Higher Education. The university accommodates about 1500 students in different academic specializations, the faculty of Business, faculty of Education and faculty of Engineering. The university cadre constitutes of 200 academic staff and 60 administrative staff distributed among eight branches/ campuses all around Lebanon. The data used in the two phases of this study were gathered from Tyr campus before and after the introduction of reward system (sample size =84).

4.2. Procedure

The same procedure was used for collecting survey data within each faculty. The quality commitment scale was included within a survey instrument containing a mixture of standardized instruments and items designed specifically for the organization in question. Questionnaires were administered by the researcher to academic staff members on two stages, before (*M0*) and after launching reward schemes (*M1*) to the target sample and consent to take part in the survey was obtained after the researcher explained the purpose of the survey. Confidentiality was assured, and completed questionnaires were removed from the study site for processing. Feedback was provided on the main findings of the survey to all academic staff who took part.

4.3. Experiment Design

The experiment on the impact of rewards on staffs' attitude toward quality commitment was planned to take place in three different faculties at the university; the faculty of Education, faculty of Engineering and the faculty of Business. Rewards were carefully selected based on the findings of an empirical investigation on Academic Reward Systems in Lebanon [44]. Table 3 represents Lebanese academic staffs' appreciation of variety of rewards.

In this study, respondents ($n = 265$) were asked to rate the motivational effect of a variety of intrinsic / extrinsic rewards, the highest rated reward ($mean = 4.1318$) was "Opportunities for promotion" then Possibility for training, seminars and further education supported by the university ($mean = 4.0643$), this reflects an intrinsic motivational orientation of the academic staff. The model of experiment was intended to measure the varying level of commitment among these three faculties after introducing varying levels of reward to each faculty as follows;

4.3. A: Faculty of Education

A set of rewards were officially launched in coordination with the university management and the head of the faculty of Education, A formal letter signed by the university officials targeted all members of the faculty of Education, including a three main rewards parallel with the expected performance criteria's, basis and responsibility of evaluation. The three main rewards are:
1. Researcher of the semester Award;
2. Discipline Award; and
3. Instructor of the semester award.

In addition, some privileges were granted specifically to all staffs of the faculty of English, the privileges are;
1. Ability to select which courses to teach per semester.
2. Two training sessions to be held during the rest of 2015 at the university. The training program will be designed to fit your professional needs; you will have the main voice in setting its priorities.
3. A regular meeting with the university director (at the end of each semester) to communicate your suggestions on potential developments on quality issues at the faculty of English.
4. Your right to get a regular feedback from the faculty of Education head of department on your progress.
5. The right to report about any quality misconduct to the university director directly in a secured way.

4.3. B: Faculty of Engineering

Other set of rewards were officially launched in accordance with the university management and the head of the faculty of Engineering, A formal letter signed by the university officials targeted all members of the faculty of Engineering ,including a two main rewards parallel with the expected performance criteria's, basis and responsibility of evaluation. The two main rewards are:
1. Researcher of the year Award;
2. Instructor of the semester Award.

The distinguishing characteristic among the offered rewards to the faculty of English and the faculty of Engineering is that faculty of Engineering members receive only two awards with no other privileges.

1.4.3. C: Faculty of Business

As per the experiment, faculty of Business staff members was intentionally left without any kind of rewards. As a control faculty, neither rewards nor privileges were granted to this faculty.

5. Measurement of staff commitment

In accordance with the conceptualization of quality commitment described above, a set of 12 items was construct was adopted from Jackson (2004) (see Table 4. Responses to each item were recorded on a five-point scale from not at all (1) to all the time (5). The properties of the scale are described below.

5.1. Results before (*M0*) and after rewards (*M1*)

Following are responses gathered during the two phases measurement,respondents were asked to appraise their attitudes toward questions of table 4 on a scale from 1–5 and cross the corresponding box, considering how often

Table 3 – Dimensions of organizational commitment

Rate of motivational effect: 1 = no motivational effect, 2 = low motivational effect, 3 = average motivational effect, 4 = good motivational effect, 5 = high motivational effect	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Researcher of the year award	251	3,6454	1,41625
A financial reward of a well-done project/research	252	3,7460	1,40821
Staff of the Attendance award	188	3,2500	1,39374
Award ceremonies of 10,20 and 30 years of service	251	3,5697	1,43879
An article of you at work, published in the university's magazine	252	3,4206	1,46868
Lunch with seniors & colleagues in the university cafeteria as a reward	256	2,9492	1,31707
A personal "thank you"or note of appreciation from coordinator, dean or colleagues	260	3,9846	1,13889
Verbal praise of appreciation from the manager in front of the colleagues	259	3,5907	1,23674
Allowed to purchase the work tools and software of choice	193	3,1917	1,38049
Car benefits (only taxable value each month to be paid)	190	3,0895	1,39818
Housing benefits (only taxable value each month to be paid)	187	3,0695	1,48848
Challenging new assignments regularly	255	3,5059	1,26077
Private office rooms	192	3,6771	1,41047
Flexible office hours	192	3,7500	1,33028
Free medical services	190	3,8632	1,47006
Opportunities for promotion	258	4,1318	1,26847
Relaxation room for lunch breaks at the university's facilities	249	3,2972	1,42558
Possibility for training, seminars, and further education supported by the university	249	4,0643	1,33346
University's benefit programs to gyms, public swimming pools and other exercising	182	3,2473	1,52669
Free tickets to movies, theatres, and cultural events and sports events	183	2,7541	1,53697
Benefits of getting help in cleaning the house	179	2,2011	1,44712
Displaying your name on the research display board	196	3,3878	1,43318

Source: Adapted from [44]

Table 4 – List of scale items

Item wording
A **Q1** It pleases me to know that my own work has made a contribution to the Quality of the university's outcomes
A **Q2** A major source of satisfaction from my job comes from producing a quality Piece of work
A **Q3** It is important to me that my university continues to put an emphasis on Quality
B **Q4** I am continually taking action to improve the quality of my work
B **Q5** Even if my work was never checked, I would continue to treat quality as Being important
B **Q6** I do not mind spending more time on a task in order to increase its quality, Even if I get no credit for it
B **Q7** I am prepared to put in extra effort to meet quality goals
B **Q8** In my job, quality is the most important target to achieve
C **Q9** I feel that quality is the most important aspect of my job
C **Q10** I take personal responsibility for the quality of my own work
C **Q11** Each individual has an important part to play in increasing the quality of My University's outcomes
C **Q12** I feel I share a responsibility for the quality of my university's outcomes
Note: A = affective facet; B = behavioral facet; C = cognitive facet

Source: Adapted from [13]

they behave accordingly. (1 = Not at all, 2 = Few times, 3 = Some times, 4 = several times, 5 = All the time).

The respondents constitutes of 84 members among different faculties at university; 28 instructors from the faculty of Education, 24 from the faculty of Business and 30 from the faculty of Engineering. 76 instructors are teaching staff while only 8 are administrative once. 44 of them are junior level staff while 40 are senior level. About 56 are part timers while 28 are full time instructors, 24 are female while 60 are male instructors.

It's notable that significant changes in staff attitudes took place in the faculty of Education and Engineering, whilst no changes took place in the faculty of Business. Changes in staffs of the faculty of Education's attitudes toward all questions is reasonable due to the fact that all faculty members received more rewards and granted more privileges than other faculties members. Remarkable that in the faculty of Engineering significant changes took place only toward questions Q1, Q2 and Q6, while no changes took place toward question Q9 at all. These results might be justified by the fact that faculty of Engineering members received less rewards and faculty of Business members didn't receive any rewards at all and weren't granted any privileges.

According to position type (administrative/teaching), results shows a significant changes in teaching staff attitudes toward all questions, whilst only slightly significant changes in administrative staff attitudes toward question Q11 and no changes toward other questions. The

Таблица 5 – Changes in staff attitudes according faculty

	Faculty of Business				Faculty of Education				Faculty of Engineering			
question	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change
Q01	24	3.33 (0.96)	3.17 (0.82)	−0.17	30	3.67 (0.80)	4.67 (0.61)	1.00 ***	30	3.27 (0.87)	3.93 (0.94)	0.67 ***
Q02		3.17 (0.56)	3.17 (0.56)	0.00		3.53 (0.63)	4.47 (0.63)	0.93 ***		3.07 (0.78)	3.80 (0.85)	0.73 ***
Q03		3.58 (0.65)	3.50 (0.66)	−0.08		3.80 (0.41)	4.60 (0.50)	0.80 ***		3.13 (0.73)	3.73 (0.58)	0.60 ***
Q04		3.50 (0.66)	3.50 (0.51)	0.00		3.47 (0.90)	4.27 (0.78)	0.80 ***		3.40 (0.89)	3.87 (1.04)	0.47 *
Q05		3.42 (0.65)	3.33 (0.64)	−0.08		3.40 (0.81)	4.13 (0.82)	0.73 ***		3.47 (0.63)	3.80 (0.55)	0.33 **
Q06		2.42 (0.97)	2.50 (0.88)	0.08		3.47 (0.63)	4.20 (0.66)	0.73 ***		2.87 (0.97)	3.60 (1.04)	0.73 ***
Q07		3.33 (0.64)	3.42 (0.50)	0.08		3.47 (0.63)	4.20 (0.76)	0.73 ***		3.33 (0.71)	3.73 (0.78)	0.40 **
Q08		3.42 (0.65)	3.42 (0.65)	0.00		3.40 (0.72)	4.20 (0.76)	0.80 ***		3.33 (0.61)	3.80 (0.76)	0.47 **
Q09		3.42 (0.78)	3.42 (0.78)	0.00		3.53 (0.63)	4.27 (0.70)	0.73 ***		3.33 (0.96)	3.67 (1.03)	0,33
Q10		3.27 (0.77)	3.33 (0.76)	0.06		3.79 (0.42)	4.53 (0.63)	0.75 ***		3.60 (0.50)	4.00 (0.64)	0.40 **
Q11		3.33 (0.48)	3.33 (0.48)	0.00		3.13 (0.82)	4.13 (0.73)	1.00 ***		3.20 (1.06)	3.67 (0.80)	0.47 *
Q12		3.08 (0.97)	3.08 (0.97)	0.00		3.27 (0.94)	4.13 (0.90)	0.87 ***		3.67 (0.61)	4.00 (0.64)	0.33 **

For m0, m1: there are mean value and standard error in parenthesis for each cell
***, **, * : means significance at 0.99, 0.95 and 0.90 levels respectively

Таблица 6 – Changes in staff attitudes according to position type

	Administrative Stuff				Teaching Stuff			
question	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change
Q01	8	3.75 (0.46)	3.75 (1.16)	0.00	76	3.39 (0.91)	4.00 (0.98)	0.61 ***
Q02		3.00 (0.76)	3.75 (0.89)	0.75		3.29 (0.69)	3.87 (0.87)	0.58 ***
Q03		3.75 (0.46)	4.25 (0.46)	0.50 *		3.47 (0.68)	3.95 (0.76)	0.47 ***
Q04		3.50 (0.93)	4.00 (1.31)	0.50		3.45 (0.82)	3.89 (0.83)	0.45 ***
Q05		3.25 (0.46)	3.75 (0.46)	0.50 *		3.45 (0.72)	3.79 (0.77)	0.34 ***
Q06		2.50 (1.20)	3.50 (1.60)	1.00		3.00 (0.92)	3.50 (1.05)	0.50 ***
Q07		3.50 (0.53)	3.75 (0.89)	0.25		3.37 (0.67)	3.82 (0.76)	0.45 ***
Q08		3.50 (0.53)	3.75 (0.89)	0.25		3.37 (0.67)	3.84 (0.78)	0.47 ***
Q09		3.50 (0.93)	3.75 (1.16)	0.25		3.42 (0.82)	3.82 (0.92)	0.39 ***
Q10		3.75 (0.46)	4.00 (0.76)	0.25		3.56 (0.60)	4.00 (0.83)	0.44 ***
Q11		3.00 (0.76)	4.00 (0.76)	1.00 **		3.24 (0.85)	3.71 (0.76)	0.47 ***
Q12		4.00 (0.00)	4.25 (0.46)	0.25		3.29 (0.89)	3.74 (0.97)	0.45 ***

For m0, m1: there are mean value and standard error in parenthesis for each cell
***, **, * : means significance at 0.99, 0.95 and 0.90 levels respectively

case of administrative staffs' attitudes is reasonable due to the low administrative participants' number.

From a managerial level point of view, a significant change took place in the junior staffs' attitudes toward quality commitment, Noting that slightly significant changes of junior's attitude toward questions Q5 and Q6 took place. It's Worth mentioning that less changes in middle level staffs' attitudes happened toward some questions, whilst rewards produce no changes in senior level staffs' attitudes.

It's obvious that part timers are more influenced by rewards than full timers, although there is a significant change in part timers' attitude, there is less significant changes toward question Q9 and Q12. In contrast, there is a significant change in full timers' attitudes only toward questions Q2 and Q3, and no critical change in their attitudes toward other items.

Rewards impact on staffs' attitudes is evident on male responses more than females once. Generally, it's clear that a significant change took place in male attitudes; however their attitudes toward questions Q9 and Q12 witnessed slight changes only.

Discussion

In this section, authors will consider the following criteria regarding the appraisal of influence of rewards on staffs' attitude toward quality commitment. criteria's are; the significance of change in staffs' attitude after the introductions of rewards, thus the degree of change in staffs' attitudes is a reflection of how much rewards were received by staff , and how much privileges were granted to them. In addition, other facets of influence might be useful to highlight; compatibility of rewards in relation to position type, managerial level, employment status and gender.

In relation to the three faculties, the highest level rewards were given to the faculty of Education members and the significant changes in attitudes were observed in their attitudes. On the second hand, faculty of Engineering members was given less rewards and no privileges, and this was also reflected in slight changes in their attitudes. And the "control Faculty", the faculty of Business members was given neither rewards nor privileges and they responded in "no changes" in their attitudes.

According to the above discussion, we can infer the degree of change in staffs' attitudes toward quality commitment to the amount of rewards and privileges granted to them. In addition, we can understand the fact that faculty of Engineering members revealed less changes whilst no rewards produced any changes in staffs of the faculty of Business.

From a managerial level point of view, The changes in junior level staffs' attitudes might reflect the state of "juniors" who seek incentives and rewards especially in

Таблица 7 – Changes in staff attitudes according to managerial level

question	Junior Level				Middle Level				Senior Level			
	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change
Q01	44	3.59 (0.73)	4.18 (0.95)	0.59 ***	26	3.08 (1.09)	3.54 (1.03)	0,46	14	3.57 (0.76)	4.14 (0.86)	0.57 *
Q02		3.27 (0.62)	3.86 (0.93)	0.59 ***		3.31 (0.84)	3.85 (0.78)	0.54 **		3.14 (0.66)	3.86 (0.86)	0.71 **
Q03		3.59 (0.50)	4.14 (0.70)	0.55 ***		3.46 (0.65)	3.77 (0.82)	0.31		3.29 (1.07)	3.86 (0.66)	0.57
Q04		3.55 (0.66)	4.09 (0.74)	0.55 ***		3.08 (1.09)	3.31 (0.84)	0.23		3.86 (0.36)	4.43 (0.76)	0.57 **
Q05		3.55 (0.66)	3.95 (0.83)	0.41 **		3.23 (0.82)	3.46 (0.65)	0.23		3.43 (0.51)	3.86 (0.36)	0.43 **
Q06		3.05 (0.83)	3.64 (1.08)	0.59 ***		2.92 (1.09)	3.31 (1.09)	0.38		2.71 (1.07)	3.43 (1.22)	0.71
Q07		3.36 (0.65)	3.86 (0.77)	0.50 ***		3.54 (0.51)	3.85 (0.54)	0.31 **		3.14 (0.86)	3.57 (1.09)	0.43
Q08		3.32 (0.64)	3.86 (0.82)	0.55 ***		3.62 (0.64)	3.92 (0.63)	0.31 *		3.14 (0.66)	3.57 (0.94)	0.43
Q09		3.50 (0.66)	3.95 (0.78)	0.45 ***		3.31 (1.01)	3.62 (0.62)	0.31		3.43 (0.94)	3.71 (1.20)	0.29
Q10		3.48 (0.67)	4.00 (0.96)	0.52 ***		3.67 (0.48)	4.00 (0.57)	0.33 **		3.71 (0.47)	4.00 (0.78)	0.29
Q11		3.45 (0.66)	3.95 (0.78)	0.50 ***		3.00 (0.89)	3.54 (0.51)	0.54 **		2.86 (1.03)	3.43 (0.94)	0.57
Q12		3.14 (1.07)	3.64 (1.12)	0.50 **		3.54 (0.51)	3.92 (0.63)	0.38 **		3.71 (0.47)	4.00 (0.78)	0.29

For m0, m1: there are mean value and standard error in parenthesis for each cell
***, **, * : means significance at 0.99, 0.95 and 0.90 levels respectively

Таблица 8 – Changes in staff attitudes according to employment status

question	Full Timer				Part Timer			
	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change
Q01	28	3.50 (0.84)	3.93 (0.90)	0.43 *	56	3.39 (0.91)	4.00 (1.04)	0.61 ***
Q02		3.21 (0.69)	3.93 (0.81)	0.71 ***		3.29 (0.71)	3.82 (0.90)	0.54 ***
Q03		3.50 (0.51)	4.00 (0.54)	0.50 ***		3.50 (0.74)	3.96 (0.83)	0.46 ***
Q04		3.43 (0.92)	3.71 (0.98)	0,29		3.46 (0.79)	4.00 (0.81)	0.54 ***
Q05		3.50 (0.64)	3.79 (0.69)	0,29		3.39 (0.73)	3.79 (0.78)	0.39 ***
Q06		2.86 (1.08)	3.43 (1.32)	0.57 *		3.00 (0.89)	3.54 (0.99)	0.54 ***
Q07		3.43 (0.63)	3.86 (0.65)	0.43 **		3.36 (0.67)	3.79 (0.82)	0.43 ***
Q08		3.36 (0.49)	3.71 (0.60)	0.36 **		3.39 (0.73)	3.89 (0.87)	0.50 ***
Q09		3.50 (0.75)	3.79 (0.69)	0,29		3.39 (0.87)	3.82 (1.05)	0.43 **
Q10		3.62 (0.50)	3.93 (0.60)	0.31 **		3.56 (0.63)	4.04 (0.91)	0.48 ***
Q11		3.14 (0.85)	3.64 (0.73)	0.50 **		3.25 (0.84)	3.79 (0.78)	0.54 ***
Q12		3.64 (0.62)	3.93 (0.60)	0.29 *		3.21 (0.95)	3.71 (1.07)	0.50 **

For m0, m1: there are mean value and standard error in parenthesis for each cell
***, **, * : means significance at 0.99, 0.95 and 0.90 levels respectively

Таблица 9 – Changes in staff attitudes according to gender

question	Female				Male			
	n	m0	m1	change	n	m0	m1	change
Q01	24	3.50 (0.66)	4.17 (0.82)	0.67 ***	60	3.40 (0.96)	3.90 (1.05)	0.50 ***
Q02		3.33 (0.64)	3.83 (0.70)	0.50 **		3.23 (0.72)	3.87 (0.93)	0.63 ***
Q03		3.50 (0.88)	4.00 (0.72)	0.50 **		3.50 (0.57)	3.97 (0.76)	0.47 ***
Q04		3.58 (0.65)	4.00 (0.83)	0.42 *		3.40 (0.89)	3.87 (0.89)	0.47 ***
Q05		3.58 (0.50)	3.92 (0.78)	0.33 *		3.37 (0.76)	3.73 (0.73)	0.37 ***
Q06		2.83 (0.82)	3.17 (1.01)	0,33		3.00 (1.01)	3.63 (1.12)	0.63 ***
Q07		3.50 (0.66)	3.92 (0.78)	0.42 *		3.33 (0.66)	3.77 (0.77)	0.43 ***
Q08		3.58 (0.50)	4.00 (0.59)	0.42 **		3.30 (0.70)	3.77 (0.85)	0.47 ***
Q09		3.58 (0.88)	4.00 (1.02)	0,42		3.37 (0.80)	3.73 (0.90)	0.37 **
Q10		3.73 (0.46)	4.08 (0.78)	0.36 *		3.52 (0.63)	3.97 (0.84)	0.45 ***
Q11		3.33 (0.96)	3.83 (1.01)	0.50 *		3.17 (0.78)	3.70 (0.65)	0.53 ***
Q12		3.67 (0.48)	4.08 (0.65)	0.42 **		3.23 (0.96)	3.67 (1.02)	0.43 **

For m0, m1: there are mean value and standard error in parenthesis for each cell
***, **, * : means significance at 0.99, 0.95 and 0.90 levels respectively

their early employment trip, while "no changes" in senior level staffs' attitude might reflect also seniority, maturity and self-actualization needs more than "lower level needs".

Employment status based changes reflect the state of part timers who seek complementary intrinsic/extrinsic compensations and thus their attitudes were subject to change in contrast to full timers who receive stable financial and non-financial compensations and thus are not overwhelmed by rewards.

On the other hand, the idea that "males" are more dazzled by rewards might be compatible with the fact that they hold more responsibilities than "females" in the Lebanese context. And "females" might be in favor with complementary rewards more than necessary once.

Findings draw us into the establishment of some useful recommendations that might be helpful for promoting quality commitment in higher education institutions in Lebanon. Among the notable issues, compatibility of rewards is of high concern to be considered, whereas part

timers, junior level staffs were in favor with rewards more than full timers and senior level staff. Thus, university officials and decisions makers should take into account the "different wants" of "different actors" to guarantee more overwhelming staffs and more significant changes in their attitudes.

Future works on the effect of reward system on university staffs' commitment to quality is recommended, especially when it takes into consideration the limitations of this study where the experiment took place only at one university. Generalization of this study findings require undertaking in depth examination and high scale study, where variety of Lebanese universities are included, and the context of different managements, cultures, and quality systems are considered.

Список литературы

[1] Higher Education Strategic Plan: Documentation of Ministry of Education and HE, DGHE, 2007/2008.

[2] Loukkola, T., Zhang, T. Examining Quality Culture: Part 1 – Quality Assurance Processes in Higher Education Institutions / T. Loukkola, T. Zhang. – Brussels: E U A Publications, 2010. – 50 p.

[3] Zairi, M. Total quality management sustainability: what it means and how to make it viable / M. Zairi // International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management. – 2002. – Vol. 19, iss. 5. – P. 502–7.

[4] Antony, J. Critical success factors of TQM implementation in Hong Kong industries / J. Antony, K. Leung, G. Knowles, S. Gosh // International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management. – 2002. – Vol. 19, iss. 5. – P. 551–66.

[5] Wirth, M. Qualität von eLearning: Konzepte und Methoden zur Beurteilung der Qualität eLearning-gestützter Aus- und Weiterbildungsprogramme [Electronic resource] / M. Wirth // EUSL. – Mode of access: http://www.amazon.de/gp/product/3933436613. – Date of access: 01.08.2015.

[6] Newton, J. Feeding the Beast or Improving Quality? : academics' perceptions of quality assurance and quality monitoring / J. Newton // Quality in Higher Education. – 2000. – Vol. 6, iss. 2. – P. 153–63.

[7] Rowley, J. Motivation and academic staff in higher education [Electronic resource] / J. Rowley //Emerald Insight. – Mode of access: http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/09684889610125814. – Date of access: 22.03.2009.

[8] Smidts, A. The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification / A. Smidts, A.T.H. Pruyn, C.B.M. van Riel // Academy of Management Journal. – 2001. – Vol. 44, iss. 5. – P. 1051–62.

[9] Lipsky, M. Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services / M. Lipsky. – New York : Russel Sage Foundation, 1980. – 244 p.

[10] Prottas, N. The power of the street level bureaucrat / N. Prottas // Urban Affairs Quarterly. – 1978. – Vol. 13, iss. 3. – P. 285–312.

[11] De Vries, P. Self-assessment within the quality assessment process: a critical perspective / P. De Vries // Higher Education Policy Series. – 1997. – Vol. 40. – P. 88–100.

[12] Paul, R. Jackson. Employee commitment to quality / R. Jackson Paul // International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management. – 2004. – Vol. 21, iss. 7. – P. 714–730.

[13] Porter, L.W. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric clinicians / L.W. Porter, R.M. Steers, R.T. Mowday, P. Boulian // Journal of Applied Psychology. – 1974. – Vol. 59, P. 603–9.

[14] Mowday, R.T. The measurement of organizational commitment / R.T. Mowday, R.M. Steers, L.W. Porter // Journal of Vocational Behavior. – 1979. – Vol. 14. – P. 224–47.

[15] Meyer, J.P. Testing the 'side-bet theory' of organisational commitment: some methodological considerations / J.P. Meyer, N.J. Allen // Journal of Applied Psychology. – 1984. – Vol. 69. – P. 372–8.

[16] Mishra, A.K. Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: the role of trust, empowerment, justice, and work redesign / A.K. Mishra, G.M. Spreitzer // Academy of Management Review. – 1998. – Vol. 23. – P. 567–88.

[17] Reichers, A.E. A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment / A.E. Reichers // Academy of Management Review. – 1985. – Vol. 10. – P. 465–75.

[18] March, J.G. Organizations / J.P. March, H.A. Simon. – New-York : Wiley Pub. Co., 1958. – 345 p.

[19] Hall, D.T. Personal factors in organizational identification / D.T. Hall, B. Schneider, H.T. Nygren // Administrative Science Quarterly. – 1970. – Vol. 15. – P. 176–190.

[20] O'Reily, C.A. Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior / C.A. O'Reily, J. Chatman // Journal of Applied Psychology. – 1986. – Vol. 71. – P. 361–378.

[21] Steers, R.M. Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment / R.M. Steers // Administrative Science Quarterly. – 1977. – Vol. 22. – P. 46–56.

[22] Mottaz, C.J. Determinants of organizational commitment / C.J. Mottaz // Human Relations. – 1988. – Vol. 41. – P. 467–482.

[23] Bengtsson, L. Total quality management and work organization: relationship between quality management strategies and work organization in Swedish industrial companies / L. Bengtsson, M. Ljungström // Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing. – 1998. – Vol. 8, iss. 4. – P. 351–66.

[24] Kanji, G.K. Quality motivation / G.K. Kanji, K. Kristensen, J.J. Dahlgaard // Total Quality Management. – 1995. – Vol. 6, iss. 4. – P. 427–34.

[25] Evans, J. The Management and control of Quality / J. Evans, W. Lindsay. – 2005. – 6 ed., Mason : Thomson Publishing. – 760 p.

[26] Cheng, T.-K. Quality motivation in China: humanistic and technological / T.-K. Cheng, S.-F.F. Chan // Total Quality Management. – 1999. – Vol. 10, iss. 7. – P. 967–78.

[27] Waldman, D.A. The contribution of total quality management to a theory of work performance / D.A. Waldman // Academy of Management Review. – 1994. – Vol. 19, iss. 3. – P. 510–36.

[28] Chatman, J.A. Improving international organizational research: a model of person-organization fit / J.A. Chatman // Academy of Management Review. – 1989. – Vol. 14. – P. 333–49.

[29] Mottaz, C.J. The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction / Mottaz, C.J. // The Sociological Quarterly. – 1985. – Vol. 26, iss. 3. – P. 365–385.

[30] Mahaney, R.C. The Effect of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards for Developers on Information Systems Project Success / R.C. Mahaney, A.L. Lederer // Project Management Journal. – 2006. – Vol. 37, iss. 4. – P. 42–54.

[31] Thomas, S.L. Research and practice in performance appraisal: Evaluating employee performance in America's largest companies / S.L. Thomas, R.D. Bretz Jr. // SAM Advanced Management Journal (07497075). – 1994. – Vol. 59, iss. 2. – P. 28.

[32] Austin, A.E. Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions / A.E. Austin, Z.F. Gamson. – Washington, DC : Association for the Study of Higher Education. – 1983. – 131 p.

[33] Bland, C. The Impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions / C. Bland, B. Center, D. Finstad, K. Risbey, J. Staples // Journal of Higher Education. – 2006. – Vol. 77, iss. 1. – P. 89–123.

[34] Deming, W.E. Out of the crisis / W.E. Deming. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press. – 2000. – 256 p.

[35] Senge, P.S. The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization / P.S. Senge. – New York : Currency Doubleday. – 1990. – 430 p.

[36] Allen, R.S. Aligning Reward Practices in Support of Total Quality Management / R.S. Allen, R.H. Kilmann // Business Horizons. – 2001. – Vol. 44, iss. 3. – P. 77–85.

[37] Magjuka R.J. Team-Based Employee Involvement Programs: Effects of Design and Administration / R.J. Magjuka, T.T. Baldwin // Personnel Psychology. – 1991. – Vol. 44, iss. 4. – P. 793–812.

[38] Besterfield, D.H. Total Quality Management // D.H. Besterfield. – 3rd ed. – London: Pearson Education, 2003. – 640 p.

[39] Cameron, J. The debate about rewards and intrinsic Motivation: Protests and accusations do not alter the results / J. Cameron, W.D. Pierce // Review of Educational Research. – 1996. – Vol. 66. – P. 39–52.

[40] Stajkovic, A.D. Differential Effects of Incentive Motivators on Work Performance / A.D. Stajkovic, F. Luthans // Academy of Management Journal. – 2001. – Vol. 4, iss. 3. – P. 580–590.

[41] Balkin D. Rewards for Team Contributions to Quality / D. Balkin, S. Dolan // Journal of Compensation &Benefits. – 1997. – Vol. 13, iss. 1. – P. 41–47.

[42] Latham, G.P. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century / G.P. Latham, C.C. Pinder // Annual Review of Psychology. – 2005. – Vol. 56. – P. 485–516.

[43] Honig-Haftel, S. The Effectiveness of Reward Systems on Innovative Output: An Empirical Analysis / S. Honig-Haftel, L.R. Martin // Small Business Economics. – 1993. – Vol. 5, iss. 4. – 261–269.

[44] Mourtada, T. Higher education in Lebanon: an empirical investigation on the academic reward system / T. Mourtada // Инновационные образовательные технологии. – 2015. – № 1(41). – С. 36–46.

Mourtada, T. Higher education in Lebanon: an empirical investigation on the academic reward system / T. Mourtada // Innovatsionnyye obrazovatel'nyye tekhnologii. – 2015. – № 1(41). – С. 36–46.