

**Gender and Emotions at Work: A Reconceptualisation of Work
Commitment**

Author

Fisher, Ronald James

Published

2007

Thesis Type

Thesis (PhD Doctorate)

School

Department of Management

DOI

[10.25904/1912/377](https://doi.org/10.25904/1912/377)

Rights statement

The author owns the copyright in this thesis, unless stated otherwise.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/366871>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

**Gender and emotions at work: A reconceptualisation
of work commitment**

Ronald James Fisher

Bachelor of Arts, Master of Commerce, Master of Transport Management,
Master of Business Administration

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**Department of Management
Griffith Business School
Griffith University**

April 2007

Removal Notice

Some figures from Chapter 4 have been removed from the electronic version of this thesis for copyright reasons.

Abstract

This thesis provides a different lens through which work commitment can be viewed, with a particular focus on how such commitment is gendered and emotionalised. The study is a qualitative investigation into how work commitment is gendered and emotionalised within a university-based workplace, highlighting the long-standing conceptual and methodological inadequacies of work commitment research. In addition, it also recognises the gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment, through the development of a grounded theory of work commitment. The grounded theory of work commitment provides a significant addition to the current literature, and enables a depth of insight not yet achieved in previous theorising and conceptualisation of work commitment.

This study uses gender and emotion as a lens through which to study work commitment for several reasons. First, the theorising and conceptualising of work commitment to date has not fully considered the impact of gender and emotions upon how organisations and individuals describe and measure work commitment. Only a few studies have argued that commitment is a gendered construct with women ascribing different meaning to work commitment than men. Work commitment research has also not adequately addressed the importance of emotions as part of commitment, with emotional aspects of commitment being regarded as the efforts of organisational members to retain membership or embrace organisational goals and values. It is this lack of attention to the importance of the relationships between gender and emotions and their impact on work commitment, and how this relationship is understood from the perspective of organisational members, that underpins the need for research in this area. Therefore, this study investigates and addresses the question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* This thesis utilises a specific methodological and theoretical approach to the study of work commitment. In comparison to the extensive work commitment literature, which has been primarily functionalist in nature, utilising a dualistic ontology and positivistic epistemology, the study upon which this thesis is based uses a grounded theory approach. A focus on understanding from the perspective of people in the workplace,

rather than a focus on measurement of a number of commitment related constructs, has allowed the researcher to delve deeper into important issues relating to commitment that have either been previously overlooked or only partly understood. For example, previous research has mainly regarded gender and emotions as independent, objective constructs, with no regard given to the intertwining relationships within which these constructs exist. In contrast, this research reconceptualises work commitment through accounts of the workers themselves. A grounded theory methodology and method is used to build a substantive theory of work commitment. Grounded theory provides an appropriate methodology and method to understand how commitment is gendered and emotionalised by building a theory based on the interpretations of workers of commitment in their workplace.

This research concludes that the work commitment of university academic staff is a gendered construct. Women are often faced with the competing demands of the greedy institutions of home and the workplace (Coser, 1974; Franzway, 2000). Maintaining an effective work/life balance has important implications for work commitment, with women being affected to a greater degree than men. In addition, the career building work activities of male staff, such as a focus on research, also impact unfairly upon women, for this activity is often at the expense of teaching and service to the university. This study also found that emotions are central in the construction of work commitment, not only in relation to the display of emotions but also in relation to the ways in which emotions are considered indicators of work commitment. Women tend to display emotions like caring, passion and excitement while men tend to show anger at perceived poor management and decision making.

This study makes an important contribution to the work commitment literature through illustrating how gender and emotions impact upon organisational, career and professional commitment, issues which have been neglected in previous research. The construction of a theory of work commitment, through the utilisation of a grounded theory approach, enables a theory of commitment to be built based on the lived interpretative experiences of organisational members.

The construction of a grounded theory of work commitment allows for illustration of commitment to organisation, profession and career as the common

threads that link the sub-categories of the theory. As a result of the tendency of men to concentrate on research as a commitment to career, work that is less well regarded by decision makers, such as teaching and service, falls to women. Organisational commitment is weak amongst both women and men, with commitment at the departmental or school unit level not being reflected at the organisational level. Professional commitment is strong, and clearly gendered, with women associating teaching with the notion of profession. Career commitment for women is mainly centred on giving, learning and helping. For men, career commitment involves a focus on research and a commitment based on reciprocity. The grounded theory produced by this research is a substantive theory which focuses on behavioural phenomena involved in work commitment in the setting for the study. As a substantive grounded theory its findings may not be generalisable beyond the setting of the study.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Table of contents.....	vi
List of tables.....	xii
List of figures.....	xiii
List of acronyms.....	xiv
Acknowledgements.....	xv
Statement of original authorship.....	xvi
Chapter 1 Background and Justification for the Study.....	1
Purpose of the study.....	1
The importance of commitment in contemporary workplaces.....	2
Research problem.....	3
Justification for the study.....	4
Methodology.....	5
Structure of thesis.....	6
Chapter 2 Work Commitment, Gender and Emotions.....	11
Introduction.....	11
Methodological issues.....	17
Emotional aspects of commitment.....	22
Work commitment.....	25
Attempts to classify and understand commitment.....	25
Commitment: measurement and theory.....	28
Organisational commitment.....	29
Occupational commitment.....	31
Professional commitment.....	33
Organisational commitment and gender.....	34
Gender blindness and suppression.....	34
The missing dimensions of emotions.....	37

Emotional labour.....	39
Greedy organisations.....	43
Presenteeism.....	44
Maintaining a work/life balance.....	47
Norm of organisational man.....	49
Appraisal and promotion in academic work.....	51
Conclusion.....	57
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	61
Introduction.....	61
Research orientation.....	62
Ontology and epistemology.....	66
Methodology.....	69
Method.....	70
Data collection.....	72
Sample.....	75
Interviews.....	79
Critique of grounded theory.....	83
Conclusion.....	92
Chapter 4 Data Collection and Analysis.....	95
Introduction.....	95
Organisational and ethical clearance and informed consent.....	99
Theoretical sensitivity.....	100
Data collection.....	101
Selection of interviewees.....	103
Analysing interview material.....	104
Identifying concepts.....	110
Changing the sampling strategy.....	116
Theoretical coding.....	120
Identifying core and sub-core categories.....	123

Judging the goodness of qualitative research.....	124
Conclusion.....	127
Chapter 5 Gendering Work Commitment.....	129
Introduction.....	129
University as a greedy institution.....	130
Presenteeism as an indicator of commitment.....	143
Balancing work and family life.....	150
Female stereotypes.....	154
Commitment through exceeding requirements.....	157
Appraisal of commitment.....	160
Harassment of female staff.....	164
Perceptions of self and commitment to work.....	167
Male perceptions of self and work.....	167
Female perceptions of self and work.....	168
Compliance.....	170
Exploitive role model.....	172
Differing standards.....	172
Conclusion.....	174
Chapter 6 Emotionalising Work Commitment.....	177
Introduction.....	177
Fear of work through skill deficits and diminished organisational support.....	178
Anger/annoyance with poor organisational work allocation.....	180
Passion/enthusiasm for work	184
Emotional attachment to work	186
Emotional work and dissonance	188
Excitement about teaching and research	191
Obsession with work as manifest by presenteeism	194
Concern for others/care for students and quality	195
Obligation/duty of care to organisation	198

Conclusion.....	203
Chapter 7 Achieving Work Commitment	209
Introduction.....	209
Meaningful work.....	211
New work challenges.....	214
Work ethic.....	215
Meaning of commitment to academic staff.....	217
Teaching as a source of commitment.....	218
Research as a source of commitment.....	219
Recognising lack of commitment.....	221
Managerialism.....	226
Lack of appreciation.....	228
Disengagement.....	229
Conclusion.....	230
Chapter 8 Creating Work Commitment	233
Introduction.....	233
A substantive grounded theory of work commitment.....	235
Main conceptual elements of the theory.....	236
Gendering work commitment.....	237
Emotionalising work commitment.....	237
Achieving work commitment.....	238
Creating work commitment – a core category and BSP.....	239
Commitment to the organisation.....	239
Commitment to profession.....	245
Commitment to career.....	249
Female academic staff.....	249
Male academic staff.....	254
Evaluating “Creating Work Commitment” as a core category and BSP.....	258
Generation of concepts.....	259

Systematic linkage between concepts.....	259
Development and conceptual density of categories.....	259
Accommodation of variation.....	259
Consideration of micro and macro conditions.....	260
Consideration of process.....	260
Significance and extent of findings.....	260
Does the theory stand the test of time.....	261
Conclusion.....	262
Chapter 9 Implications and Conclusions.....	264
Introduction.....	264
Conclusions about the gendered nature of work commitment.....	266
Conclusions about the emotionalised nature of work commitment.....	268
Implications for theory.....	269
The grounded theory of work commitment.....	270
Methodological implications.....	271
Importance of gender in theorising and conceptualising commitment.....	272
The impact of emotions in accounting for affective work commitment.....	272
Extending previous research by Singh & Vinnicombe (2000a).....	273
Career and professional commitment as distinct constructs.....	273
Implications for practice.....	274
Limitations.....	275
Further research.....	276
References.....	278
Appendices.....	311
Appendix A: Affective, continuance and normative commitment scales...311	
Appendix B: Academic levels.....313	

Appendix C: Interview guide – initial interviews.....	314
Appendix D: Memo for interview 1.....	316
Appendix E: Data analysis database.....	317
Appendix F: Interview guide – interview 5 onwards.....	318
Appendix G: Interview guide – interview 10 onwards.....	320

List of Tables

Table 1: Main epistemological and methodological differences between Glaser's and Strauss and Corbin's approaches to grounded theory.....	85
Table 2: Schedule of interviewees.....	121
Table 3: The sub-core category of gendered work commitment at university.....	129
Table 4: The sub-core category of emotional work commitment at university.....	177
Table 5: The sub-core category of academic work commitment at university.....	211
Table 6: Conceptual elements of the proposed grounded theory.....	236

List of Figures

Figure 1: The conditional matrix.....	104
Figure 2: The concept indicator model.....	106

List of Acronyms

ACS	Affective Commitment Scale
BSP	Basic Social Process
CWC	Creating Work Commitment
HRM	Human Resource Management
MMPI	Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
OCQ	Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
OCB	Organisational Citizenship Behaviour
OLE	Object Linking and Embedding
RSI	Repetitive Strain Injury

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors, Maree Boyle and Liz Fulop. You have both provided me with motivation, help and support during this research. Maree, your knowledge and guidance in conducting qualitative research, together with your extensive background in sociology, especially in the areas of gender and emotions, have been of immeasurable assistance to me. Liz, your support throughout my research, especially in the areas of methodology and gender, together with your eagle eye for a well written sentence, has been a major influence on my thinking and research on methodology, gender, emotions and commitment.

To my long-suffering wife Jo, thank you for your support and patience, particularly through the long periods of seven days a week work that you have endured. Without your support the journey would have been much more difficult.

I would also like to thank Griffith Business School for its generous support during the latter stages of my studies. Also, I thank the numerous, and necessarily nameless, academics at the unnamed university who agreed to be interviewed in conjunction with my research.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this thesis to Meredith Gibbs. Mega, your courage, will and determination have always been an inspiration to me, particularly in recent times.

Statement of Original Authorship

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Chapter 1

Background and Justification for the Study

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the research is to develop a substantive theory of how work commitment is gendered and emotionalised, utilising a grounded theory methodology. The setting for the study is a multi-campus Australian university, as the focus is on the experiences of professionals and their commitment. The grounded theory approach used is based on the seminal work of Glaser and Strauss (1967), further developed by Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998). Understanding the gendered and emotional aspects of work commitment is important as it addresses a gap in the way commitment is understood and conceptualised, and will inform future research about work commitment.

The Importance of Commitment in Contemporary Workplaces

The concept of work commitment was originally introduced as an alternative measure to job satisfaction, with a large body of subsequent research showing it to be a robust and stable construct (Cappelli, 1999; Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006). Work commitment has been described as being central to any study of Human Resource Management (HRM), to the extent that it has been argued that the reason for introducing HRM policies is to increase employee commitment so that other positive organisational outcomes will follow (Guest, 1998). Despite numerous studies spanning more than 40 years we still do not have a thorough understanding of work commitment (Guest, 1998). Work commitment is a broad construct under which several other key constructs are subsumed. Of these constructs, commitment to profession, career and organisation are central to this study because most professional

work incorporates each of these constructs to some degree. Guest (1998) has suggested that a lack of understanding of work commitment is due to a number of factors including the ineffectiveness of change programmes, weak training, failure to understand the antecedents of commitment, failure to change leadership behaviours and failure to develop appropriate rewards structures. The over-reliance on positivistic approaches in researching work commitment, with its focus on measurement, has exacerbated the problem.

In the workplace, job security has traditionally been exchanged for loyalty, with managers ensuring good performance through employee commitment (Liccione, 2005). Changes in the employment relationship, with a move away from lifelong employment, have forced employees into career building strategies in order to enhance employability in increasingly competitive, de-regulated employment markets (Waterman, Waterman, & Collard, 1994). Changes in the demography of workplaces, along with changed work values such as work-life balance and increased casual labour, have also impacted on commitment. Increases in commitment to career, together with the rise of new “professions”, and the commitment they engender, have tended to weaken commitment to the organisation (Cappelli, 1999).

In the marketplace most executives surveyed have indicated that commitment and loyalty are important factors in determining whether a business succeeds or fails (Cappelli, 1999; Rowley, 2004). Another study has found that employers regard commitment as the most critical employee behaviour, a viewpoint that Cappelli (1999) has questioned on the basis that workers now tend to change jobs more frequently, therefore minimising the need for commitment. However, it does appear that employees with higher levels of commitment have higher levels of work

performance, together with lower levels of lateness, absenteeism and propensity to leave (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987). In recent times, increases in employee empowerment and improved observability at work, due mainly to advances in technology, have also been claimed to increase employee commitment (Godard, 2001; Kazlauskaite, Buciunienne, & Turrauskas, 2006).

Changes in employee commitment have forced organisations to consider what it is they really want from employees. Organisations still need employees to act in the best interests of the organisation, through hard work and good corporate citizenship (Ryan, 2002). However, commitment is problematic, as it is part voluntary and part induced. Getting commitment right is difficult in organisations, as it is a deeply contested construct that is usually presented in management terms.

Research Problem

The purpose of this research is to discover the ways in which work commitment is understood from the perspective of organisational members, and to explore the gendered and emotional aspects of the phenomenon. The context for the study is a multi-campus Australian university, involving academic staff of various levels from all academic units of the university. Academic staff are professionals with diverse commitment and knowledge. Staff are charged with delivering the core business of the university in terms of research and learning (Bryson, 2004). The main functions of academic work are research, teaching and service to the university (Willmott, 1995). Achievement in academic work is used for performance appraisal, tenure and promotion. The research question is: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* In addressing the research question the study will determine whether work commitment is gendered, and if so how? The research will also

examine how emotions contribute to a gendered perspective of work commitment. In addition to the purpose of the research, expressed in the research question, the research also aims to reconceptualise work commitment through the generation of a new theory.

Justification for the Study

Past research has failed to consider the gendered and emotional aspects of work commitment adequately, particularly given the changes to the workplace outlined above. Several reasons for failure have been identified, which include (a) the dominance of male identity and the “masculinity” of management work as the norm; (b) the predominance of men in decision making roles in organisations; (c) denial of, or blindness to, gender differences and the consequences of this (Linstead, 2000; Wilson, 1996); and (d) failure to recognise and understand the emotional content of work commitment (Fineman, 2000b). Thus, a clear understanding of how gender and emotions impact on work commitment is needed. This is based on the assumption that understanding commitment is a prerequisite to actually achieving increased levels of commitment. A more complete understanding of commitment is particularly important in a rapidly changing business environment. Equitable employee performance management, and promotion of the most appropriate employees, is fundamental to business success (Michie & West, 2004). However, women are often judged, and promotion decisions are made, against standards of extra-high performance and commitment. (Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2002). These are different standards to those against which men are usually judged.

Work commitment has been mainly conceptualised in ways that have failed to recognise gender differences (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) in

two main ways. Firstly, they fail to recognise that the lens through which the performance of men and women is viewed has been principally designed and operated by men. Therefore, the paradigm must reflect these biases. Secondly, the predominant means of conducting research in organisational and management studies utilises a functionalist approach (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), based on a dualistic ontology and a positivistic epistemology. Research conducted using the functionalist paradigm fails to recognise the very attributes that women bring to management, along with the ways in which they experience work commitment.

Existing measures of work commitment do not provide an adequate explanation of the commitment of women, and some men, in contemporary workplaces. As a consequence, in many workplaces the majority of workers are often incorrectly seen as having low commitment. Continued use of existing measures has the potential to impact adversely on performance appraisal and opportunities for promotion for women and some men.

Methodology

As argued above, continued use of a functionalist research paradigm in organisational and management studies has resulted in a failure to understand work commitment adequately. Understanding how professionals experience commitment may be achieved through the use of qualitative research, giving particular regard to the ways in which workers interpret, and derive meaning from, their work context. Previous qualitative research into work commitment has been undertaken by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000a; 2000b) and Franzway (2000). However, neither study has provided insight into how commitment is constructed and interpreted by people in the workplace, in particular the gendered and emotional nature of their commitment.

Grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) provides a new way of understanding work commitment through the interpretations of organisational members of events and people in their workplace. Grounded theory, an interpretive approach, is the most appropriate methodology and method for building a theory of work commitment as it allows theory to be constructed without imposing a predetermined framework, while still being cognisant of the contributions and limitations of prior research (Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Past research into work commitment has mainly followed a dualist ontology and objectivistic epistemology. Using grounded theory for this research will enable a substantive theory of work commitment to be constructed. In building a substantive theory of work commitment, the gendered and emotional aspects of commitment can be properly conceptualised and understood.

Structure of Thesis

This thesis has nine chapters, which are shown diagrammatically at Figure 1, below. The purpose of the first chapter is to provide an introduction by arguing the importance of understanding the gendered and emotional nature of work commitment. Accompanying the understanding of the construct of work commitment is the need to bring gender and emotions into accounts of work commitment. Whenever the generic term “commitment” is used the researcher is not seeking to attribute to any one dimension of commitment. The chapter sets out the aims and significance of the study, leading to a discussion about the context in which the research is undertaken. The methodology used in the research, a novel approach in studying commitment utilising grounded theory, is proposed. Finally, the structure of the thesis is discussed.

Chapter Two is a review of the work commitment and gender literature. The review commences with an overview of the traditional components of work commitment, namely professional, career and organisational commitment. The chapter continues by highlighting limitations in the ways in which commitment has traditionally been theorised and measured, a consequence of which is the neglect of the emotional content of commitment, together with the perception that women are less committed than men.

Issues faced by women in the workplace, particularly those associated with the measurement of workplace performance, based on male-oriented measures, are discussed. Women working in greedy institutions (Franzway, 2000), presenteeism (Baxter & Hughes, 2004), gender blindness and suppression (Linstead, 2000; Wilson, 1996) are also discussed, suggesting that the discipline and practice of management is clearly male-oriented. The chapter concludes that the current measures of work commitment are biased and methodologically unsound, and a reconceptualisation of work commitment should be undertaken. Grounded theory methodology and method is proposed; one that recognises the contributions and deficiencies of previous research, and constructs a theory based on the ways in which individuals interact with their social world.

Chapter Three details the orientation of the research in the interpretive paradigm, proposing that a grounded theory approach be adopted. Research into work commitment has mainly followed a dualist ontology and objectivistic epistemology. Previous approaches have resulted in the gendered and emotional nature of work commitment being either denied or suppressed. Where qualitative research has been reported, it has been limited to comparative case studies (Singh & Vinnicombe,

2000a) and discourse analysis (Franzway, 2000). Grounded theory is selected as the most suitable methodology for this study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), as the purpose of the research is to generate a new theory of work commitment based on the ways in which individuals in the workplace interpret reality, in terms of their professional, career and organisational commitment. In generating a new theory of work commitment, the gendered and emotional nature of commitment are considered.

In Chapter Four the collection and analysis of interview and observational data is reviewed. Commencing with organisational and ethical clearance to conduct the study, the selection of interviewees and data analysis are discussed. Open, axial and theoretical coding are utilised to construct categories based on a process of constant comparison of data. Data management utilising Microsoft Access as a database is described. Sub-core categories representing gendered work commitment, emotional work commitment, and other aspects of work commitment, are identified, together with a core category that link to form the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment. Finally, a criterion of “goodness” is used to evaluate the research.

Chapter Five presents the sub-core category of “Gendering Work Commitment”. Women working in a greedy institution, together with the difficulties of balancing work and family are presented as central to understanding the gendered nature of work commitment. The gendered nature of commitment, in this case teaching, research and service to the university, are also discussed as important issues for women.

Continuing with the presentation of sub-core categories, Chapter Six sets out the sub-core category of “Emotionalising Work Commitment”. This chapter discusses

the emotional content of work commitment as expressed by staff in their construction of the meaning of work commitment.

Chapter Seven presents the sub-core category of “Achieving Work Commitment”. Commencing with a discussion of what staff find meaningful in their work lives, enablers and barriers to commitment are discussed. The gendered and emotionalised content of enablers and barriers to commitment are discussed.

In Chapter Eight the core category and Basic Social Process (BSP), “Creating Work Commitment”, is introduced. “Creating Work Commitment” links the three sub-core categories discussed in chapters five, six and seven, to form the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment, thus addressing the aim of the research which was to reconceptualise work commitment through the generation of a new theory. The main components of the core category (i.e. organisational, professional and career commitment) together account for most of the similarities and variations in commitment exhibited by participants in the study.

Chapter Nine presents a discussion of the main research findings in the context of the contribution made to knowledge. In addressing the research question *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* commitment is shown to be a gendered and emotionalised construct. In terms of gender, women are faced with the challenges of managing the competing greedy institutions of work and home. Women also “fill the gap” in teaching and service resulting from men’s focus on research as an investment in their careers. For many women, a commitment to teaching is interpreted as professional commitment. The emotionalised nature of commitment is shown by women who construct commitment through a range of emotions such as caring, passion and excitement. Men tend to construct commitment through

presenteeism and adherence to the norm of organisational man. Organisational commitment is low for women and for men. Professional commitment is gendered, with women associating a commitment to teaching and students with professional commitment. Career commitment is also a gendered construct, with women investing in careers through giving, caring and helping. Men construct commitment to career through a focus on research as the element of work most valued by decision makers. Implications for theory and practice are considered, along with limitations and opportunities for future research.

Chapter 2

Work Commitment, Gender and Emotions

Introduction

Work commitment has been predominantly measured and studied using approaches that may have little relevance in today's business environment. Different approaches to the study of commitment are required in order to present a balanced, more gender sensitive and inclusive perspective of the commitment of *all* members of the organisation. Refocusing on gender and emotions presents a path to such a re-conceptualisation. The purpose of the research, which stems from the literature review that follows, is expressed in the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* The research also has the aim of reconceptualising work commitment through the generation of a new theory.

Within the substantial work commitment literature, Morrow (1983; 1993) has provided a review of the ways in which the phenomenon has been theorised and measured. Classification of work commitment has led to a number of forms being identified, which together with their main component parts, will be briefly discussed. The items of work commitment on which this research will focus are organisational commitment, occupational commitment and professional commitment, as seen from the perspective of organisational members.

In terms of commitment, despite long standing recognition of inadequacy in the recognition of gender as an important construct, numerous scholars have done little to address the question of why formidable barriers prevent the advancement of women, minority ethnic groups and the disabled (Brown, 1976; Wolff, 1977). In organisational and management studies, gender divisions have been largely treated as

irrelevant or invisible in practice (Cetin, 2006; Thompson & McHugh, 1990). Studies of work commitment have in the main followed the trend of either ignoring or suppressing the importance of gender (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). In a male dominated organisational world, the expectation has been that women's experiences can be adequately understood through the lens of the dominant gender culture, where stereotypes of men and managers coincide (Wilson, 1996), thereby failing to address the lived experience of gender. Bem (1993, p. 125) has suggested that masculinity and femininity are "cultural lenses" that act to polarise reality, thereby classifying society along gender lines. Bem (1993, p. 127) has further suggested that looking *at* the lenses of a culture, rather than *through* them, may reveal previously hidden cultural alternatives to the ways in which reality is organised. Attempting to understand women's experiences in organisations by looking through the lens of the dominant male-oriented culture is bound to be counter productive (Wilson, 1996).

Brewis and Linstead (2004) have suggested several competing perspectives on gender, within the substantial organisational and management literature. Highlighted are five schools of thought, three based on approaches relating to how gender impacts on the practice of management, the remaining two focussing on how gender can be incorporated into management theory. Each has implications for research where gender is an issue.

The first three approaches that have been suggested are liberal feminism, radical feminism and diversity. Liberal feminism is characterised by a focus on social justice and equality of employment opportunities, and is underpinned by the notion that women are not naturally inferior to men (Davidson & Cooper, 1992; Kanter,

1977). Radical feminism holds that social structures should be changed radically to reflect the natural differences between men and women, a subset of which is based on the notion that women are more in touch with their emotions, act more passionately and intuitively than men, and are therefore superior to men (Daly, 1984; French, 1993). Diversity is an approach based on the premise that managing diversity is now accepted business practice, one that is designed to improve business outcomes, and that gender is another form of diversity that should also be recognised (Kandola & Fullerton, 1998; Thomas, 1990).

The remaining two approaches, gender *in* management and *gendering* management, involve linking gender with organisational and management theory in the understanding that gender does affect the thinking and actions of managers (Brewis & Linstead, 2004, p. 58). They (2004, pp. 67-68) contend that denial and neglect of gender are linked to failure of management theory to recognise the actions and interactions of individuals, instead treating management as a set of abstract functions, thus leading to gender suppression and gender blindness, which will be discussed later in the chapter.

The gender *in* management approach is based on an argument that men and women manage differently due to differences in the ways in which they are socialised (Brewis & Linstead, 2004, p. 72; Calas & Smircich, 1995). Research has suggested that men and women do display different leadership styles, with men adopting a transactional style and women adopting a transformational style (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Jogulu & Wood, 2006; Rosener, 1990; Trinidad & Normore, 2005). Transactional leadership is conceptualised as rewarding the successful achievement of organisational outcomes, an approach based on maintaining organisational

functions without providing inspirational leadership performance (Bass, 1997). Transformation leadership, while entailing transactional leadership, provides motivation to followers through a range of charismatic, inspirational and intellectually stimulating behaviours (Bass, 1997).

Brewis and Linstead (2004) have also argued that despite the apparent advantages of transformational leadership, there are relatively few women in senior or executive management positions. It seems likely that the under representation of women in senior managerial ranks is due to predominantly male cohorts of decision makers in organisations; cohorts that in the main contain individuals who understand managerial and leadership qualities in different ways to women, based on their own approaches to leadership and management.

Brewis and Linstead (2004) have also commented on research by Alvesson and Billing (1997) that has advanced the notion that differences between men and women, as proposed by the gender in management school, are at odds with academic research. Alvesson and Billing (1997) have argued that there is *no* difference between men and women in their approach to leadership and management. Such an argument is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, it fails to recognise that the lens through which the performance of men and women is viewed is designed and operated by men, and therefore the outcome must reflect these biases. Secondly, the predominant means of conducting research in organisational studies and management utilises a functionalist approach (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), based on a dualistic ontology and a positivistic epistemology. A dualistic ontology proposes that objects exist independent of the mind, while a positivistic epistemology attempts to understand the world utilising approaches like the hypothetico-deductive method. Research

conducted using the functionalist management paradigm fails to recognise the very attributes that women bring to management.

The final perspective on gender in organisations and management suggested by Brewis and Linstead (2004) is *gendering* management. The *gendering* management approach holds that an individual's identity as male or female, as distinct from biological difference, is constructed around discourse. Discourse shapes and restricts individuals, the roles they play, and their accomplishments (Olsson & Walker, 2004). As a result women may choose to identify themselves with a masculine identity, one which is not the exclusive domain of men. Masculinity is typified as being objective, rational and self-assured, underpinned by a lack of emotion, a sense of competitiveness, and all-round toughness (Collinson & Collinson, 1997).

Within the *gendering* management approach, displaying certain kinds of emotions runs contrary to the notion of masculinity (Glaser & Frosh, 1994). For example, men mainly strive to conceal their feelings lest they be perceived as displaying womanly characteristics. For men, only when feelings are regarded as "manly", such as anger, is it acceptable to display them (Reynolds, 1992).

Individual success in organisations is linked to the predominant masculine paradigm; therefore it seems likely that both men and women who already are, or who wish to be, successful in organisational life will work at achieving what Connell (1995) has referred to as masculinist identities. For women, as Brewis and Linstead (2004) have pointed out, achieving a balance of masculine and feminine attributes is a necessary condition for success. Lennie (2000) has also suggested that current management theory follows a rationalistic perspective, one based on a dualistic

ontology and positivistic epistemology. Acker (1992) has argued that organisational life may be observed in a detached manner that denies any link between the object of conception and the conceiving act. Grounding management theory in objectivity reinforces the masculine notion of being able to manage in a detached, central way; one that effects change by directing others. Management practice and management studies are therefore inextricably linked, firstly reinforcing and in turn being reinforced by, the predominant functionalist, managerialist approach employed in management research. Mainstream management practice, theory and research therefore combine to reinforce the notion of masculinity in management through a focus on rationality in management practice, denial of “differences” in management theory, and excessive adherence to a scientific approach to management research.

Mainstream management literature, particularly in the USA while less prevalent in the UK, has shown that particular aspects of organisational life are clearly gendered. For example, entrepreneurship research (Bruni, Gherardi, & Poggio, 2004) has shown that the identities of men and women are constructed to maintain the notion that entrepreneurship is the domain of men. At the attitudinal and behavioural level, research has suggested (Brewer, 2000; Franzway, 2000, 2001; Jenkins, 2004; Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a, 2000b) that work commitment may also be a gendered construct based on standards devised and measured by men.

To explore these issues further, the chapter firstly discusses the emotional aspects of commitment in the context of the commitment of women. It then continues with a review of the literature relating to the ways in which commitment has been traditionally conceptualised and measured. Organisational, occupational and career commitment are discussed in conjunction with the gendered nature of commitment in

relation to gender blindness and gender suppression. Emotional issues associated with commitment in the context of the gendered nature of the workplace are discussed, along with key issues such as the greedy organisation, presenteeism, emotional labour and work/life balance.

Methodological Issues

Using the functionalist approach (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), a number of relationships between employee behaviours and work commitment have been proposed. Included here are relationships between organisational commitment and: (a) turnover and tardiness (e.g. Angle & Perry, 1981; Joiner & Bakalis, 2006); (b) performance and job involvement of employees (e.g. Leong, Huang, & Hsu, 2003; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974); (c) job satisfaction (e.g. Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Saks, 2006); (d) autonomy and responsibility (e.g. Conley, Muncey, & You, 2005; Koch & Steers, 1978); (e) role conflict (e.g. Bettencourt & Brown, 2003; Morris & Koch, 1979); (f) role ambiguity (e.g. Irving & Coleman, 2003; Morris & Sherman, 1981); (g) age (e.g. Angle & Perry, 1981; Freeborn, 2001); and (h) work experiences (e.g. Morris & Sherman, 1981; Saks, 2006). Porter et al., (1974) have proposed that organisational commitment is a more effective means of discriminating between organisational members staying or leaving the organisation than is job satisfaction. Porter et al., (1974) have also developed a measure of organisational commitment, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). Angle and Perry (1981) have noted that that the OCQ, which had been claimed to be a homogeneous measure of commitment, in fact measures both commitment to stay and value commitment, research that has been confirmed by Penley and Gould (1988) and Fisher (1990). For the purposes of measurement, organisational commitment has

been defined as (a) “attitudinal” (Mowday et al., 1979), (b) “calculative” (behavioural) (Becker, 1960; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972), (c) “continuance” (behavioural) and “affective” (Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990), and (d) “normative” (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Meta-analysis of a number of studies of commitment has been carried out.

Meta-analysis is a means of quantitatively determining the consistency, or otherwise, of previous research undertaken in respect of a particular topic (Hunter, Schmidt, & Jackson, 1982). Meta-analysis carried out by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) involving 124 published studies of organisational commitment based on the positivist approach mentioned above, has identified 14 studies where women appeared as a discrete group. Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) research has concluded that women tend to be more committed than men, although the magnitude of the difference is small. Mainly, there is no consistent relationship between gender and organisational commitment.

Similar analysis to that of Mathieu and Zajac (1990), has also been carried out by Cohen and Lowenberg (1990) involving 50 published studies of organisational commitment. Using positivist or quantitative approaches for analysis, ten studies existed where women were identified as a discrete group. Cohen and Lowenberg’s (1990) research has concluded that there is a weak relationship between gender and organisational commitment.

Although the meta-analyses carried out by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) and Cohen and Lowenberg (1990) have been based on studies that differentiate between women and men in the sample, women’s organisational commitment has not been an

outcome of any the studies. Any distinction between men and women has been an expression of gender made by participants, presumably captured as nominal data.

Other studies, using the measures of organisational commitment previously discussed, have shown mixed results. Studies of business executives (Ngo, 1998) and managerial and professional employees (LaVan & Banner, 1985) have concluded that there is no significant relationship between gender and commitment. Graddick and Farr (1983) have noted that women have lower levels of organisational commitment. Bus drivers studied by Angle and Perry (1981) have shown “the surprising result” that women appear to show higher levels of attitudinal commitment (i.e. commitment is a process of exchange between the organisation and the member) than men. While, in a study involving human resource workers (Wahn, 1998) women have been found to have higher levels of continuance commitment (i.e. commitment to stay) than men.

In a qualitative study of British and Swedish engineers (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a), utilising 37 matched pairs of men and women workers, women’s career prospects were shown to be adversely affected by male managers’ perceptions of women’s career and organisational commitment. Singh and Vinnicombe’s (2000a) research has also proposed that women’s adverse career prospects are due to the perception that male managers hold of the capabilities of women as managers. The male perspective is implicitly reinforced by perceived low levels of commitment, rather than on experience of women as managers (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a). A semi-structured interview approach, designed to reveal whether shared meaning of commitment existed between male and female workers, has also been used by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000a). Their analysis has revealed that the meaning of organisational commitment to males is mainly associated with task delivery along

with issues involving time frames or objectives. The meaning attributed to males is consistent with the existing positivistic measures of organisational commitment, reinforcing the proposition that the existing measures are male-oriented, thereby not representing women's experiences. Other meanings associated with males include being proactive, innovative, value-adding, challenge seeking and quality-minded (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a). Meanings associated with women include enthusiasm, involvement, concern for people and being available for work (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a). Organisational commitment clearly has different meanings for men and women. Also, the meanings associated with women have not been considered in the items used by the measures of commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer et al. (1990).

The barriers to success facing women who have to manage the complexities of family and career have been identified (Franzway, 2000). Current measures also fail to consider the dual role that some women (and indeed men) undertake in balancing family and work commitments. Consequently, it appears that women, together with men who display more "feminine" forms of commitment, are often incorrectly perceived as having different, mainly lower, levels of organisational commitment than the majority of male workers. Measures in current use, developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and used by most researchers over many years, have failed to identify the complex influence of emotions on commitment and the sources of these emotions.

The proposition that women express organisational commitment in a different way to men is supported by Franzway's (2000) research involving women working in the trade union movement. Her research is a case study based on interviews utilising

discourse analysis in the context of working for a trade union. During the interviews, women expressed commitment in terms of passion, consensus, service to members, enabling and strengthening the capabilities of others, sacrifice, and personal fulfillment. Also, the dominant male notion of commitment is grounded in a myth of self-sacrifice based on working long hours, a mind-set unconsciously reinforced by the union movement itself (Muir, 1994).

Morrow (1993) has suggested that the descriptions and measures of affective, continuance and normative commitment, proposed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer et al., (1990), have replaced calculative (organisational and employee transactions based on changes in side-bets or investments), and attitudinal commitment (employee belief in and acceptance of organisational goals and values, willingness to exert considerable effort on organisation's behalf and desire to remain a member). Although the measures have been designed to remove limitations associated with the former measures they remain based, as stated above, on a predominantly rationalistic approach underpinned by masculine constructions of the dimensions measured. A range of research has also followed this path.

Measures proposed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer et al., (1990) have required participants to choose from three pre-determined, structured sets of responses using a seven-point interval scale (Meyer et al., 1990). Feelings towards one's organisation are purported to be measured by Meyer and Allen's (1997) revised Affective Commitment Scale. However, the only question that relates directly to emotions asks: "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organisation." By contrast, Fineman (2000b), a leading scholar in the field of emotions and work, has introduced emotions such as happy, sad, excited, bored, passion, envy, fear, love, anger, guilt,

embarrassment, nostalgia and anxiety into studies of emotions. What emotions would the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS) questions capture? How could any sense be made of a choice made on an interval scale given the complexity of the concept? It appears that insight into the emotions identified by Fineman (2000b) would not be gained through the use of the ACS as a measure of commitment.

A positivistic view of reality, utilising quantitative techniques for data analysis, is the basis for Allen and Meyer's (1990) approach. Although affective commitment is, by definition, a measure of emotional commitment, the positivistic approach either denies the association of emotions with organisational commitment, or treats it in a very limited way. The questions used in the current commitment scales, as described in Appendix "A", reflect the grounding of the measure in the functionalist paradigm.

Emotional Aspects of Commitment

Previous studies of commitment have not considered emotions but rather emotional factors (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990; Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974). For example, research (Franzway, 2000; Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a, 2000b) has shown that, in the main, women's commitment has a greater emotional content than that of men, or that the content is perceived differently. However, this does not necessarily mean that women have lower levels of commitment. As the emotional content of commitment has been suppressed or distorted, women's perspectives of commitment have been largely ignored. This is evident in research into Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), where the various dimensions have been presented in the theory as being gender-neutral (Kidder, 2002). Indeed, they may be seen as being associated with different gender

stereotypes, through the language chosen to name the concepts (e.g. cheerleading versus sportsmanship), which automatically tie the concepts to gender. Also, more subtly through the characteristics and behaviours the concepts emphasise, which have different connotations relating to gender stereotypes. Whilst the work of authors such as Kark and Waismel-Manor (2005), Kidder (2002) and Acker (1990) has focussed on the gendered meanings of OCB, many of the ideas discussed can be relevant to understanding the meaning of OCB for other minority group characteristics. These include race, ethnicity and social class, or the intersection between gender and various different social identity categories, as gender issues are rarely experienced alone, often overlapping with other social identities (Kark & Waismel-Manor, 2005). In addition, two key issues have implications regarding the consequences of OCBs: (a) the effects of OCBs on managerial evaluations of performance and judgments regarding pay increases, promotions etc., and (b) the effects of OCBs on organisational performance and success. Consequently, women have often been incorrectly perceived as having lower commitment than men, thus making a lesser contribution through OCB, resulting in lost opportunities for promotion and inappropriate measurement of performance (Kark & Waismel-Manor, 2005). Males who do not display “traditional patterns” of commitment have also been disadvantaged through perceptions of their lack of fit with the traditional, rational masculine model (Knights & Richards, 2000).

The study of emotions in the workplace is relatively new, although in a short period of time it has developed into a sub-discipline of organisational studies (Fineman, 2000a). Much research into emotion has attempted to express it as a number, following the psychometric approach, which is itself based on the scientific

paradigm (Wirshbo, 1990). Researchers have desired to understand emotion and to include it as a measure of organisational behaviour, often expressing emotions as indicators of some other, usually unrelated behaviour (Sandelands & Boudens, 2000). Fineman (2004) has described attempts to classify emotions in this way as only approximating the complexities of an individual's emotional life. Despite the inaccuracies associated with attempting to understand emotions through measurement, results of the predominant psychometric approaches are viewed as important indicators of how people are perceived and managed in the workplace (Fineman, 2004).

Fineman (2004) has considered emotions to be a vitally important, yet poorly understood, part of organisational life. Citing Hochschild (1990), Fineman (2004) has stated that what we feel is as important as what we think and do. However, attempting to understand emotions through psychometric measures, a focus on measurement, by asking questions of people in a survey, is an attempt to decontextualise emotions, which Fineman claims cannot be achieved. Measurement of emotions, using psychometric means, is particularly problematic when it is used as an "item" for commercial success (e.g., high-esteem, enthusiasm and happiness) (Fineman, 2004, p. 725), providing a convenient, appealing yet completely inaccurate link between affect and behaviour.

Language has often not been sufficient to describe emotions, therefore, attempting to measure emotions in this way has been problematic (Fineman, 2004). Sandelands (1988) has also suggested that feelings and language differ in form, one being dynamic and simultaneous, the other expressing ideas in a linear fashion. Because of this incongruence, using language to describe emotion cannot help but

distort emotion in some way. Continuing with the inadequacy of language, Boudens (2005) has argued that emotions may best be accessed using indirect means, as emotions are communicated in different ways, involving both verbal and non-verbal means. Therefore the ability of language to reflect experience accurately is debatable. Boudens (2005, p. 1286) has also suggested that emotions involve concepts that are learned behaviours, and are not developed internally within the individual through introspection. It follows then that what individuals express as emotions, using language, may not be truly representative of what they are actually feeling, thus making measurement using self-reports problematic in the conceptualisation and theorisation of emotions. Furthermore, Wirshbo (1990) has suggested that prescribing words as labels for emotions not only categorises them, but may also change the quality or meaning of the phenomena to suit an individual's preconceived notion of what the phenomena *should* mean. The complex nature and role of emotions in interpersonal relationships often is not reflected in what an individual is feeling, or in how these feelings are reported (Fineman, 2004; Wirshbo, 1990).

Work Commitment

Attempts to classify and understand commitment

Morrow (1983) has proposed that work commitment plays a central part in organisational life, classifying commitment as comprising work ethic endorsement, job involvement, organisational commitment, career/professional commitment and union commitment. Work ethic endorsement is a multi-dimensional concept that involves the importance of work itself to the individual (Morrow, 1993). Components of work ethic endorsement include the Protestant work ethic (PWE), work ethic, work involvement, and employment commitment (Morrow, 1993). Of these four

components, Morrow (1993) has suggested that PWE is the most appropriate measure, based on psychometric data collected mainly in the USA.

When career commitment was reviewed by Morrow (1993), the predominant way of measuring it involved using a three dimensional approach entitled “career salience.” The measures of career salience include career loyalty, vocational planning and devotion to career. Occupational commitment is presumed to be encapsulated by career commitment (Blau, 2001; Morrow, 1983, 1993). Immediately prior to Morrow’s study in 1983, and subsequent to it, interest in how organisations manage professional employees increased. Research into managing professionals had a similar focus to career salience research, and possibly should have been integrated with it. Despite this, a parallel body of literature has arisen, including a new measure of professional commitment developed by Aranya, Pollock and Amernic (1981). Further research by Morrow (1993) has suggested that other components of career commitment include career involvement, career commitment (re-conceptualised by Blau in 1985) and modified career commitment (derived from, and closely associated with, the Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) measure of organisational commitment).

Morrow (1993) has suggested that professional commitment has emerged as a topic of interest to organisations since the 1980’s. The reasons for increased interest include the perspective that individuals hold about their particular vocation being a “profession” even though it may not be generally regarded as such (Burriss, 1983; Hallam, 2002; Von Glinow, 1988). Also, the number of vocations that are regarded as professions has increased. Finally, there is an awareness and acceptance of a growing shortage of workers in many industries, a trend that is likely to increase over time

(Konrad & Deckop, 2001) due to changes in work practices and demographics (e.g., the ageing workforce). Components of professional commitment include local or cosmopolitan (whether the commitment is to an organisation or a specialised occupation), professionalism (whether the individual subscribes to the ethos of a profession) and modified professional commitment (based on identification and involvement with a chosen profession). Research by Cherniss and Kane (1987) and Von Glinow (1988) has suggested that career commitment should be used rather than professional commitment mainly due to increasingly fewer differences between the notion of “occupation” and “profession.”

Job involvement is the form of work commitment where the focus is on the job itself (Morrow, 1993). Job involvement has been conceptualised in a number of ways, principally by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) in terms of job performance, self esteem and personal identification with work. Kanungo (1982) has also conceptualised job involvement as a cognitive state of identification with the job. Finally, Farrell and Rusbult (1981) have proposed the notion of job commitment, which is described in terms of job satisfaction, job alternatives and the organisational investments that one perceives to have accumulated in relation to the job.

The final component of work commitment is organisational commitment, which has attracted the attention of researchers more than any of the other components. Morrow (1993) has suggested that although a number of measures of organisational commitment exist, the main ones are affective, calculative and normative commitment as proposed by Meyer et al. (1990) and Allen and Meyer (1990). Most research in the domain of organisational commitment denies the impact

of gender on commitment, which is problematic. Organisational commitment will be discussed in greater detail later.

Commitment: Measurement and Theory

The substantial body of commitment literature contains a number of approaches to the definition and measurement of commitment. Included in these are the divergent views that commitment is a psychological state (Meyer et al., 1990), a situation involving individual choice (Weick, 1995), or a phenomenon that is not clearly understood due to the theoretical and methodological approaches applied (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a).

Extending the research of Meyer et al. (1990) and Allen and Meyer (1990), Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) have proposed that three distinct themes can be identified in the psychological approach. These themes represent commitment as a psychological state that is firstly an attachment between employee and organisation (affective), secondly a perceived cost associated with leaving the organisation (continuance), and thirdly an obligation to remain a member of the organisation (normative). These measures include the attitudinal and behavioural components of commitment.

Weick (1995) has proposed a behavioural view of commitment, based on the notion that individuals invest greater effort in understanding actions to which they are most strongly committed. Behavioural commitment is defined by Salancik (1977) as a force that binds an individual to his or her actions. Individuals become bound (committed) when behaviour is public, explicit, volitional and irrevocable (Salancik, 1977; Weick, 1995). The four behaviours act together to indicate that the action did occur, and that it occurred because the individual chose to do it. While organisations

have the ability to change situations in order to encourage commitment, Weick (1995) has suggested that many organisations, particularly bureaucracies, do not encourage individual choice due to the nature of control within these organisational forms. The higher the degree of control exercised by an organisation, the lower the opportunity an individual has to express commitment behaviourally.

Commitment has traditionally been theorised and measured by the predominant psychological approach, utilising quantitative methods. Using this approach has resulted in little consideration being given to gender differences affecting commitment in the workplace (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Qualitative research by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000a) has suggested that the meaning of commitment, as interpreted through the life experiences of individuals in the work place, differs between men and women. Consequently, when women's commitment is judged using the traditional quantitative approach, the results are usually inaccurate and misleading.

Singh and Vinnicombe's (2000a) research has important implications for the theory and measurement of commitment. In many workplaces women and some men, often the majority of workers, are incorrectly seen as having low commitment based on the traditional approach, bringing its continued use into doubt. This has the potential to impact adversely on performance appraisal and opportunities for promotion, where decision makers are mainly men, masculinity is reified and its primacy is reinforced through organisational processes (Martin, 1996).

Organisational commitment

Organisational commitment has been the subject of organisational studies for over thirty years (Cappelli, 1999; Guest, 1998). As mentioned above, most research

tends to be grounded in psychology, focusing mainly on whether commitment is regarded as “attitudinal” or “behavioural”. Organisational commitment has been described by DeCotiis and Summers (1987) as having important implications for both organisations and individuals, hypothesising that organisational commitment is a strong predictor of employee motivation and turnover.

Attitudinal commitment tends to focus on the organisation (Angle & Perry, 1983; Mowday et al., 1979; Shepherd & Mathews, 2000), with the needs of the individual being satisfied by interaction with the organisation. Individuals whose needs are satisfied by organisational interaction increasingly identify themselves with the organisation, while desiring to retain membership in order that the relationship may continue (Mowday et al., 1979).

Behavioural commitment tends to focus on the individual, in the belief that the behaviour of the member is central to organisational commitment (Angle & Perry, 1983; Mowday et al., 1979; Salancik, 1977; Shepherd & Mathews, 2000). An example of behavioural commitment is Becker’s (1960) theory of side-bets, where side-bets or investments (e.g., long service leave, sick leave, flexible working hours etc.) accrue on behalf of the individual and act to commit him or her to the organisation. Individually, side-bets may appear trivial. However, taken together side-bets accumulate to commit the individual to the organisation (Becker, 1960).

Measures of organisational commitment tend to be quantitative, mainly involving factor, correlation and regression analyses. Organisational commitment has been measured in various ways by different researchers, mainly along behavioural (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972; Ritzer & Trice, 1969) and attitudinal or affective lines (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990; Porter et al., 1974).

Affective commitment, as measured by the Porter et al., (1974), Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer et al., (1990) instruments, is determined by responses made to pre-determined items, which purport to measure emotional commitment. However, effective measurement of organisational commitment is not achieved, as commitment has traditionally been defined by researchers rather than through the life experiences of workers themselves (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a).

Occupational commitment

Career, occupational and professional commitment are terms that have been used interchangeably in the commitment literature (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000). Some researchers (Blau, 2001) have proposed that career commitment entails occupational commitment. Others (Lee et al., 2000) have suggested that occupational commitment includes both professionals and non-professionals. Furthermore, research has shown (Blau, 1985; McGinnis & Morrow, 1990) that the various categories of commitment tend to be positively related to one another.

Morrow (1993) has identified work commitment as including the affective and continuance dimensions of organisational commitment along with career commitment, work ethic and job involvement. More recent research (Blau & Ryan, 1997), has suggested that job, work and career (i.e., occupation) may also be multidimensional. Meyer et al., (1993) have suggested that occupational commitment, conceptualised and theorised using positivistic approaches, entails the dimensions of affective, normative and continuance commitment directed towards one's occupation.

Blau (2001) has also proposed that there is now a need to focus on occupational commitment rather than on organisational commitment. Changes in the

workplace will continue to involve restructuring and redefinition of the psychological contract (Stone, 2001). Factors such as worker insecurity about their jobs (Cappelli, 1999), increased global and national competition (Allred, Snow, & Miles, 1996; Chilton & Orlando, 1996), demographic changes, and increased benefits (Foot, 1996) exacerbate the impact of the changing workplace. As a result, other researchers (Blau, 2001; Handy, 1994; Johnson, 1996) have suggested that employee commitment may be changing from commitment to one's organisation to occupational commitment.

Occupational commitment, like organisational commitment, has mainly been studied quantitatively. Measures of organisational commitment, such as the OCQ (Porter et al., 1974), have been modified by exchanging the word "occupation" for "organisation" (Meyer et al., 1993). Following this approach, Meyer et al. (1993) have suggested that the three component model of organisational commitment, proposed by Meyer et al., (1990) and Allen and Meyer (1990), should also be a suitable measure of occupational commitment, with measures of affective, continuance and normative commitment apparently being generalisable across domains.

Research into occupational commitment has followed the same path as organisational commitment studies. Quantitative methods have been employed, using measures adapted from studies of organisational commitment. As with organisational commitment, these are based on a dualistic ontology and an objectivistic epistemology and are therefore not appropriate measures for reasons discussed above. Also, as is the case in organisational commitment research, neither gender differences nor emotions has been considered in the theory or measurement of occupational commitment.

Professional commitment

Morrow (1993) has proposed that professional commitment is a form of work commitment that emphasises the importance of a profession to an individual. However, there is no agreement among researchers about a theory of professional commitment, or to a large extent its measurement. Also, the relationship between professional commitment and other components of work commitment are not clearly understood. Research has tended to focus on measuring professional commitment quantitatively (Aranya et al., 1981; Gouldner, 1958; Hall, Smith, & Langfield-Smith, 2005; Hall, 1968; Lee et al., 2000), using psychometric measures.

Other research (Dwyer, Welker, & Friedberg, 2000) has investigated the professional commitment of accountants. The measure used was the OCQ, developed by Porter et al., (1974) to measure organisational commitment, though modified by replacing the word “organization” with “profession.” The research has suggested that a five item measure may be appropriate. Also, quantitative research undertaken by Wallace (1995), again using the modified OCQ (Porter et al., 1974), has suggested that professional commitment is typified by a life-long career, and the level of organisational commitment depends on the career support and advancement that the organisation offers.

Professional commitment research has also followed the pattern of organisational and occupational research in that it is grounded in a dualistic ontology and objectivistic epistemology. As with the other forms of commitment research discussed, professional commitment has given no consideration to gender differences or to the effect of emotions on commitment. Wallace’s (1995) research has suggested that an understanding of professional commitment is important to organisations in the

areas of the distribution of rewards, changes in the composition of the workforce (e.g., demographic changes, ageing workforce, greater specialisation etc) autonomy and career advancement, as a means of engendering organisational commitment through career support.

Organisational Commitment and Gender

Gender blindness and suppression

Few quantitative studies have focused on women's commitment specifically. Where women have been identified as a discrete group within research, the issue of gender, that is theorising it, has tended to receive little attention. Where gender has been considered, no consistent relationship between gender and commitment has been noted (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). The lack of a consistent relationship, together with negligible measurable differences between genders, has suggested that gender has not been an important consideration for researchers using quantitative approaches to measure organisational commitment. Women have been consistently measured against "male-as-norm" standards (Wilson, 1996, p. 826), with differences being regarded as "deficiencies" on the part of women (Acker, 1998). A range of studies has identified the characterisation of males as universal workers based on the false premise that maleness is neutral or the norm (e.g., Dickens, 1998; Fletcher, 2005; Hansen, 2002; Wajcman, 2000). Compounding the misrepresentation is the attribution to women of so called "typically feminine skills" (e.g., caring), which are claimed to be known innately. Meanwhile, skills associated with traditional "male" jobs (e.g., technical achievement) are viewed as qualifications that are *achieved* by men, in turn being valued more highly by

organisations. Work is clearly not gender neutral, and attempts to portray it as such only mask the politics and power relations of gender itself (Oakley, 2001).

Wilson (1996, p. 829) has suggested that the failure to incorporate gender and sexuality into organisational studies is “gender blindness.” However, being unable to see it is a different proposition to seeing and choosing to suppress it. Prominent management researchers such as Taylor, Weber, Mayo and Maslow were all *aware* of gender differences, yet their research actively worked to suppress gender (Linstead, 2000). In their major contributions to the discipline of management, these researchers sought to reduce differences, including gender differences, by a systemic “smoothing out” process (Linstead, 2000). For example, Maslow’s (1954) much quoted hierarchy of needs was founded on his research on captive primates, with regard to dominance behaviour. As Cullen (1997) has pointed out, Maslow’s (1954) research is methodologically unsound, being disproved by subsequent research. Maslow’s understanding of dominance in apes and monkeys was incorrect. Despite this, it led to the conclusion that high dominance women who displayed more masculine traits, have more in common with high dominance men than low dominance women, and the suggestion that the gender distinction be dropped altogether (Cullen, 1997; Maslow, 1954). None of the distinctions reported by Maslow (1954) have been identified in the hierarchy of needs. This is not gender *blindness*, but the deliberate *suppression* of observable difference for theoretical reasons (Linstead, 2000). The hierarchy, built on flawed primate research displaying very significant gender bias, has however, been so influential in management and organisational theory that it has been regarded as a “classic among classics” (Cullen, 1994). Furthermore, the ubiquitous nature of Maslow’s theory is evident even in current management texts

which continue to present the hierarchy of needs as the most well-known, classic and widely recognised theory of motivation (Cullen, 1997).

The seminal work of Mayo (1960), in the area of human relations, has followed a similar gender pattern to that of Maslow (1954). In the Hawthorne Studies women played an important part, one group being composed entirely of women the other of men. Despite the obviously gendered outcomes from the two groups, the results were presented in an aggregated and non-gendered way (Linstead, 2000; Mayo, 1960). Commenting on gender blindness and suppression, Wilson (1996) has proposed that organization theory should be reviewed and re-written from a gendered perspective. In this way the differences between men and women in the workplace would be clearly understood. Acknowledging differences does not mean that women should be undertaking less important work, or work of a lower status (Wilson, 1996).

While classic organisational theory (e.g., Taylor, Maslow, Mayo) has been presented in a deliberately biased manner in terms of gender, not all management research that has failed to acknowledge gender issues has done so deliberately (Brewis & Linstead, 2004). Much research that has followed the “classics” has failed to consider gender as an issue, which is gender blindness, as opposed to recognising it and deliberately suppressing it. The influence of the functionalist paradigm, under which most organisational and management research is undertaken, is itself heavily influenced by management science and rationality, which has compounded the problem through the methods associated with it.

Wilson (1996) has suggested that there is a general lack of attention to gender as a category of social reality. Women themselves have been able to do little to change this as they have not had control over the resources needed for the production

of knowledge (Wilson, 1996). Attempts to measure masculinity and femininity have been defined in ways that at best excluded women and at worst expressed an active dislike for them (Lewin, 1984). For example, in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), described as “the most widely-used and well-researched psychological test designed in existence” (Lewin, 1984, p. 179), the femininity dimension of the Masculinity/ Femininity measure was validated on a group of 13 homosexual men (Lewin, 1984). Condor (1991) has argued that ethical guidelines in psychology have had little effect in preventing the use of blatantly sexist research techniques and there exists a pervasive lack of concern for feminist issues.

The privileging of “maleness” over “femininity” is highlighted in qualitative research undertaken by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000a), suggesting that in the workplace women are perceived as having lower levels of both career and organisational commitment than men, a view that the researchers do not support. Singh and Vinnicombe’s (2000a) study has also shown that women’s commitment involves different emotional considerations to those of the men in their study. Singh and Vinnicombe’s (2000a) approach has drawn on the shared and different meanings of commitment between male and female engineers, utilising a qualitative case-study approach. Case studies often utilise *some* of the practices of grounded theory, however, the case method is more widely used for qualitative research between organisations or for longitudinal studies (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Lowe, 2002), and therefore will not be used for this research.

The Missing Dimensions of Emotions

Recent qualitative research (Franzway, 2000; Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a) has suggested that there is a link between gender, the gendered nature of emotions

and organisational commitment (Fulop & Linstead, 2004). Singh and Vinnicombe's (2000a) research has suggested that in an organisational context, women tend to experience different emotions to men in relation to organisational commitment. Also, within these differences, the level of seniority of women acts to modify the emotions displayed (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a). "Differences" are often interpreted as a lack of commitment, which is not necessarily so. More in-depth qualitative research is required into how emotions influence, or are linked to, work commitment as a whole, particularly when one considers changes that have occurred in the workplace. Qualitative data offer a means of revealing the "maleness" that underpins organisational studies (Bruni et al., 2004).

Within the male domains of organisation and management, a situation exists where work is categorised and commodified based on gender, a *gendering* management perspective (Brewis & Linstead, 2004), based on labour market processes where differences are exploited for profit (Tyler & Taylor, 1998). As a result certain work has come to be regarded as "women's work", mainly based on what are perceived to be the innate or natural characteristics of women (Pettinger, 2005). In service encounters women are perceived as being better than men at making contact with customers, men being "too explosive" to deal with difficult customers (Leidner, 1991, p. 198). Customer service work is also gendered in other ways. For example, in women's clothes shops the clothing worn by female shop workers is gendered, as are other attributes such as make-up, hairstyle etc., that make up the female aesthetic. A range of research has suggested that female attractiveness is an integral part of recruitment and continued employment in a number of industries, particularly those that have come to be regarded as women's work (Sanders, 2005).

The notion of women's work is characterised by the supposed natural attributes of women, such as patience, caring and thoughtfulness.

Emotional Labour

The concept of emotional labour is significant because it intertwines the two spheres, employment and domestic, while addressing aspects of specifically socially constructed skills which women have to learn (Williams, 2001). These represent tacit skills and are unrewarded because they are invisible. James (1989) has expanded the concept by considering it in relation to "caring work". The skills are housewives' skills (Williams, 2001) based on women's domestic work, and can range from the routine maintenance of the household (e.g., shopping, washing, ironing and being responsive to the needs of others), to sitting with a distressed child, friend or relative; or just providing company for someone who is lonely, frightened or in pain. This emotional care is a recognised part of the job in occupations such as hospice staff and child care workers. Hochschild (1997a) has described emotional labour as managing or suppressing feelings in order to present a false image, with the intention of engendering a particular behaviour in another. James (1989), supported by Hochschild's (1997a) research, has suggested that, unlike other types of work, this requires people to give something of themselves in order to carry out the work successfully. It is a notion which challenges the artificial division between domestic and workplace labour, and it is crucial to the continuity of the daily maintenance of both spheres (Williams, 2001).

Fineman (2000a) has argued that emotional labour does not just exist in low-paid service work. Emotional labour is also present in professional work (e.g., medical practice, dentistry, teaching, police etc.), where it is an essential part of the

social milieu. The gendered aspects of emotional labour cause particular problems for workers in what Fineman (2000a, p. 5) refers to “wrong sex” jobs (e.g., male nurse, female police officer etc.). People in “wrong sex” jobs have to deal with the gendered emotional stereotypes in order to meet the needs and expectations of employer and customer (Fineman, 2000a). Women’s identities, constructed by the ways in which they are perceived by others in a struggle against the male stereotype, reinforce the notion that emotional labour is a gendered process (Fulop & Linstead, 2004). Given the gendered and emotionalised environment in which emotional labour is conducted, one would expect that women’s commitment to work would reflect these challenges.

Parker (1990) has suggested that men construct caring in a different way from women, with a majority of men using the language of the labour market to describe their activities. However, only a minority of women describe their caring work in an occupational manner. Women carers, when compared with men, find difficulty in making a boundary between caring for and caring about. Because some women are compelled to do unpaid labour outside the context of industrial or employment rights which provide minimum pay and conditions, they do this at a considerable personal and financial expense to themselves (Williams, 1995). Often, women with an elderly parent to care for leave their employment early and lose financially by giving up paid work. Williams (1995) has claimed that even those women who maintain paid work still pay a price in restricted opportunities for training and general advancement, and experience higher levels of stress.

The categorising and commodification of work has also been carried out along lines of sexual difference as a main characteristic (Tyler & Taylor, 1998). In her seminal work about the gendering of work along emotional lines, Hochschild

(1983) has described the commercialisation of emotions for organisational purposes as emotional labour. Emotional labour is a gendered phenomenon that describes the ways in which workers, as part of their jobs, manage emotions in order to create an organisationally desirable display of emotion (Sass, 2000). Employers have exploited what may be considered to be desirable female characteristics mainly at the employee/customer interface in service industries. In the main, women are frontline workers and customers are the main recipients of their work (Conley, 2005). However, Conley's (2005) findings have overlooked the important issue that it is organisational ends that are being pursued, and the organisation is the ultimate beneficiary.

Building on Hochschild's (1983) work, Williams (2003) has suggested that women are conditioned, through the requirements of work, to use femininity as a means of service delivery. Service work for women has the potential to be exploited by an expectation that women will manage expression of behaviour, a surface approach, through to the management of feelings, a deep approach. Workers engaging in deep performances understand that they *should* feel particular emotions yet do not do so. Deep performances have the potential to incur psychological costs for workers. Emotional labour is presented as a gendered concept, based on the day-to-day interactions of women in the workplace, and underpinned by the notion that women's work has been regarded as unskilled, and often is neither recognised nor acknowledged. Emotional labour is externally controlled by managers and organisations. The negative aspects of emotional labour have included the potential for exploitation and alienation through the commercialisation of feelings (Williams, 2003).

A contrasting view of emotional labour, one that suggests that the commercialisation of feelings has been exaggerated by Hochschild, has been suggested (Schweingruber & Berns, 2005; Wouters, 1989), based on the notion that some workers derive satisfaction from emotional labour. However, research by Williams (2003) has shown that Wouters' (1989) research, in particular, is not sustainable, especially in regard to the changing workplace and increases in managerialism. Wouters (1989) also fails to consider the relationships between emotional control and required workplace behaviours demanded by predominantly male managers. .

Further research into the desirability or otherwise of emotional labour has suggested that women in high status jobs are no more likely than men to suffer adverse consequences from the performance of emotional labour (Wharton, 1993). Indeed, some women have reported higher levels of job satisfaction than men. However, for workers with less meaningful work, emotional labour can be a stressor and can lead to the emotional exhaustion of workers. Arguing that emotional labour can result in enjoyment and satisfaction, and is therefore acceptable, only presents one side of the argument. What is frequently overlooked is that workers who engage in emotional labour often need to develop coping strategies in the interest of their own well-being (Conley, 2005; Constanti & Gibbs, 2005). In this regard, there is a similarity between the demands of emotional labour and those of the greedy organisation discussed below, albeit for different reasons. It is not sufficient for work to appear to be desirable, challenging and satisfying for it not to be recognised as gendered, and in many cases undesirable.

Greedy Organisations

Franzway's (2000) description of her workplace as a "greedy organisation" is typical of many organisations, particularly those operating in an increasingly competitive, complex and dynamic environment. Such organisations strive to engender loyalty and commitment in their members, with some organisations demanding total, undivided commitment (Coser, 1974). Commitment is often achieved through the voluntary compliance of members by the organisation, fostering perceptions of the desirability of membership. Coser (1974) has termed such organisations "greedy institutions", a term adapted by Franzway (2000) to her organisational experiences. In her research she describes organisational processes that exist by weakening competing ties that organisational members may have, or by discouraging the formation of ties between organisational members and any other organisation or person who has demands that conflict with those of the organisation.

Greedy organisations are sustained by the voluntary commitment of members, from whom they demand absolute loyalty (Brandth & Kvande, 2002). Often, the genesis of the greedy organisation is founded in workplace changes, such as the empowerment of employees, which change the content and focus of jobs making them more challenging than before (Brandth & Kvande, 2002). As employees take up new challenges and opportunities voluntarily, organisations in turn place high demands on workers with the aim of establishing themselves as the core social identities of workers (Coser, 1974). As a result, workers are expected to provide exclusive and undivided loyalty in pursuit of interesting and exciting jobs. For women, family responsibilities and extended working hours clearly do not go together (Rasmussen, 2004). Consequently, women build up a "time debt" to their

families, which in turn leads to the commodification of parenthood (Kugelberg, 2006).

In reality, women often have to deal with the conflicting demands of competing greedy institutions, work and family (Coser, 1974; Franzway, 2001). It is argued that men are mainly able to concentrate on work and careers, while women often have to juggle the competing demands of home and work. Juggling competing demands also involves being able to cope with the emotional challenges that accompany the situation, such as feelings of guilt towards unmet commitments. Greedy organisations are clearly gendered, privileging men over women, while still measuring work commitment using male standards.

Eveline (2004) has suggested that universities are greedy organisations, places where values and commitment are distorted by an intensifying of work conditions. Increased work pressures lead to changed behaviours, including spending excessive time in the workplace, a form of presenteeism. Restructuring educational markets has led to an increase in emotional management work along with the emotional demands of a greedy organisation (Blackmore & Sachs, 2003).

Presenteeism

The notion of presenteeism, a male construction of the worker that emphasises being present at work for long hours and often on weekends (Baxter & Hughes, 2004), is a phenomenon often associated with greedy organisations. At university, so called “proper” academics, a male construction of the worker based on presenteeism, are those who have sufficient time to invest in their careers (Baxter & Hughes, 2004). In contrast, women often have the demands of home and family, effectively another potentially greedy institution, to balance along with an academic career. Presenteeism

acts as a gendered and often invisible organisational power process that categorises work as women's (e.g., secretary, receptionist) and men's (e.g., managers, supervisors) (Brewer, 2000). Commitment is often measured by the amount of time that an individual gives to the organisation, resulting in the perception that part-time workers are less committed and therefore of lower value to organisations (Jenkins, 2004). Women are often perceived as having lower commitment, having been forced into part-time work due to work-family conflicts resulting from working in greedy organisations. Sheridan (2004) has suggested that organisations value and reward longer working hours, exacerbating the issue for women. Men are pressured to work longer hours while the availability of part-time work also increases, ensuring that part-time work remains the domain of women. Being unable or unwilling to work long hours results in women being regarded as less meritorious, and consequently less entitled to rewards or promotion. The allocation of rewards is an important issue linked to the roles that women play, with women often occupying lower paid, more routine jobs, while jobs at a higher level are often associated with men (Collins, 2005).

Sheridan (2004) has questioned the absence of men from part-time work, highlighting the constructed nature of work practices and the gendered underpinnings to them. Sheridan (2004, p. 222) has argued that "women are connected to others, so they consider part-time work. Men see themselves as independent, so they don't consider part-time work. These self-perceptions are reinforced through gendered social norms and organisational practices, with economic underpinnings to each." Citing previous research by Hochschild (1997a) and Moss and Deven (1999) Sheridan (2004) has doubted that work patterns will change in response to policy. .

Expectations that men will work long hours, together with an organisational paradigm that values and rewards such behaviours, underpin the presence of presenteeism in many workplaces (Sheridan, 2004). Beechey and Perkins (1987) have suggested that gender enters into the construction of part-time jobs and that the division between full-time and part-time work is one crucial contemporary manifestation of gender in the workplace. There is nothing inherent in the nature of particular jobs that makes them full-time or part-time. Beechey and Perkins (1987) have also argued against seeing part-time work as work that is naturally associated with family commitments. Rather, they see the vested interests that business has in maintaining work structures which allow women to perform both paid and unpaid work (Truman, 1992).

Healy (1999) has focused on the case of women school teachers who take a break for childbirth, consideration being given to critical career events within an occupation group characterised by highly qualified workers at a time of change. Healy (1999, p. 186) has suggested that “women’s different career patterns, involving combinations of career breaks and part-time working, are at the root of assumptions about women’s commitment .” Also that careers for women “with caring responsibilities, itself a reflection of the dominant domestic division of labour, tend not to fit the male norm of career” (Healy, 1999, p. 186). Halford, Savage and Witz (1997) have argued that the male notion of career has resisted change, with social norms reinforcing the imbalance between those who seek and pursue careers and those who do not, either by intent or circumstance (Bradley, Healy, & Mukherjee, 2004; Halford et al., 1997).

Changes in the workplace have included a greater number of women in the workforce together with more women holding positions at higher levels in

organisations. Growth of international business has brought changes to the workplace, including the restructuring of organisations into different, usually smaller, entities demanding more complex forms of managing. Legislative changes, with a focus on anti-discrimination and equal opportunity in the workplace, have changed the relationships between managers, peers and subordinates. New technology has resulted in the need to retrain and, in some cases, reduce the numbers of workers. Finally, the increase of casual employment and other peripheral work, at the expense of full-time work, has fundamentally changed the attachments of many employees to the workplace. Women fill these ranks, but not necessarily willingly. All of these workplace issues have contributed to changes in the way that employees are committed to their organisations, occupations and professions, and their emotional engagement or involvement with their work. Given the changes in the workplace outlined above, a better understanding of the ways in which commitment is gendered and emotionalised is essential.

Maintaining a Work/Life Balance

In recent times researchers have drawn attention to the intersection of work and family (Gottlieb, Kelloway, & Barnham, 1998; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Hepburn & Barling, 1996; Kanter, 1977). The argument has been that there is a reciprocal relationship between the two spheres of social life that often result in conflict and tension (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Gutek et al., 1991). The trend in management studies has been to portray the interaction of the domains of work and family as being liable to generate conflict. Tensions have come to be characterised as *work family conflict*, where the main focus of research has been on identifying and resolving the causes of conflict (Runte & Mills, 2004). In recent years, it has been

suggested that mainstream management theory is actually more accurately labelled “malestream” as it fails to recognise the relationship between management and gender (Linstead, 2000). However, this research relies on role expectations defined within the dominant male-oriented discourses; those generated by men for men, which ultimately reinforce the status quo. Inherent in this discourse is the assumption that conflict is the inevitable result of competition for the limited resource of the employee’s time and commitment. The relationship between hours worked and perceptions of work-family conflict also reflects women’s position grounded in the notion that only financially remunerated activities are of value (Runte & Mills, 2004).

Runte and Mills (2004, p. 245) have argued that the current discourse, operating at the intersection of work and family, attempts to redress the imbalance between commitment and organisation. The imbalance has not been recognised. Indeed, commitment is still conceptualised and theorised in many workplaces in ways that reinforce the stereotypical gender roles of modernity (Runte & Mills, 2004, p. 245).

Recently, interest has centred on the question of whether mothers’ working endangers children’s psychological welfare. Much less emphasis has been placed on whether or not this is the case for fathers, or whether fathers’ commitment to work presents any danger. In a study of MBAs, Miree and Frieze (1999) have reported that mothers who take leave from work, or decrease their work time following childbearing, suffer a wage penalty. However, mothers with young children who remain continuously in the paid workforce do not suffer a wage or promotion penalty. Breaks in paid market-employment for the fulfillment of parental responsibilities are considered ‘gaps’ in one’s employment history, for which a wage penalty may be

exacted because of a perceived deterioration in one's human capital (Miree & Frieze, 1999). Hence, time spent nurturing children is perceived as a gap which demands no skilled labour (Kirchmeyer, 2002).

In a longitudinal study of mid-career managers, Kirchmeyer (2002) has compared the career progression of men and women in the 1990's. The study found that income gaps between men and women were explained by gender differences in career determinants, such as work hours, career interruptions, and having a non-employed spouse. Women's family situations were also confirmed as issues that continue to present obstacles to progression. Common gender differences in work experiences, family responsibilities, and career interruptions have, however, failed to explain the poorer progression of women in management (Brett & Stroh, 1997; Schmeer & Reitman, 1995; Stroh, Brett, & Reilly, 1992).

Norm of Organisational Man

Morgan (1981) has highlighted the extent to which notions of men and masculinity have dominated the conditions of sociology, yet many engaged in sociological and other academic work continue to avoid giving feminism and gender relations the attention that they deserve (Collinson & Hearn, 1994), albeit a situation that is changing over time. Witz and Savage (1992) have suggested that there may have been a polarisation where organisational theorists were not particularly interested in gender, and feminist writers had little interest in organisations, except in so far as they provided examples of a set of patriarchal practices. Differences are reinforced by a well-funded, male-oriented organisational research paradigm versus a critical discipline aimed at exposing the embedded nature of patriarchy in society (Witz & Savage, 1992). Hearn, Sheppard, Tancred-Sheriff and Burrell (1989) have

argued that prominent organisational theorists have failed to recognise the contributions of women in the workplace. As a result we have been left with a legacy of male terms such as “organization man”, with its focus on “man” and “brotherhood” (Whyte, 1956), “corporate man”, with its male-oriented tribal connotations (Jay, 1972), and “bureaucratic man”, an inquiry into workers’ experiences in bureaucracies based on interviews with men only (Kohn, 1971). As Collinson and Hearn (1994) have noted, there is a recurring paradox; the category of man and masculinity is central to analysis yet remains hidden, taken for granted and unexamined (Wilson, 1996).

In the main, pressures on maintaining a work-life balance are responses to the growth of a new knowledge-based economy. De-regulation of labour markets and the decline in the importance of trade unions, which did not always support women, even those employed by the union itself (Franzway, 2000), has exacerbated the problem. Changes in working patterns involving greater flexibility, based mainly on computer technology, have led to longer and more flexible working hours (Perrons, 2003). Modernisation and flatter organisational structures have increased influence and responsibility in lower level jobs, most of which are occupied by women (Rasmussen, 2004). Work patterns reflect workplace change to the extent that longer working hours are regarded as demonstrations of commitment in many organisations. Workers are often not openly concerned with longer work hours as they undertake more challenging, sometimes more meaningful, work. However, the price for changing work patterns is often paid by those who provide the support for such changes (Perrons, 2003). Employees providing support are mainly women who make choices based on careers involving long, irregular hours with inadequate family support

services (e.g., childcare); and work that is either less career oriented, less desirable, or both (Perrons, 2003).

Further to the workplace changes mentioned above, the relationship between time spent at work and time spent at home has changed over the past thirty years (Hochschild, 1997b). Changes to the balance mean that some employees now turn to the workplace, rather than the home, for emotional support (Hochschild, 1997b). As Hochschild (1997b) has indicated, women are more likely to have most of their friends at work, which is not the case for men. Hochschild (1997b) has also argued that for some women the workplace, with its emphasis on empowerment, quality management, training and employee assistance schemes, has replaced the home as the most desirable place to spend time.

Appraisal and Promotion in Academic Work

The competence method of appraisal is regarded as one that promotes equal opportunities (Garnsey & Rees, 1996). However, there are reasons for thinking that the positive qualities women bring to the work of management (e.g. empathy, caring, readiness for work) can easily be overlooked in approaches of this kind. Evidence drawn from different organisations in a study by Rees and Garnsey (2003) has suggested that decisions about competence frameworks focus mainly on process at the expense of content. Relating this to Foucault's work (Foucault, 1972, 1976, 1977, 1998), the approach can be used both to 'objectify' through enclosure, partitioning and ranking, and to 'subjectify' through appraisal processes used for self-criticism and development. Research has shown (Rees & Garnsey, 2003) how the issue of the way in which women are affected by the competence procedure can be used to open debate about appropriate management behaviour and skills. There is growing

recognition of the qualities of co-operation, empathy, listening, nurturing, coaching and so on, often explicitly associated with women, but also some men. These characteristics often enhance the performance of managers in diverse industry sectors (Ruderman, Ohlott, & King, 2002; Sharpe, 2000). Unfortunately, this recognition is not reflected in compensation practices or in promotion policy towards women. The proportion of women in top management positions has shown little improvement over the past ten years (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2002; Oakley, 2000). Failure to reward these qualities through competence-based compensation schemes, even when these schemes are deemed to be gender neutral, suggests a gap between espoused policies and actions in practice.

An equitable promotion process is essential if all employees within an organisation are to have equal opportunity to progress in their careers (Todd & Bird, 2000). Historically, such processes have not been equitable within Australian universities (Eveline, 2004). The under-representation of women at senior academic levels, as in most other organisations, has been well documented (Eveline, 2004). Moving into the new millennium, the percentage of women at senior levels in Australian Universities has increased, yet it remains unacceptably low with women comprising only 15.6 per cent of academics above senior lecturer and 27.9 per cent of the senior lecturers (Todd & Bird, 2000). The lack of women in senior academic positions is not confined to Australia, it is an international phenomenon (Acker, 1992; Bacchi, 1993; Doyle & Hind, 1998).

Probert, Ewer and Whiting's (1998) research into gender pay equity in Australian higher education has shown that women are clustered in the lower academic ranks to a greater degree than men, with more than two-thirds of women

occupying positions at levels A and B. Academic levels are listed in Appendix “B”. Part-time work has been mainly the domain of women academics, with far fewer men engaged in part-time work. Family responsibilities are the most common reason given by women for working part-time (44.4% of women with tenured employment, 31.5% of women in contract positions) (Probert et al., 1998, p. 41). None of the men in part-time employment cited family responsibilities as the reason for part-time work. The research also found that almost 43 per cent of male academics had a partner who did not work full-time, compared to just over 8 per cent of women. Fifty percent of academic women identified themselves as the main carer for their children compared to 4.3 per cent of men. Women engaged in academic work are evidently not able to draw on the same degree of support as men in caring for dependent children. Despite the demands of family and work, there is no evidence to substantiate the frequently held assumption that domestic responsibilities result in women spending insufficient time on their paid work to be competitive (Acker, 1992; Allen, 1990). The issue then is one of perception rather than substance.

Women’s domestic role has been an issue when considering ‘merit’, i.e., the basis for promotion. Women’s academic career patterns do not often fit the male-as-norm model against which all candidates are evaluated (Caplan, 1993; Castleman & Allen, 1998). Part-time work, in which women are disproportionately represented to a high level together with career breaks, are damaging to promotion chances (Acker, 1992; Grimes, 1990; Rimmer & Rimmer, 1994). As Caplan (1993, p. 218) has suggested, the “academic clock”, or optimum work schedule for academics, makes no allowances for women’s family-related roles such as mothers and carers. The lack of objectivity in assessment of an academic record is illustrated most tellingly in the

studies of Steinpreis, Anders and Ritzke (1999). These researchers had circulated the same curriculum vitae, changing only the sex of the applicant so that half of the applications purported to be from men, half from women. Applications were then sent to 238 male and female academic psychologists in the United States for assessment regarding suitability for appointment. Results of the research showed that males were more likely to be employed than females with equivalent qualifications. Also, contributions by males were likely to be more highly regarded than similar contributions made by females (Steinpreis et al., 1999).

Others have challenged the notion of merit more broadly. Both Burton (1992) and Bacchi (1993) have pointed to the politics and definitions of merit, and why those in power might weight certain activities more highly than others, thus reinforcing an existing power imbalance (Todd & Bird, 2000). The questioning of such power imbalances, one of several key feminist concerns, figures centrally in Foucault's work (Weedon, 1999); the body as a site of power central to the constitution of subjectivity, the dispersed, discursive nature of power, and power's link with knowledge (Weedon, 1999). Foucault (1998) has set out a distinctive approach to power that poststructuralist feminists have appropriated. In doing so, his aim was to rethink what he calls the "repressive hypothesis", an approach that holds that since the seventeenth century sexuality has been repressed or denied (Foucault, 1998).

Foucault (1998) has argued that the repressive approach is part of a widely accepted understanding of how power works in society. In the repressive model, power is centred and operates by repression (Weedon, 1999). Foucault (1998) has also argued that power is not possessed by people, it is *exercised*. Power is

transmitted through, and exerts pressure on people. Individuals may struggle against it and resist the grip it has on them (Foucault, 1972), and because of this, power is never monolithic and never completely controlled from one point of view (Foucault, 1998). Wilson and Nutley (2003) have suggested that in order to understand the exercise of power and control in appraisal, from a Foucauldian point of view, it is important to consider how knowledge and power are linked; how monitoring is used to build knowledge; how decisions, made on such knowledge, act to normalise behaviour; and how normalised patterns of behaviour lead to self-discipline and self-control.

The work of feminist Foucauldians has been used to understand the gendered nature of the appraisal process (Thomas, 1996). The argument is that appraisals tend to define visibility in terms of the male norm (Wilson & Nutley, 2003). In universities this norm defines the academic objectively, measuring performance quantitatively in terms of goals and outputs (Thomas, 1996). Those that do not conform to such norms of performance find it increasingly difficult to fit in (Thomas, 1996). In addition to the general absence of gender considerations there is also a neglect of agency in the generation of theory relating to appraisal (Newton & Findlay, 1996). Wilson and Nutley (2003) have suggested that the subjective experiences of employees, and the way in which they interpret those experiences, have not been given sufficient attention. In other research, Valian (1998) has argued for a cognitive explanation of continuing inequity. In doing so she proposes the existence of gender 'schemas', the implicit, largely non-conscious beliefs about sex differences that men and women alike, share (Valian, 1998).

A number of studies have presented empirical data that confirm the existence of discrimination in academic promotion processes (Todd & Bird, 2000). McDowell, Singell and Ziliak (1999) have concluded that promotion prospects for women are inferior to those of their male colleagues. Ginther and Hayes (1999) in their study of humanities academics in the United States have concluded that after controlling for organisational factors, achieving tenure is a gendered process. Within Australia, Allen's (1990) research about senior Academics at the University of Melbourne has shown that men are promoted faster and higher through the academic ranks than women, having controlled for such variables as qualifications, length of service and scholarly output (Allen, 1990).

Sex discrimination has clearly been an aspect of employment in higher education throughout the world, despite the particular context of the academy and its commitment to universal values of merit (Knights & Richards, 2000). Conventional studies of sex discrimination subscribe to a meritocratic model of equal opportunity. Because of its universal acceptance within modern liberal regimes, struggles in the name of equal opportunity are the most effective means of securing change, for discrimination other than on grounds of merit is seen to be a contradiction of human rights in liberal society (Knights & Richards, 2000). Meritocracy has the power to pass the responsibility for unequal outcomes back onto the individual and therefore stigmatise the unsuccessful as incompetent or incapable, something that these same individuals are likely to internalise, thus affecting adversely levels of self-worth (Sennett & Cobb, 1977). Due to the continuing existence of an inequitable division of domestic labour and the gender asymmetry in childcare, meritocracy also has the effect of reinforcing the advantage that men have over women in the competition for

rewards in the workplace. Knights and Richards (2000) have argued that meritocracy presides over, and serves to legitimise, some of the most all-pervasive social inequalities in academic and other areas, and perpetuates the domination of masculine values thus maintaining inequality between the sexes. Male-oriented appraisals perpetuate work-based inequities between women and men.

The gendered nature of appraisals, based on the privileging of men over women, has also impacted on work commitment. Women have shown a commitment to provide additional service and pastoral care even in situations where men have turned these down, in favour of work that is perceived as having higher status or associated more with career development (Deem, 2003). Even where women perceived that they had been adversely affected by gender bias, they still told positive stories of commitment and of their organisational and career experiences (Crompton & Harris, 1998).

Conclusion

Work commitment has been researched and conceptualised in ways that deny, or fail to consider, the impact and importance of gender and emotions in the workplace. Re-conceptualising work commitment qualitatively will enable an area of organisational studies that has been neglected in several important respects, to be understood from the perspective of organisational members.

In the first instance the existing measures of organisational, occupational and professional commitment are biased by virtue of their composition. Current ways of conceptualising commitment, largely devised by male researchers to measure “masculine” constructs, are not appropriate measures of the organisational

commitment of women, and some men, often the majority of workers, in contemporary workplaces.

Secondly, the existing measures are based on a dualistic ontology and an objectivistic epistemology (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Sandberg, 2000), where pre-determined, structured questions are analysed using quantitative methods. The use of this research paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) precludes or distorts consideration of emotions in organisations. Emotions are an integral part of organisational life that has been excluded, in the main, by the privileging of a dualistic ontology and objectivistic epistemology. In the proposed research, work commitment will be studied using an interpretive approach, drawing on grounded theory, in order to understand commitment from the perspective of people in the workplace informed by the ways in which they construct commitment.

Thirdly, current measures of commitment are misleading. By excluding emotions, and failing to give due consideration to the gendered workplace, it is impossible to obtain a realistic picture of the commitment of women, let alone that of men.

The review of work commitment, gender and emotions literature has suggested that women are treated differently to men in the workplace, with success in organisations being linked to the predominant masculinist paradigm, which itself is based on masculine identities. Rationality, expressed through objectivity, reinforces the masculine notion of being able to manage in a detached, non-emotional way. Management practice and research support the notion of masculinity through a denial of “differences” and excessive adherence to the scientific approach. Consequently, a biased view of women’s commitment and performance often results. The challenges

facing women in the workplace include managing the demands of home and work which are competing greedy organisations, the male construct of presenteeism, maintaining a work/life balance, emotional labour, and the knowledge that work is organised and measured by men with men in mind. Ignoring or suppressing the gendered and emotional nature of the workplace, and measuring women's commitment using men's standards, disadvantages women who often display commitment in different ways to men.

The literature review has suggested that there is a link between gender, the gendered nature of emotions and commitment. However, the link has not been adequately researched or explained by past research. Literature has been reviewed in sufficient depth to identify opportunities for further research, as suggested by Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998; 2000), and to generate and inform the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* The aim of reconceptualising work commitment by generating a new theory of work commitment is also supported by the inadequacies of past research. As past research has predominantly been conducted using functionalist approaches together with the hypothetico-deductive method, a qualitative approach is proposed for this study. The study will focus on how people in the workplace understand their world through the interpretation of phenomena in the social context in which they occur. The methodology and method that will be used for this research is a grounded theory approach based on the seminal work of Glaser and Strauss (1967)

In the following chapter the research design that guides the study is explained. The chapter discusses why grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was chosen as

the research methodology, and why the approach advocated by Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) was preferred to that of Glaser (1978; 1992; 1998).

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the philosophical approaches that underpin the collection and analysis of data for the research. As previously mentioned, the existing measures of organisational, occupational and professional commitment are biased by virtue of their composition, being largely devised by male researchers to measure male characteristics (Hirschman, 1993; Wallendorf & Brucks, 1993). In theorising work commitment using positivistic approaches, researchers have in the main failed to consider important issues such as emotions (Fineman, 2000b). Where emotions have been considered the focus on understanding emotions has been through measurement. Existing measures of work commitment do not provide an adequate explanation of the commitment of women, and some men, in contemporary workplaces. Where qualitative approaches to researching commitment have been used (e.g., Singh and Vinnecombe, 2000), the methods employed, comparative case studies in the case of Singh and Vinnecombe, have not shown how commitment is interpreted in a work context. Therefore, a different approach to the way in which work commitment is conceptualised is required.

The selection of a research design involves a number of inter-related steps (Creswell, 2003; Crotty, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000b). Firstly, the study should be located within an appropriate research paradigm. Secondly, a methodology should be selected consistent with the chosen research paradigm. Thirdly, the methodology should indicate the method that will be used for the collection and analysis of data.

The first section of this chapter deals with the research design. It presents the ontological and epistemological assumptions used in this study and compares them with the current approach to the theorisation of work commitment. The second section details the methodology and method used in the reconceptualisation of work commitment. Finally, the work context of participants in the research is considered.

Research Orientation

Studies of work commitment, particularly organisational commitment, have in the main been developed using quantitative approaches. Also, the most widely used measures (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Becker, 1960; Meyer et al., 1990; Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974) have been developed mainly by men, using male-oriented rationalistic approaches (Hirschman, 1993; Wallendorf & Brucks, 1993). Most studies have followed the functionalist paradigm, identified by Burrell and Morgan (1979) as the dominant paradigm used in organisational studies. The functionalist paradigm is based on a dualistic ontology and an objectivistic epistemology (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Sandberg, 2000), where pre-determined, structured questions are analysed using quantitative methods.

A dualistic ontology proposes that phenomena exist as knowable, observable realities independent of those who may observe them (Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Locke, 2001). An objectivistic epistemology suggests that sense is made of the world by means of approaches like the hypothetico-deductive method, where hypotheses are formed *a priori* then either confirmed or falsified by reality (Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Locke, 2001). Consistent use of the functionalist paradigm in management and organisational studies has resulted in either the exclusion of issues such as emotions or has focused predominantly on their measurement.

The use of the functionalist paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) has precluded or distorted the consideration of emotions when attempting to understand work commitment. Emotions are an integral part of organisational life that has been excluded, in the main, by the privileging of a dualistic ontology and objectivistic epistemology. A theory of work commitment should be developed based on the meaning of commitment to workers.

A different approach to conceptualising and theorising work commitment is required, one that does not focus predominantly on measurement. Qualitative research offers an understanding of work commitment based on the lived experiences of persons in the workplace, together with the ways in which they interpret phenomena (Cassell & Symon, 1999).

The characteristics of qualitative research include a belief in multiple realities rather than a focus on one universal truth (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999), grounded in the realisation that individuals experience phenomena in different ways. In qualitative research discovery of multiple realities is often the result of multiple ways of achieving understanding (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). In this study it is proposed that work commitment, together with emotions and their gendered nature, are more appropriately investigated through the interpretive paradigm, identified by Burrell and Morgan (1979) as an approach based on a nominalist ontology and anti-positivistic epistemology. Nominalist ontology proposes that reality is built up over a period of time through the empirical experiences of people rather than being prescribed. An anti-positivistic epistemology proposes that reality can only be known through the interaction of the individual and the phenomenon, rather than through other means such as the scientific method. Through the consistent adoption of

functionalist systems no consideration has been given to attributes usually associated with women, though not excluding men, such as compassion and empathy. In keeping with the functionalist approach, emotions have been regarded as though they stand alone, that is as separate entities that are independent of the individual. Treating emotions as independent of the individual is in contrast with the conceptualisation of Fineman (2000b) that emotions in fact co-exist and intertwine with so-called “objective” measures of reality. By excluding emotions it is impossible to obtain a realistic picture of the commitment of women, let alone that of men.

The major interpretive methodologies include ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory, action research and historical research (Stern, 1994). While the methods used by qualitative researchers to some extent share common approaches to data collection, namely interviews and observation, their methodological frameworks differ. Ethnography attempts to understand culture by learning from structures, rituals and symbols, the researcher becoming immersed in the cultural scene (Stern, 1994; Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). The primary objective of the various approaches to phenomenological enquiry is the investigation and description of phenomena as experienced by humans, without investigating causation (Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). Grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) attempts to understand, through interpretation, the symbolic meanings that gestures and words have for people as they interact with one another, and to build a theory from this (Stern, 1994; Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). Action researchers attempt to find solutions to practical problems by implementing change and observing and evaluating changes during implementation (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). Finally, historical research is the interpretation and narration of events from the past by attempting to

understand the thoughts and behaviours of persons involved in the events (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). Discourse and narrative analysis were also considered as possible approaches for analysis, but were subsequently rejected. In deciding not to use discourse or narrative analysis, the researcher was mindful of postmodernism's anti-theoretic stance and denial of attempts to create new knowledge in a structured and systematic manner (Rosenau, 1992). As the development of theory was an aim of this study postmodernist approaches were rejected as appropriate approaches for the study.

The purpose of this research is to discover the ways in which work commitment is understood from the perspective of organisational members, and to explore the gendered and emotional aspects of the phenomenon as expressed in the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* A further aim is to generate a theory of work commitment based on interpreting what commitment means to persons in the workplace. However, understanding the different ways in which commitment is conceived in the workplace is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Discovery of the meaning of commitment is not sufficient unless a theory that enables reconceptualisation is also generated. From the major interpretive methodologies outlined above, grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) appears to be the most suitable approach to reconceptualise work commitment with a focus on gender and emotions.

Grounded theory is a qualitative, interpretive approach by which theory is generated inductively through the interpretation of people's lived experiences. The purpose of a theory is to provide a means of understanding "diverse and unrelated facts" in a structured and coherent way (Morse, 1994b, pp. 25-26). Glaser and Strauss

(1967) have suggested that comparative analysis, and the theories subsequently generated, can be either substantive or formal. In their study of persons dying they describe the substantive element as having a focus on dying while the formal element has a focus of “status passage” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 33). Both substantive and formal theories are “middle-range”, falling between the minutiae of everyday life and all-encompassing grand theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 32). Middle range theories tend to focus on behavioural phenomena, for example trust or caring, and are essentially constructed around a Basic Social Process, which is usually a core category or central theme that unites conceptual categories (Blaikie, 1993; McCann & Clark, 2003a; Morse, 2001). A Basic Social Process accounts for change over time and has two or more stages (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Conceptual categories are developed inductively through a process of analysing, coding and categorising data (Morse, 2001).

Using a grounded theory approach necessitates the immersion of the researcher in the data in order to achieve density or “thick description” of categories (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000b; Johnson & Duberley, 2000). During the theory building stages of the research the researcher is required to adopt an emic or insider’s perspective in order to explore data and discover meaning (McCann & Clark, 2003a).

Analysis of work commitment should lead to a substantive middle-range theory involving the gendered and emotional experiences of persons in the workplace. Grounded theory is the most suitable approach for this research.

Ontology and Epistemology

Grounded theory is underpinned by an ontology where reality is built up over time, through interpretations of the empirical experiences of people, a nominalist

approach (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Goulding, 2002). Epistemologically, grounded theory draws on symbolic interactionism as a means of understanding events in the human world (Chenitz & Swanson, 1986; Goulding, 2002; Locke, 2001). Grounded theory was introduced by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as a description of the way in which qualitative information had been collected and interpreted in sociological research undertaken in a hospital setting during the 1960's. Since this time the grounded theory approach to data analysis and theory building has been adopted by other disciplines, including management studies, and is widely used as a framework for conducting interpretive research (Goulding, 2002; Locke, 2001).

Grounded theory has its origins in early 20th century American pragmatist philosophy, in particular the symbolic interactionist school of sociology that stems from this philosophy (Locke, 2001). The basis for the development of symbolic interactionism was a need to link philosophy and social science, which were perceived to have lost relevance, with the everyday life experiences of people (Locke, 2001). American pragmatists “emphasized the symbolic and social character of human thought and behaviour as well as the importance of close connection with the subjects and the situations under study” (Locke, 2001, p. 21). From this central theme Mead (1934), generally regarded as the architect of symbolic interactionism, has proposed that humans construct and interpret meaning through interaction with others. People interact through their social roles and behaviours. Interaction is symbolic because people use symbols, actions and language (Stern, 1994). Meanings determine what actions are to be taken towards objects (Locke, 2001).

Blumer (1969) has suggested that symbolic interactionism is based on three premises. The first premise is that “human beings act toward things on the basis of

the meanings that the things have for them” (Blumer, 1969, p. 2). This suggests that the meanings that people ascribe are important in their own right, rather than as things that are coloured by the lens through which they are viewed. Blumer (1969) has identified psychology’s use of attitudes, perception and cognition to account for human behaviour, and sociology’s use of social position, status, culture and values as examples of the ways in which meaning is “bypassed” or “swallowed up” in the factors used in the explanation (Blumer, 1969, p. 3).

The second premise is that “the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one’s fellows” (Blumer, 1969, p. 2). This locates the source of meaning “as arising in the process of interaction between people” (Blumer, 1969, p. 4). Traditionally there are two dominant views of the source of meaning, one being an intrinsic perspective where meaning is derived from the object itself, the other being an extrinsic perspective where meaning is brought to the situation by the person for whom the situation has meaning (Blumer, 1969). This second premise of symbolic interactionism places meaning in a social context, as occurring in and through people as they interact (Blumer, 1969, p. 5).

The third premise is that “these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he (*sic*) encounters” (Blumer, 1969, p. 2). Furthermore, interpretation occurs through a two-step process (Blumer, 1969). Firstly, the person indicates to him or herself the thing towards which action is directed. Secondly, through the process of communicating with oneself, meanings are selected, checked and transformed based on the direction of the person’s actions. In symbolic interactionism individuals act towards others and inwardly towards themselves (Blumer, 1969; Charon, 1998). The use of the term

“self” has a different meaning to its use in psychology (Charon, 1998). In the context of social interaction the self becomes a social object, to be constantly defined and redefined through social interaction (Mead, 1934).

Individuals understand phenomena by ascribing meaning to things and later behaving towards such things in accordance with the importance they attach to them (Blumer, 1969). Also, human interpretation of the world is based on an individual’s own responses that explain phenomena. Interpretations are based on the social interaction that occurs between the person and the world. The ways in which people make sense of phenomena in their world serve as a guide to future action (Blumer, 1969). The commitment of women, and some men, based on their interpretation of the social interaction between themselves and the world, is not understood adequately by the current measures of work commitment. Using a grounded theory approach, the research reported and discussed in this thesis will address an important gap in work commitment research by considering the gendered and emotionalised aspects of work commitment.

Methodology

Locke (2001) has suggested that researchers using the grounded theory approach for research outside the boundaries of sociology should be aware that grounded theory reflects the theoretical and methodological approaches of symbolic interactionism in respect of the nature of the social world and the way in which it may be studied. From a theoretical perspective this means taking due notice of the participants’ view of reality, learning the participants’ world, understanding how “self” is interpreted in given contexts and learning about the changing properties of interaction. The methodological assumptions of grounded theory require that every

aspect must be tested and validated empirically. In doing this, the researcher should bring as few assumptions as possible to the research, allowing both conceptual categories and interpretation to result from the situation under research (Locke, 2001). In this study due notice is taken of the epistemological origins of grounded theory, the use of which will inform data collection, analysis and the development of theory. The researcher also takes due notice of previous research involving gender, emotions and work commitment discussed in earlier chapters. Knowledge of previous research confirms and reinforces the need for a reconceptualisation of work commitment without prejudicing or “forcing” the development of theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998).

The link between meaning and its influence on behaviour, a view of reality based on the social interactions of people, aligns grounded theory with the interpretive paradigm (Locke, 2001). This suggests a nominalist ontology, that is a subjective view of reality, and an anti-positivistic epistemology, where the researcher actively participates in and interprets the social world. In contrast, the modernist or functionalist paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Goulding, 2002; Locke, 2001) is based on a realist or objective view of reality, where objects exist independent of the observations and life experiences of persons. This is a world of *a priori* knowledge, which progresses by the confirmation or falsification of hypotheses (Locke, 2001).

Method

Grounded theory allows researchers to understand people’s experiences in a rigorous and detailed manner (Ryan & Bernard, 2002). Understanding is achieved, in the main, by obtaining text derived from interviews, identifying concepts and categories emerging from the text, and eventually linking them into theory. Glaser

and Strauss (1967) have also referred to obtaining data from other sources, such as observation or other written material that may serve to triangulate method (Locke, 2001). Triangulation is a means of validating qualitative research in order to provide the rigour that is often lacking in data obtained using just a single approach (McCann & Clark, 2003c; Silverman, 2001). In addition to triangulation of method, the use of different, geographically dispersed groups of participants provides triangulation of source and site (Creswell, 1998; McCann & Clark, 2003c). In this research triangulation of source and site is achieved by interviewing university staff of different levels, conducted at each of the university's campuses. It is also achieved through the use of two experienced researchers, both independent of data collection and initial analysis, to check the researcher's analysis (Nelson, Englar-Carlson, Tierney, & Hau, 2006). Ryan and Bernard (2002) have further described the grounded theory process as iterative, where data are constantly compared with other data, with the researcher becoming increasingly "grounded" in the data, developing more substantive categories as the process continues.

Locke (2001) has proposed that there are numerous practices that are fundamental to the grounded theory process. In the first instance, while it is expected that researchers will have some background knowledge of the phenomena under investigation, this must be set aside, or bracketed, while the research is taking place. Since their original work Glaser (1992) and Strauss (1987) have proposed different approaches to undertaking grounded theory research. Glaser (1992) has suggested that a researcher should have no previous knowledge of a situation, allowing ideas to emerge from the data. Strauss (1987) has proposed that pre-conceptions are inevitable, otherwise how could a researcher decide what particular fields were of

interest to him or her? Strauss and Corbin (1998) have also proposed that theoretical sensitivity, a process where a researcher becomes aware of the subtleties of the data, is essential in order to understand and give meaning to data. Theoretical sensitivity may also be achieved by a review of relevant literature or experience (Carpenter, 1999), however, there is a clear distinction between gaining insight into the subtleties of data and imposing a predetermined framework onto it (Schreiber, 2001). In this study the researcher has an understanding of the existing gender, emotions and work commitment literature. However, knowledge of the literature does not threaten to impose an existing framework on the study, serving only to confirm that previous research has been misdirected. The approach to be used in the current research will be consistent with the approach advocated by Strauss (1987), being an interpretive approach where prior knowledge of the research topics will be bracketed while data is collected by means of minimally structured interviews.

Data Collection

Swanson (1986b) has suggested that grounded theory research lends itself to the use of formal interviews. Formal interviews are pre-planned, scheduled events, while informal interviews consist of unscheduled events, such as conversations, informal discussions etc. Within the category of the formal interview Swanson (1986b) differentiates the structured interview from the unstructured interview. Structured interviews use a schedule from which the interviewer does not deviate and which are designed to obtain uniform answers that can be quantified. Unstructured interviews may use an interview guide containing a set of brief general questions, outline of topic or themes, designed to assist the interviewer (Swanson, 1986b). In this research data were collected by means of interviews, supplemented by

observation. As the purpose of the study was to generate theory about the meaning of work commitment, as expressed by university academic staff, unstructured, formal interviews were used (McCann & Clark, 2003a). Interviews were used to clarify general areas about which the interviewee would talk. They were not designed to be rigidly adhered to by the interviewer.

Observation of interviewees was conducted during interviews, noting such things as gestures, mannerisms and attitude to the interview questions. Notes of observations were made at the time and were transcribed as memos immediately following the interview (Glaser, 1992; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Prior to undertaking the first interview a conceptual and theoretical understanding of the phenomena under investigation had been developed by reading and understanding the large body of work commitment literature (Kvale, 1996; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Knowledge of the literature served to highlight the inadequacies of the ways in which work commitment has predominantly been conceptualised. The researcher also conducted a review of the voluminous literature concerning work-related gender and emotion issues. Reviewing this literature also served to confirm the researcher's understanding of the biased ways in which women's contributions in the workplace have been regarded and studied.

Kvale (1996) has also proposed that a significant part of any interview takes place before the first interview actually commences. In the case of this study a clear research question had been developed, ethics approval had been obtained and organisational approval to undertake the study had been received. Immediately prior to the commencement of each interview the researcher provided the interviewee with

an outline of the study including its purpose, together with information about the supervisory panel and contact details for the purposes of complaints and feedback. A consent form was also provided to each interviewee, which was signed by both the researcher and the interviewee prior to commencement of the interview.

At the outset of a grounded theory study involving interviews it is not known how many interviews will be required to achieve saturation of categories emerging from the data (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). In grounded theory, saturation is achieved when no new conceptual information is available either to produce new codes or to add to existing ones (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). Therefore, at the start of this study the researcher made assumptions about the number of interviewees and the initial questions that would form the basis of the unstructured interviews. Preparation of this kind is known as purposive sampling (McCann & Clark, 2003a), a sampling technique based on the use of existing knowledge of participants. In this research the choice of initial interviewees was based on a sample of equal numbers of male and female academic staff across all levels. The assumptions made included a sample size of between 20 and 30 persons. Initially, data would be collected using a grounded theory approach involving minimally structured interviews. Observations, and possibly the perusal of records, would be undertaken for the purposes of triangulation. Data collected would be interpreted in accordance with the method described above.

As the study progressed theoretical sampling was introduced, where choices concerning interviewees were based on the emerging theory (Glaser, 1978; McCann & Clark, 2003a; Schreiber, 2001). In this way data from new interviewees were compared with emerging categories and further analysis was conducted until

saturation of categories was reached. Categories were deemed to be saturated when no new data emerged, categories were conceptually dense and all variations in categories could be explained (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In grounded theory research, data collection and analysis occur simultaneously through the constant comparison of data and emerging theory (Blaikie, 1993; McCann & Clark, 2003a; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Sample

As previously discussed, a researcher should possess theoretical sensitivity prior to commencing a grounded theory study (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), or “an awareness of the subtleties of the data” (McCann & Clark, 2003a, p. 10). Theoretical sensitivity enabled the researcher to give meaning to the data and to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Carpenter (1999) has suggested that theoretical sensitivity can be obtained by a preliminary literature review. In this study the gender, emotion and commitment literatures served to reinforce the need for a study of the kind proposed. Therefore theoretical sensitivity was achieved.

The research is a qualitative study of individuals employed at a multi-campus university. At the initial or purposive stages of a grounded theory study the researcher makes decisions about the composition of interviewees, often based on criteria such as gender, location and experience (Patton, 1990). In this study, as stated above, it was anticipated that 20 to 30 interviews may be required to achieve theoretical saturation (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999). Initially, it was expected that interviewees would include academic staff employed at each of the university’s campuses. Initially, the sample consisted of similar numbers of female and male workers. The

composition of the sample was reviewed as data were analysed. Interviewees were selected using a “snowball” approach where persons known to the researcher were initially asked to nominate two or three persons who may be willing to participate in the research. As the interviews proceeded, each interviewee was asked to nominate two or three persons who may be willing to participate in the research. In terms of the positions held by interviewees the sample included members of academic staff from sessional staff through to Professor.

As the interviews proceeded data were collected and analysed. Transcription and analysis took place as soon as possible after the interview. Conceptual categories emerged from the process of data analysis. Decisions regarding future interviews were based on the emerging theory (Glaser, 1978).

Having obtained the data, the next stage was that of naming or coding (Locke, 2001), which was the first event in the theory development process (Charmaz, 2000). Coding is the term used by Locke (2001), Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) to describe the process where researchers use incidents in the data to conceptualise and develop meaning based on their perception of what is being expressed. Incidents may be observations, phrases, names etc. The first stage of coding was open coding where each incident was named, the name representing the researcher’s interpretation of the data. Patterns in data were given conceptual labels, which themselves were less abstract than conceptual categories. Line-by-line coding was used to break the data down into single events (Carpenter, 1999; McCann & Clark, 2003a). Early in the research process an incident may be given more than one name to encourage thoughts about different meanings, the ultimate meaning being decided over the course of the research as more and more data are named. Coding

may be done formally using index cards or informally by making notes on the transcripts of interview. In this study open coding was conducted informally. Locke (2001) has also suggested that comparing data incidents with other incidents should be carried out in conjunction with coding, the purpose being to assist in developing common names for categories, together with clarification and refinement of the researcher's perceptions of the data. Comparing also assists researchers in determining not just similarities, but also differences in categories. Open codes may reflect the actual language used by the interviewee or may be compiled by the researcher (McCann & Clark, 2003a). *In vivo* coding uses the actual language of interviewees, and its use avoids any misconceptions that might be imposed on the data by the researcher (McCann & Clark, 2003a). Sociological constructs are open codes determined by the researcher from analysis of the data, and often offer a more scholarly approach to concept development (McCann & Clark, 2003a).

Once the open coding of each interview had been completed the technique of axial coding was employed (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). At this stage of the analysis the disaggregated open coded data were reconstructed through a process of categorisation and linking of sub-categories. Categorisation involved the grouping of a number of concepts that had been brought together through the process of constant comparison of data (McCann & Clark, 2003a). The stage of axial coding is an extremely important step in theory development, being the point in the research where the data are interrogated and compared in a more concentrated and abstract way than at the open coding stage.

The final stage of coding was the process of selective coding (McCann & Clark, 2003a). At this level the aim was to discover and develop an overarching

category, and to identify and develop links between the overarching and other categories. At this level the researcher should be able to conceptualise the data holistically and theoretically, rather than descriptively as a collection of disjointed data (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Stern, 1980). Data were now reconstituted from their disaggregated state into a meaningful, but different, whole. Reconstitution of data is discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

The development of an integrated theory demands a core category that has emerged from constant comparison of data, is wide ranging and able to explain the differences between other categories that have emerged. It also must be able to explain most of the variation in the data. A core category should provide thick description yet be sufficiently economical to be usable (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Strauss, 1987).

As ideas emerged from the data, the researcher attempted to capture these in written form through the process of memoing, a system of writing notes relating to the theory being developed, through categories and their links to other categories (Corbin, 1986a; Locke, 2001). When all categories were saturated they were sorted on the basis of similarity and difference (Dick, 2002). Through the processes of coding, comparing and memoing, categories were produced which were the elements of the in-process theories that had been developed. Dick (2002) has suggested that a core category, and other categories associated with it, will usually be evident by this stage. Eventually the core category was saturated, that is additional data added nothing to the core category. Saturation of associated categories also occurred. In summary, in using the grounded theory methodology and method, the researcher assumes that the theory is contained within data collected and is awaiting discovery.

The process of coding makes some of the theory's components visible. Memoing provides the relationships that link the categories (Dick, 2002).

Dick (2002) has also suggested that at the start of a grounded theory study it is often difficult to know what literature is relevant. Also, literature is not favoured over data, indeed it is treated as having the same status. Using grounded theory allows researchers to commence data collection without carrying out a *comprehensive* literature review, the review being sufficient to inform the researcher of the main areas already researched and the key findings (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998). Further reference to literature may then “emerge” as the research progresses. Literature discovered in the research process is regarded as data.

Interviews

As stated above, data were collected using unstructured formal interviews. As suggested by Swanson (1986b), a brief set of questions was used as a guide to clarify general areas about which the interviewee will talk. The interview check-list was not rigidly adhered to by the interviewer.

When interviewing, Kvale (1996) has suggested that questions should be descriptive, utilising key words such as “how” and “what” to encourage spontaneity from interviewees, rather than allowing speculative accounts of why an event took place. Interview questions should also contribute both thematically and dynamically to the research (Kvale, 1996). Questions with thematic significance should be relevant to the theme of the research, while dynamically significant questions should relate to the interpersonal relationships between interviewer and interviewee (Kvale, 1996). Interview questions should be brief and simple.

A key factor in conducting effective interviews is establishing rapport with the interviewee (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1997). One way of achieving rapport is to tell the prospective interviewee that you believe that he or she has something important to say (Minichiello et al., 1997), which is usually the case. In this way persons who may be reluctant to participate often consent to an interview, given the perceived importance of what they have to say. An alternative approach is to introduce the research in a more precise manner, usually by stating the purpose of the research and the way in which the project will be undertaken (Minichiello et al., 1997). Given the level of intelligence of the target group for this research, namely university academic staff, the latter approach was taken. Minichiello et al., (1997) have also cautioned against a directive style of questioning during the first few interviews as this may bias responses. Instead a more reticent approach is suggested, at least during the early interviews, while the researcher is gaining familiarity with the interview format and questions. In this research due regard was given to the need to avoid a directive style of questioning during the early interviews.

In grounded theory research the interview is conducted in conjunction with obtaining observational data. Swanson (1986b) has proposed that early interviews tend to be less precise than subsequent ones, these becoming narrower in focus as theoretical sampling progresses. As this study progressed the researcher was aware of a need for a change of focus, revising the interview guide on several occasions. The researcher was also aware of the need for flexibility, being ready to play an active or passive role in the interview, as the situation demanded. Also, interviews were shorten or lengthened as the situation demanded, with the researcher ready to adjourn

or move interviews to another place if necessary, to probe appropriately and to deal empathetically with interviewees (Gorden, 1975).

Swanson (1986b) has proposed that in structuring interviews time is a major consideration. In the case of the interviewer, sufficient time to conduct the interview is required, followed by the time consuming process of transcribing the interview. In the case of the interviewee both time and location are important, with consideration being given to the convenience and comfort of the subject.

Prior to commencement of the interview the subject should be advised and encouraged to answer all questions freely and to ask questions as desired. The interviewee should agree to audio-taping of the interview, and should be able to turn off the recorder at any stage of the interview if desired (Swanson, 1986b). The interview should commence with social talk, which should set the conversational tone for the interview. A question such as “Tell me about your career so far” would be an appropriate social question. The opening question should introduce the major theme(s) of the interview, such as “What comes to mind when you think of work commitment?” The researcher was mindful of the difficulties that some people have in engaging in social talk, particularly between genders. However, being familiar with the work environment certainly enabled the researcher to find common ground. Reflecting on the need to commence an interview in an appropriate manner, the researcher endeavoured to ascertain the research and teaching background of the interviewee prior to the interview. Knowing the research and teaching interests of interviewees enabled interviews to commence in a manner that was comfortable to the interviewee, but without biasing the interview.

A conversational tone should continue throughout the interview. Use should be made of probes to encourage the subject to elaborate on a point. Probes such as “ummmm....” or “I see...” convey to the subject that (s)he has been heard (Gorden, 1975). Frequently used probes include time sequence, such as “...and then?” detail, “Tell me more about.... That’s very interesting”, and clarification “I don’t quite understand. But you said earlier” (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973, p. 74).

As the interview nears a close, the interviewer should ask direct questions based on the literature or on emerging concepts (Schreiber, 2001). These include speculative questions like “others have told me...” or “the literature suggests” or “has this been your experience?” (Schreiber, 2001, p. 68). The interview should finish with a key questions such as “Is there anything else I should know about work commitment that I didn’t ask?” (Schreiber, 2001, p. 67), closure being tentative with provision for a follow-up interview if necessary.

An important skill in interviews is active listening on the part of the interviewer. Seeking clarification during the interview facilitates the collection of trustworthy information and communicates to the interviewee that the interviewer is actually listening to what has been said (Kvale, 1996). Researchers should also realise that over the course of a study the interview questions will change, moving from the general to the particular. The focus of questions may also change due to a move from purposive sampling at the outset of the project to theoretical sampling as categories and theories develop (McCann & Clark, 2003b). During the course of this study the interview guide was changed on several occasions. Changes were due initially to remove questions that did not inform the study (e.g., links between theory and practice through effective teaching). Changes were also made to include questions

that elucidated developing categories (e.g., questions regarding commitment to academic department and membership of a research centre).

Following each interview the researcher allowed sufficient time to reflect quietly on the interpersonal communications evidenced at the interview, taking particular note of the interviewee's voice, facial expressions, gestures and body language (Kvale, 1996). Identity issues relating to both interviewer and interviewee were also considered during the interview process. These included issues such as gender, age, position in the organisation and location of the interview (King, 1999).

Analysis of data commences with the first interview. Comparison of the first two interviews should yield basic codes and possibly initial categories. Interviews become richer and fuller as analysis is undertaken immediately following data collection. Demographic information should be left to the end of the interview. The number of interviews to achieve saturation should be between 20 and 50 (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lofland, 1971), although this should be regarded as a guide, as sample size cannot be determined *a priori* (Morse, 1991, 2000).

Critique of Grounded Theory

Since grounded theory was first introduced (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) as a means of generating theory grounded in data, the original authors have re-stated their positions in subsequent publications. Strauss, particularly in a publication with Corbin in 1990, has proposed a series of steps designed to assist researchers wishing to use grounded theory (Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The structured approach to conducting grounded theory research has been continued by Strauss and Corbin in further publications (Corbin, 1986a, 1986b; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Glaser has also re-stated his position on grounded theory (Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1998),

questioning Strauss' understanding of grounded theory in a vitriolic open letter which became the foreword to *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs forcing* published in 1992. Glaser's approach to grounded theory, often referred to as "orthodox" grounded theory (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000), has been one where even the research question itself emerges from the data, with the researcher having to trust that a theory will eventually emerge. For Glaser, the structures proposed by Strauss and Corbin have suggested forced outcomes based on verification, a positivistic approach that grounded theory had sought to avoid (Babchuk, 1996). While there is no doubt that grounded theory may be used to generate hypotheses that are testable through verification or falsification as suggested by Corbin (1986b), grounded theory is essentially an interpretive qualitative approach (Charmaz, 2000), and has been used as such in this study.

In response to Glaser's (1992) suggestion that deviation from orthodox grounded theory forces frameworks onto research, thus detracting from producing theories that are truly grounded in data, Strauss and Corbin (1998; 2000) have argued against this on the basis that paying due regard to previous research enables the researcher to become sensitised to data and prevents duplication of studies. As previously stated, having knowledge of past research in the areas of gender and work commitment enabled the researcher to identify gaps in the literature that this research seeks to address, namely that of the supposed gender neutrality of work commitment and the failure to consider organisational members' emotions adequately. Despite Glaser's (1992) criticism, it seems that rigid adherence to procedures was not Strauss and Corbin's (1998; 2000) intention. Elaboration of the grounded theory method was meant to clarify sampling procedures rather than violate the original premises of

grounded theory (Robrecht, 1995). Indeed, Strauss and Corbin have proposed that while due regard *must* be given to rules and procedures in order to ensure that grounded theory is conducted properly, thereby avoiding outcomes based on partial or incorrectly formulated approaches, this should not be regarded as imposing a rigidly constructed framework that is set *a priori*. The main differences between the approaches to grounded theory research of Glaser and Strauss are summarised in Table 1 below.

The approaches to conducting grounded theory are clearly different and researchers proposing to use grounded theory should decide which approach is to be adopted (Babchuk, 1996). This thesis follows the approach advocated by Strauss

Table 1. Main Epistemological and Methodological Differences Between Glaser's and Strauss and Corbin's Approach to Grounded Theory

	Glaser	Strauss and Corbin
Epistemology	More positivistic, based on symbolic interactionism	Less positivistic, based on symbolic interactionism
Research paradigm	Postpositivist	Poststructuralist/Interpretive
Researcher's role	Independent	Dialectic and active
Theory	Emphasis on generation	Emphasis on validation
Literature	Supports emerging theory	Preliminary review to enhance theoretical sensitivity
Research problem	Emerges in study	Personal experience. Suggested by others. Literature. Emerges in study
Theory generation	Categories emerge from data	Rules and procedures. Structure provided by Paradigm Model

Adapted from McCann and Clarke (2003a)

(1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998). Other difficulties also arise when researchers undertake a “partial” grounded theory (Benoliel, 1996), where only part of the grounded theory method is used, such as the constant comparison of data to achieve internal consistency, without giving due regard to the ways in which data are collected or analysed (Wilson & Hutchinson, 1996). Other methodological mistakes in grounded theory include discovering meaning but not generating a theory, producing typologies not theories, and producing large chunks of narrative that have not been properly analysed (Becker, 1993; Wilson & Hutchinson, 1996). Even articles published by prestigious journals (e.g., Browning, Beyer, & Shetler, 1995; Isabella, 1990; Sutton, 1987), which are held up as exemplars of grounded theory (Suddaby, 2006), often pay scant attention to epistemology and methodology. In addition to common mistakes in the use of grounded theory, its adoption by disciplines such as management has led to research that is not informed by symbolic interactionism, and is consequently flawed both epistemologically and methodologically. Examples of such studies are those of Leonard and McAdam (2002) and Parry (1998). Being cognisant of research that does not follow the canons of grounded theory is important as it prevents new researchers from similar pitfalls. The researcher has been constantly aware that symbolic interactionism is the theoretical perspective that facilitates interpretation of the relationships between individuals and their social world (Milliken & Schreiber, 2001), and should be inherent in every grounded theory study.

Grounded theory has been criticised for producing “empty” categories which provide an approximation of the creativity involved in theory building and a “smokescreen used to legitimise purely empiricist work” (Silverman, 2001, p. 71). A

similar line is taken by Bryman and Burgess (2000) and Bryant (2002) who have claimed that grounded theory is seldom implemented in its entirety, sometimes being used to disguise methodological weakness or research incompetence. Bryman (1988) has questioned whether grounded theory method actually does produce theory, suggesting that the approach appears to produce categories rather than theory. Finally, the epistemological basis for grounded theory has been challenged, with suggestions that researchers can undertake grounded theory without the theoretical underpinning provided by symbolic interactionism (Charmaz, 2000; Milliken & Schreiber, 2001).

Milliken and Schreiber (2001) have argued that challenges to the epistemological underpinnings of grounded theory discussed above are not sustainable as symbolic interactionism exists at every level of grounded theory, with the researcher engaging in symbolic interactionism between him or herself, data, participants and emerging theory. Even researchers with no knowledge of symbolic interactionism *per se* enact its meaning inherently through conduct (Milliken & Schreiber, 2001). Researchers undertaking grounded theory utilise symbolic interactionism either consciously or otherwise. In this study the researcher was part of the interpretive process of symbolic interactionism through his involvement in the research (e.g. interviewing and observing) and was therefore an integral part of the research.

Critiques of grounded theory methodology and method thus far have mainly been criticisms of inappropriate approaches to the research; criticisms of the actions of the individuals undertaking the research rather than of methodology or method. Conducting research in the way suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998; 2000),

together with the development of a core category that is a robust Basic Social Process (Fagerhaugh, 1986), should address concerns about methodology and method and result in a well executed study. Acknowledging and understanding criticisms of grounded theory serves to prepare the researcher for the task ahead. Recognising previous errors in conducting grounded theory has highlighted to the researcher the need to ensure that data collection, analysis and theory generation are transparent processes, and that theory generated is raised to a higher conceptual level than just discovering meaning. The processes associated with data collection, analysis and theory generation are detailed in Chapter Four.

In addition to the critical views about grounded theory discussed above, a major critique of grounded theory has been undertaken based on reflection or reflexivity (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). The critique encompasses many aspects of grounded theory, focussing on the positivist roots of Glaser and on the need for grounded theory to generate “practical” outcomes, through to the depth of research accomplished by the methodology. Criticism advanced by Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) includes:

1. Grounded theory may generate the same theories repeatedly; possibly old concepts will be given new names.
2. Glaser and Strauss emphasise the importance of the practical utility of any theory generated. However many theories may have no “practical” application, indeed a focus just on practicality may tend to de-emphasise the value of research in furthering knowledge. Here, Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000, p. 20) argue that there is confusion between a) achieving practical utility as an *advantage* accruing from research, and b) practical application as a *necessary condition* of research.

3. Data coding and the construction of categories are criticised on grounds that they impose high levels of manual work on researchers. There also appears to be a bias towards a cognitive approach to research at the expense of affective aspects.
4. Disaggregated data may lead to lost meaning when data are decontextualised.
5. Category building may result in trivial theory being generated.
6. Substantive vs formal theory is a semantic difference based on lower or higher levels of generality.
7. Researchers interpret, without reflection, what they see through their own self-referential perspectives, producing theories that are structurally shallow due to having been constructed from data that reflect the actor's perspective. Greater reflexivity is needed in order to *interpret the actor's interpretation of reality*.

Summarising their critique, Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) have suggested that most of the concerns they hold relate to “orthodox” grounded theory. However, two main criticisms of Strauss’ approach to grounded theory methodology and method are raised. Firstly, Strauss is criticised for proposing a method that is too detailed, resulting in excessive human effort being outlaid in following rigid, complex coding procedures. Other researchers have also raised this issue (e.g., Robrecht, 1995 discussed above). Strauss and Corbin (1998) have also responded to this issue, suggesting that the processes described in their method are meant as a guide rather than a set of prescriptive procedures. Secondly, a major concern raised by Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) emanates from an account of participant observation described by Strauss (1987), involving an unreflective description of events and construction of the identity of participants. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) have argued that theories produced by a grounded theory approach are

constructed in close proximity to the actor, and "...can never reach down to the deep structures of the empirical material..." (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000, p.33). In other words, by interpreting what the actors are saying, without reflection on the part of the researcher, the opportunity to build deeper theories is lost, resulting in structurally shallow theories. Greater reflexivity would enable *interpretation* of the actor's *interpretation* of reality to occur (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). However, the epistemological foundation of grounded theory, that is symbolic interactionism, deals with the ways in which people construct and interpret meaning through interaction with others (Mead, 1934). Interpretation is at the level of "the person in dealing with the things he (*sic*) encounters" (Blumer, 1969, p. 2), and incorporates the researcher, *as part of symbolic interactionism at the level of the actor* (Milliken & Schreiber, 2001).

Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000, p. 34) have further argued that an "epistemological break" should be made with theory generated at the actor level, enabling formal theory to account for deep structure and substantive theory for the surface structure on which the formal theory is based. The researcher understands Alvesson and Skoldberg's (2000) argument to be a genuine attempt to improve the effectiveness of grounded theory as a qualitative methodology. Also, adopting reflection and reflexivity on the part of the researcher may well lead to more robust general theories as Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) suggest. However, the researcher believes that adopting Alvesson and Skoldberg's (2000) argument may result in linking substantive and formal theory in a way that challenges grounded theory's epistemological roots (i.e. symbolic interactionism). Charmaz (2000) has also argued for grounded theory methodology to move beyond post-positivism.

In reconceptualising work commitment the researcher conducted an interpretive study, one that was informed by the use of symbolic interactionism as its epistemological foundation. The researcher was mindful of the critique proposed by Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) and paid it due regard. However, the central issue of the critique involved an epistemological division between substantive and formal theory. The main difference between substantive and formal theory is one of scope (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), with substantive theory being more restricted than formal theory, a distinction which Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) regard as a semantic difference based on a lower or higher level of generality. In its place, Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000, p. 34) have proposed that "... *formal theory* would then account for the deep structure and the *substantive theory* for the surface structure, upon which this is based."

The purpose of this research is to build a *substantive theory* of the gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment. The context for the study is a particular group of professional workers. Data have been collected from each campus of a multi-campus university. While the research has represented work commitment in the context of the study, it *may* also represent the work commitment of professional workers in other work contexts; however, no such claim can be made. As developing a *formal theory* is not the purpose of this research, the epistemological issues of proximity to actors and lack of reflexivity on the part of the researcher in terms of a *formal theory* would appear to be avoided. The structure provided by Strauss (1987), Corbin (1986a; 1986b) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998; 2000) was used to guide the research in the knowledge that rigid adherence to procedures

was not an end in itself. Rigid adherence was avoided by using the structure as a guide only, not as a prescription for undertaking the research.

Conclusion

In this study a qualitative approach has been adopted as an appropriate approach to investigate and address the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* Qualitative research has been selected as it offers the means of understanding, and subsequently re-conceptualising, work commitment in a way that overcomes the biases inherent in the current positivistic approaches. The research is an interpretive study, using a grounded theory approach, which attempts to understand the ways in which people make sense of reality in a substantive area of work, as exemplified in a higher education institution. Making sense of phenomena in their world is underpinned by an epistemology that is informed by symbolic interactionism. The epistemological grounding in symbolic interactionism aligns the application of grounded theory in a management context with its original sociological roots.

In addition to achieving the purpose of this research, by addressing the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* this study also aims to reconceptualise work commitment in the form of a theory of work commitment. In order to build a new theory a grounded theory approach was chosen. Grounded theory allows a substantive theory to be generated based on the interpretation of reality by individuals. Theory generated by means of a grounded theory approach is induced from empirical data. The research employs the Strauss approach to grounded theory as it encourages familiarisation with literature prior to the study in order to orient the researcher in terms of previous research and to identify

research issues of interest. Familiarisation with work commitment literature enabled the researcher to identify deficiencies in previous research into work commitment, particularly the denial or suppression of gender and emotions as important organisational issues that impact on commitment. The Strauss approach, supplemented with that of Corbin, also provides greater structure in the data analysis phase, which was appealing to a researcher conducting a first grounded theory study. As suggested by Strauss, the procedures formulated in conjunction with Corbin, have been regarded as a guide to action rather than rules that should be slavishly followed in a positivistic manner.

Critiques of grounded theory have been considered. The researcher is mindful of issues raised by other researchers about grounded theory. Research will be interpretive, seeking to avoid issues associated with positivism and post-positivism, such as verification. Using symbolic interactionism as the epistemological basis for the study will avoid many of the issues identified as problematic when a “partial” grounded theory is conducted.

The following chapter presents the process of data collection and analysis. Interviewing, sampling, data collection, transcription of interviews and initial analysis are considered. Sub-core categories are identified, together with a Basic Social Process on which the grounded theory of academic work is based. Finally, the notion of goodness is considered in relation to the study.

Chapter 4

Data Collection and Analysis

Introduction

This chapter presents the manner in which data for the research were collected together with the initial stages of analysis. As previously discussed, the purpose of this research is to address the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* This study also aims to re-conceptualise work commitment in the form of a theory of work commitment. The research is a qualitative study using a grounded theory approach, in which participant interviews and observation are the predominant means of data collection. Participants in this study are academic staff working in a multi-campus university.

The university, whose members are the subjects of the study, is currently experiencing changes, as are most other universities in Australia, due in part to government policy changes in respect of higher education (Carrington, Coelli, & Rao, 2005). Also, the university is undergoing a major change program with a view to improving its standing in comparison with other universities, and to make it the preferred university for a greater number of students and potential students.

The university's strategic plan has highlighted the challenges facing it. Changes to the way in which education has been funded in recent years (e.g., full fee payment for an increasing number of students) together with the need to deliver quality programs are major challenges. Changes in the priorities for research grants mean that for disciplines outside the sciences it will be much more difficult to attract grants to fund research in the future.

In addition to changes resulting directly from government policy, the university is also facing the challenges in building on its multi-campus interdisciplinary strengths. In recent times the university has moved from a decentralised school-based structure to one of centralised departments operating across several campuses. Flexible learning and greater focus on, and recognition of, excellence in teaching are priorities, as are international and transnational education. Innovation in research, commercialisation and the establishment of appropriately focused research centres are also major challenges for the university.

Changes to the management of academic careers, including the division of time between research and teaching, with staff designated as research or teaching intensive, have the potential to affect all staff. Annual performance appraisal, based on a self and supervisor assessment, provides new challenges for staff. A new workload model allocates academic work, particularly teaching, in a more equitable manner. Changes to the university's management structure have been implemented, including senior management changes at faculty level together with changed faculty and academic departmental structures. The gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment is the focus of this study. Several different contexts for the study were considered (e.g. public hospital medical staff) before deciding on an academic workplace. The final choice of workplace, a university, was made based on ease of access to professional workers, together with similarities in educational attainment among interviewees.

Interviewees were selected initially by the researcher, employing a purposive sampling approach based on pre-determined criteria such as sex and academic unit. Following each interview, a "snowball" approach was used to generate further

interviewees, with the interviewee being asked to nominate a further prospective interviewee. A snowball approach to the selection of interviewees was used for two main reasons. Firstly, it is an effective approach to interviewee selection that is frequently employed in qualitative research. Secondly, this study was the first qualitative research undertaken by the researcher, who found the selection of academic staff as interviewees to be a challenging task. The snowball approach facilitated the process. After the initial interviews the researcher expanded the scope of the study to include staff from each of the university's main academic units and campuses. From this point onwards the researcher, now growing in confidence, selected interviewees from the university's on-line records utilising a theoretical approach (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Schreiber, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998). Theoretical sampling was used to collect new data for comparison with emerging categories, and to establish conceptual boundaries associated with the developing theory.

Interviews with members of the university's academic staff were first audio tape recorded then transcribed by the researcher before being analysed following Strauss and Corbin's (1990; 1998) suggested three stage approach to grounded theory analysis. Initial analysis, or open coding, involved identifying discrete items in interview data on a line-by-line basis. Discrete items identified were interrogated by the researcher in order to understand their meaning (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) in terms of both content and process. Recurring concepts were used to form provisional categories using axial coding, a process whereby data are removed from the context in which they appear and reassigned to potential categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Validity or "goodness" in the

analysis process was ensured by the constant comparison of data. While undertaking the study the researcher was aware of the need to regard grounded theory as a creative process, rather than a mechanical one (Suddaby, 2006). The researcher commenced data collection and analysis with an open mind about saturation of categories, rather than relying on a predetermined number of interviews; interpreted interview and observational material so that he engaged with the material to raise it to a higher theoretical (conceptual) level; and, at all stages of the coding and analysis processes maintained awareness of the need to be cognisant of the guidelines proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998), without slavishly adhering to them.

As interviews and coding progressed, the accuracy of the researcher's analysis was confirmed by independent analysis, this occurring after the fourth and tenth interviews. As analysis continued the researcher attempted to think of provisional categories at a theoretical level by developing sub-core categories that captured the themes emerging from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Saturation of categories occurred during the sixteenth interview. A further six interviews were conducted, making twenty two interviews overall, in order to ensure that no further categories could be identified from the data.

The first section of this chapter deals with data collection by means of interviews and observation. It presents the rationale for the selection of interviewees, conducting and transcribing interviews, and initial memoing. Samples of interviews will be used to illustrate data analysis. The second section details initial coding, utilising open and axial coding, and the building of provisional categories. At the various stages of coding the researcher, being embedded in the interpretive process through symbolic interactionism, was mindful of the need to be creative in the

construction of the meaning of commitment to participants. Remaining aware of the need for creativity (e.g., by interrogating data in the manner suggested by Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) to ascertain *what* the data was saying, *why* it was occurring etc) was a means of avoiding the issue of being too mechanical raised by Suddaby (2006). Finally, saturation of data and completion of the data collection process are discussed.

Organisational and Ethical Clearance and Informed Consent

Prior to commencing data collection the researcher met the university's Director of Human Resources to discuss the project and to seek consent to collect data from the university's staff. The Director expressed support for the research and suggested that a formal letter requesting access to the university's staff be submitted. This was subsequently done and approval to conduct the study, and to interview academic staff, was received in writing from the university's senior administrative staff in August 2003.

Following approval from the university to conduct the study and obtain data from its academic staff, a formal application for approval to conduct research involving humans was lodged with the university's research centre. Research involving humans must comply with a range of international, national, state and university guidelines, regulations and legislation. In September 2003, approval was received to commence the research, subject to voluntary participation and anonymity of subjects. Two formal documents were required to be used in conjunction with data collection in order to ensure that the informed consent of participants was received. One document detailed the purpose and scope of the project, together with the names and qualifications of the investigators. A grievance procedure was also outlined for

use by participants should the need arise. The second document was a consent form which was required to be signed and dated by the interviewee and the researcher. Formal documents were used for each interview, the consent forms being retained by the researcher.

Before commencing the data collection process the researcher reflected on his existing state of awareness of data, including literature, associated with the study. Sensitivity to data is important in a grounded theory study to assist a researcher in deciding relevance (McCann & Clark, 2003a, 2003c; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998).

Theoretical Sensitivity

Theoretical sensitivity describes a situation where a researcher is sensitised to, or has an awareness of, appropriate data when entering a field of research. Theoretical sensitivity allows a researcher to give meaning to data and to discriminate between what is relevant and what is not (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Theoretical sensitivity may be achieved in a number of ways, including a review of literature, subject to care being taken to ensure that sensitivity to concepts does not develop into imposition of a literature based framework onto the data (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Schreiber, 2001).

In the current study, the researcher had knowledge of the extensive work commitment literature from previous research, together with less extensive, though substantial, knowledge of the gender and emotions literatures. The researcher also had extensive experience as a manager and general manager across a range of industries where professional workers were employed. Knowledge of the work commitment, gender and emotions literatures, and extensive work experience, acted to sensitise the researcher to the field of research through a clear awareness of the

methodological flaws of previous work commitment research. Establishing sensitivity to the data allowed the data collection to commence.

Data Collection

In a grounded theory study data are collected in three main ways: interviews, observation and examination of records (Creswell, 2003; Easterby-Smith et al., 2002; Morse, 1994a; Patton, 1990). As suggested by Streubert and Carpenter (1999) unstructured, formal interviews appeared to be the most appropriate means of obtaining data, and were selected by the researcher as the main means of collecting data for this study. Interview data were supported by observational data obtained by the interviewer during interviews and recorded as memos immediately after each interview (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). During data collection the researcher was immersed in the research, effectively being a part of the study. As part of the study the researcher was involved in the interpretive process of giving meaning to the social world of the interviewee, through symbolic interactionism at the level of the interviewee. Informal interviews were considered as a source of data, however, these were deemed to be unsuitable given the focus of the study, the nature of interviewees, and the need to obtain written, informed consent in order to collect and use data.

Staff from whom data were collected ranged from sessional teaching staff through to professor. In addition to a range of staff across all academic positions, interviews also involved staff from each of the universities six campuses. The researcher initially contacted prospective interviewees by email inviting them to participate in the study. Following agreement by return email, the researcher contacted the staff member by telephone when the purpose of the research was discussed. The researcher also organised a time, date and place for the interview. In

organising the interview the researcher was aware of: (a) the importance of time and place to the interviewee; (b) scheduling sufficient time for the interview; and (c) the dynamics of the differences between the interviewer and interviewee of age, sex and academic position. Means of assuring quality of data were now considered in order to ensure that rich data were obtained

Mixed methods of data collection, or triangulation, have been found to provide richer data than a single approach (Charmaz, 2000; McCann & Clark, 2003c; Morse, 2001). This research utilised four approaches to triangulation in order to obtain rich data (McCann & Clark, 2003c). Triangulation of method was achieved by collecting data by both interviews and observation. Using staff of different rank, from sessional to professor, provided triangulation of sources. Obtaining data from staff at university campuses located in different geographic locations provided triangulation of site. Finally, analyst triangulation was achieved by using multiple analysts to review findings.

Prior to conducting the first interview the researcher developed a guide to assist with interview questions, as suggested by McCann and Clark (2003c). In developing the guide the researcher was mindful of the need to avoid imposing a rigid structure on interviews (Schreiber, 2001). Questions were designed to be flexible, allowing interviewees to talk freely about their experiences and understanding of work commitment as perceived by themselves (how Lyn perceived Lyn's commitment), their perception of the work commitment of others (how Lyn perceived Jim's commitment), and their perception of how second parties perceived third parties (how the interviewee Lyn perceived Jim perceived Jill's commitment). Obtaining information from multiple perspectives resulted in deeper meaning or thick

description (Johnson & Duberley, 2000). The initial interview guide is shown at Appendix “C”.

Selection of interviewees

Selection of interviewees for the initial interviews was made using pre-determined criteria for selection, otherwise known as purposive sampling (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998). Purposive sampling requires a researcher to make selection decisions based on existing criteria such as sex, location of workplace or work experience. Initially the researcher decided that for the first two interviews one female and one male staff member would be selected from the same organisational unit. Members of academic staff known to the researcher formed the pool from which the initial interviewees were drawn. Corbin (1986b) has suggested that grounded theory research should start with what appears to be an appropriate sampling group then making adjustments to the sampling plan as important variables emerge. Expanding the sampling plan as Corbin (1986b) has suggested allows data analysis to drive the data collection process. Expansion by drawing subjects from other campuses also ensured that differences in the ways in which work commitment is gendered and emotionalised across the university as a whole was captured.

The initial interview was conducted in October 2003. The interviewee requested that the interview take place at a “neutral venue”, an interview room assigned to a university research centre. Following the formal explanation of the project and signing of the interview consent form by both parties, the interview commenced. The interview was audio tape recorded under the control of the interviewee, with interviewees being advised by the researcher that they could turn off the recorder at any time. This gave interviewees the assurance that they could

speak freely, without being recorded on tape if they so desired. Observations were made by the researcher both during the interview and on its conclusion and recorded in the form of a memo, shown at Appendix “D”. Observations included non-verbal communication, such as gestures and haptics, together with the voice tone used by the interviewee. Although nervous at first, the researcher felt more at ease as the interview progressed. The interviewee appeared to be at ease throughout the interview, responding to questions in a confident manner and elaborating on points when prompted by the researcher. The interviewee was assigned the pseudonym “Pam” to ensure anonymity.

Immediately following the interview the researcher recorded an account of the interview, including observations, in a memo. After the memo had been written the researcher transcribed the interview, using Microsoft Word, printing the finished article using double line spacing with a wide margin to the right hand side of the page to facilitate ease of coding. All means of identifying the interviewee, either directly or by inference, were removed prior to printing. The researcher then read the interview again before commencing the coding process.

Analysing interview material

Coding has been described as a process of analysis that identifies patterns or events in the data (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998) beginning with open coding. Initially, open coding was conducted on a line-by-line basis, breaking data down into distinct parts, carefully and closely examining them, and then comparing them with other data in order to establish similarities and differences. Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) have referred to data items disaggregated in this way as concepts or labelled phenomena, these being abstract

representations of events deemed to be important by an analyst. Classifying data as abstract representations facilitates identification of concepts that are similar in nature, or close in terms of meaning, together with the grouping of concepts into categories as suggested by Charmaz (2000) and Corbin (1986a). Data may be classified in multiple ways depending on the way or ways in which attributes are viewed; therefore, context is an important consideration in the classification process. In order to obtain as full an understanding as possible of the phenomenon under consideration, and giving due consideration to its context, Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998, p. 182) have proposed the notion of a “conditional/ consequential matrix” to “trace the paths of connectivity among conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences.”

Figure removed, please consult
print copy of the thesis held in
Griffith University Library

Figure 1. The Conditional/Consequential Matrix From Strauss and Corbin (1998).

The conditional matrix is shown at Figure 1 above. Using the matrix enabled the researcher to consider both macro and micro conditions when undertaking data analysis. Also, the matrix provided a framework that represented the interaction between conditions and/or consequences and the dynamic way in which events occurred. Both macro and micro conditions are important in analysis, and the matrix allowed the researcher to progress from issues of a global nature through to an individual level. In this research, the conditional matrix was used as a tool to assist analysis throughout.

An example of the use of the matrix is presented using an extract from the first interview undertaken. In the interview Pam had been asked to comment on colleagues who she perceived as having no or low commitment. She said:

Yes, I think there's several people in our school, and other areas of the university, who um really don't have the levels of commitment I would expect from someone who has chosen an academic career. They don't really um participate in all aspects of the job. They are not really producing the research output that would be expected of them, are reluctant to participate in school activities like giving presentations at seminar days and that kind of thing.

The concept of focus in this analysis was an expectation of academic commitment. At the individual level of the matrix was Pam, a career academic. Moving to the sub-organisational level, Pam was linking a lack of commitment, by a career academic, to the school or academic unit. Consequences of the lack of commitment to the school were a failure to produce research output and non-participation in school activities. In trying to determine why career academics would display such characteristics, the researcher concluded that it was due to reluctance, on the part of some staff members, to engage fully in academic work. The approach taken by the researcher followed that outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998), and used in recent research by Elkjaer (2004) and Hendon and Hildebrand (2005).

As classification progressed, the researcher constantly compared the phenomenon under consideration with others already labelled, in order to discover common characteristics between phenomena, concepts, events and happenings, and also to identify variation. Strauss (1987, p.25) has proposed a concept-indicator model, shown at Figure 2 below, that represents the conceptual coding of empirical data, based on the constant comparison of one concept with another. Where common characteristics were discovered, the concept under consideration was added to the same category as the similar concepts previously labelled. In this way higher order entities or categories were constructed. The process of labelling involved a degree of interpretation of meaning derived from the context in which the phenomenon was found. While labelling concepts, the researcher recorded the method of analysis, interpretations and questions for future discussion in a record of analysis or memo.

Figure removed, please consult
print copy of the thesis held in
Griffith University Library

Figure 2. The Concept Indicator Model From Strauss (1987).

As concepts from the data were developed through the open coding process the researcher attempted to group concepts into more abstract collectives or categories. The researcher was also aware that literature was a powerful source for concept development and labelling, for example using Etzioni's (1961) notion of

alienation as a category of strong negative commitment. Using the concept indicator, the researcher initially identified concepts in the data. For example, in the third interview, when Peter, a level B academic, was providing an account of commitment, the researcher identified the concept of “going the extra mile”:

So, if you bring that back into realistic terms and collapse it inside and see it as organisational commitment. I would see that as people who go beyond the norm across the traditional dynamics.

This concept was noted and compared with each concept arising from the remainder of Peter’s, and subsequent, interviews. In the sixth interview with Sue, a sessional staff member, the researcher noted similarities with the concept “going the extra mile” and using the constant comparison process to compare emerging concepts with existing ones. Sue’s account contained the following:

...but are demonstrating those kind of things and the willingness to, to sort of help out colleagues with extra like tasks, or additional marking or second markings of things, step in to do guest lectures when somebody has to be away for a period of time, knowing that for example if the shoe was on the other foot you are going to get that repaid at some point so...

The researcher noted both instances of “going the extra mile” and combined them into a new conceptual category.

Strauss (1987) has termed the next stage in data coding as “axial coding”, a process whereby data that were disaggregated in the open coding process are reassembled to give more complete explanations of phenomena. Axial coding aligns categories with their sub-categories on the basis of dimensions and properties (Holloway & Wheeler, 2002). Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998) have suggested that axial coding is a conceptual exercise not a descriptive one; just describing phenomena and categorising them is not sufficient, an approach with which the researcher concurred. Categories established during the open coding process were re-grouped to

a higher level of abstraction, forming new composite categories that offered greater explanation based on the explanatory and supplementary nature of the sub-categories. An example of moving categories to a higher conceptual plane was combining Mary's comment that "...I think there's new sorts of what's appropriate for women..." with Sue's "...what some of the male staff members could, for example do or not do was different..." to create a new conceptual category entitled "different standards".

Strauss and Corbin (1998) have suggested a means of gathering and ordering data based on systematic collecting and ordering "in such a way that structure and process are integrated", thus emphasising the importance of integrating and understanding both structure and process (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 128). Considering just structure or process alone will result in an incomplete understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Structure deals with questions relating to *why* events have occurred. Process deals with *how* events are understood. In the current study as each concept was identified the data were questioned in the manner suggested by Glaser (1978), and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998), asking questions of the data such as "what is going on here", "what does it mean", "why is it happening", "when", "where", "who is doing it" and "how is it being done" in order to elucidate the relationship between structure and process.

The third level of coding has been termed "selective coding", where the major categories are linked together to identify an overarching or core category. Selective coding has been described as the theory building stage of analysis where the researcher, at a theoretical rather than descriptive level, attempted to derive a theory

based on explanations of phenomena grounded in data from interviews and literature (Stern, 1980; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Identifying concepts

As the researcher read Pam's interview transcript, utilising the mode of analysis discussed above, he noted discrete items that appeared to be of interest, in the context of the study, contained in the transcript data. Following the approach suggested by Glaser (1978), and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998), the researcher interrogated the data, asking questions such as "what is going on here", "what does it mean", "why is it happening" in order to discover the meaning of these items. When the researcher was satisfied that the meaning of an item was understood it was labelled as a concept and its meaning captured in a memo before proceeding to the next discrete item (e.g., the first item in Pam's interview was labelled "long serving", the second was labelled "sense of belonging"). The label names, or *in vivo* codes where these were appropriate, were hand written in the wide margin on the right hand side of each page of the interview. Wherever possible existing labels for concepts were used to facilitate description (Schreiber, 2001). As each new concept was labelled the researcher compared it with the concepts already identified in Pam's interview, marking links in the page margins of the interview where they occurred. At the conclusion of Pam's interview, 24 concepts had been labelled, 11 of which showed similarities or characteristics on at least two or more occasions (Glaser, 1978). Where concepts showed similarities the information was added to the original data, using axial or second level coding, thus forming provisional categories, as previously explained.

At this stage of analysis the researcher commenced the task of fully describing the provisional categories, allowing for both range and variation. Analysing data and building categories has been described as being both time and labour intensive (Corbin, 1986a, 1986b; Swanson, 1986a), involving mainly pen and paper approaches to data management. Given the potentially voluminous amounts of data generated by a grounded theory study, the researcher had been considering how to manage data effectively without compromising the rigour of the analysis, before finally deciding to use a computer-based approach to data management. Initially, the structure of the database was challenging, given the need to present interviews, categories and memos within the width of a computer monitor screen. Generic database software offered the flexibility, ease of storage and retrieval, and reliability necessary for the effective management of data for the study. Microsoft Access was chosen as the software platform mainly as it supported Object Linking and Embedding (OLE), a function that the researcher believed would enhance the data storage and retrieval process. Microsoft Access also was a complementary product to Microsoft Word, the word processor software used for the dissertation. Eventually, the database design (see Appendix "E") proved to be less daunting than the researcher initially thought, as none of the record linking or query functions of the software would be used. The overall database consisted of three tables entitled Interviews, Category and Interview Schedule. The Interviews table contained each of the interviews relating to the study, each captured as an embedded Word file using the OLE function. The Category database contained categories constructed during the axial coding process with fields designed to capture record number, category label, category embedded as an OLE Word file, an extended label descriptor, and a memo embedded as an OLE Word file.

The Interview Schedule table contained the names, positions, organisational unit, university campus and sex of interviewees.

After initial coding of Pam's interview, labels for the 11 categories identified in the interview were entered into the Category table of the database. New Microsoft Word files were embedded in the category and memo fields of the database using the OLE function. The Word document containing Pam's interview was now accessed from the Interviews table and opened. The first concept forming part of a category in Pam's interview was then located on the hard copy of the interview which had been previously analysed. The corresponding section of Pam's Word interview document was blocked and copied, then pasted into the appropriate Word file in the Category table. The interview number and page were also recorded in the Word file in the Category table to enable the concept to be realigned with its original interview if required in the future. While still accessing the record for the category under discussion, the Word document embedded in the memo field was now opened. Information relating to the concept and category was added to this document. Both embedded documents were then closed before moving on to the next category. The remaining concepts forming provisional categories identified in the analysis of Pam's interview were added to the database following the procedures mentioned above (e.g. self and career, rewards for work, presenteeism).

Once the open and axial coding of Pam's interview had been completed, the second interview was undertaken. The second interview also involved a staff member from the same organisational unit, but this time a male. The interviewee was assigned the pseudonym "John" to ensure anonymity. On this occasion, the interview took place in the researcher's office at John's request. As with the previous interview a

formal explanation of the project and signing of the interview consent form by both parties preceded the interview. The interview was audio tape recorded under the control of the interviewee. Following the pattern of the first interview, the researcher made observations both during the interview and on its conclusion; these being later recorded in the form of a memo. During the interview John appeared cautious but otherwise appeared to be at ease, choosing his words carefully before making any statements. Observations made by the researcher included non-verbal communication, such as gestures and haptics, together with the interviewee's voice tone.

At the conclusion of the interview the researcher recorded an account of the interview, including observations, in a memo. Following the completion of the memo the researcher transcribed the interview, again using Microsoft Word, and printed the finished article using double line spacing with a wide margin to the right hand side of the page in the same manner as the transcription of Pam's interview. The researcher then read the interview again before commencing the coding process.

Open coding then commenced following a line-by-line analysis, once again breaking data into discrete parts, carefully and closely examining them, and comparing them with other data in order to establish similarities and differences. Analysing data in this way enabled the researcher to identify similar concepts both within John's interview, and between John and Pam's interviews. In this way categories established during Pam's interview were supplemented and new categories were created in the manner described below.

As with Pam's interview transcript, when the researcher noted discrete items in John's interview transcript the data were interrogated by asking questions such as

“what is going on here”, “what does it mean”, “why is it happening” in order to discover the meaning of these items. When the researcher was satisfied that the meaning of an item was understood it was labelled as a concept and its meaning captured in a memo before proceeding to the next discrete item. As in the first interview the label names, or *in vivo* codes where these were appropriate, were hand written in the wide margin on the right hand side of each page of the interview. As each new concept was labelled the researcher compared it with the concepts already identified from within John’s interview and also with the concepts identified in Pam’s interview, marking links in the page margins of the interview where they occurred. At the conclusion of John’s interview, 19 concepts had been labelled. Following labelling, each of the 19 concepts was compared with the 11 categories identified from Pam’s interview. Comparing existing categories with the concepts from John’s interview resulted in 9 of the concepts from John’s interview being added to the existing categories, thus enriching them. After enriching existing categories the remaining concepts identified in John’s data were compared with each other in order to identify similarities or characteristics occurring on at least two or more occasions. Comparing concepts within John’s data resulted in 5 new categories being created.

Constantly comparing data, both within and between interviews, has been proposed as an essential feature of grounded theory research, providing confidence that interpretations are robust and deep (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; McCann & Clark, 2003a). Glaser and Strauss (1967) have suggested that there are four stages of constant comparison, the first of which is employed here, namely simultaneous data collection and analysis which builds depth of meaning in categories. Other stages of constant comparison pertain to integrating categories, delimiting the theory, and

writing the theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and will be discussed further in the forthcoming chapters as they occur.

Following coding of John's interview, labels for the five new categories identified in the interview were entered into the Category table of the database. New Microsoft Word files were embedded in the category and memo fields of the database using the OLE function. The Word document containing John's interview was now added to the Interviews table and opened. The first concept relating to a new category in John's interview was located on the hard copy of the interview which had been previously analysed. The corresponding section of John's Word interview document was blocked and copied, then pasted into the appropriate Word file in the Category table. As with Pam's data, the interview number and page were also recorded in the Word file in the Category table to enable the concept to be realigned with its original interview at a future time should this be required. While still accessing the record for the category under discussion, the Word document embedded in the memo field was now opened. Information relating to the concept and category was added to the memo document. Both embedded documents were then closed before moving on to the next new category. The remaining new categories, identified in the analysis of John's interview, were added to the database following the procedures outlined above.

Once the new categories had been added to the database the focus moved to enriching existing categories. Choosing the first category to be enriched and opening the existing embedded Word file, enabled appropriate data to be electronically blocked, copied and pasted from John's interview document into the Category table. Data added in this way were identified by interview and page number to facilitate future identification. When the first category had been enriched, by adding concepts

identified in John's data, the embedded memo file associated with the category was opened and updated with information relating to the new data. The remaining categories for enrichment were identified and updated following the procedures mentioned above.

At the conclusion of the open and axial coding processes for the first two interviews 16 categories, each containing two or more concepts had been constructed. A number of other single or individual concepts remained from the two interviews, these being retained for constant comparison with concepts arising from future interviews. Concepts remaining were highlighted in the margins of Pam's and John's interviews to facilitate identification in the ongoing process of analysis. At the researcher's request Pam and John had each nominated a potential interviewee who was then contacted by the researcher. Persons nominated in this way became the third and fourth interviewees.

The third interview was conducted in a similar manner to previous interviews. Concepts identified from open coding analysis of the third interview were used to enrich existing categories and to create new categories where appropriate, following the same procedures as for John's interview, including the constant comparison of concepts across all interviews. Interview four was conducted following completion of open and axial coding of interview three. Analysis of interview four followed the same procedures used for previous interviews. At the completion of analysis of interview four the researcher reviewed the interviews and analyses conducted to date.

Changing the sampling strategy

Upon reviewing the interviews conducted so far, along with the concepts and categories identified in the interviews, the researcher noted several recurring issues

associated with work commitment, including presenteeism, passion and the university as a greedy institution which, will be discussed in chapters five and six. Interviews conducted so far had been with staff from a particular academic unit and geographic location of the university. In order to determine whether members of academic staff in other academic units, and working at other campuses of the university, were also experiencing similar issues, the researcher decided to expand the scope and method of selecting interviewees, as suggested by Corbin (1986b). In order to accommodate and attempt to capture both similarities and variations within and between concepts, the researcher decided to select prospective interviewees from the university's on-line list of academic staff, thus replacing the process of asking interviewees to nominate prospective interviewees. In changing the method of selecting interviewees, the researcher moved from a purposive sampling approach to collecting data, based on a "snowball" approach, to a theoretical sampling approach whereby data collection was based on emerging categories (McCann & Clark, 2003a; Schreiber, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998).

Using the university's on-line staff listing proved to be an effective means of selecting interviewees. Initially the researcher sent an email to prospective interviewees outlining the project and requesting an interview. While three staff members overall declined the invitation to participate in the research, all for reasons of pressure of work or time constraints, staff were mainly enthusiastic and willing to participate. Following initial contact with a prospective interviewee the researcher made contact by telephone to establish a time and place for the interview. Prior to commencing the fifth interview the interviewer also reviewed the data collection process for continued effectiveness.

Reviewing the data collection process led the researcher to make changes to the interview guide by removing questions relating to teaching, namely linking theory with practice, and strategies for embedding this in theory. From the interviews conducted so far, the questions about linking theory with practice had not yielded any work commitment concepts. The emergence of the commodification of commitment, the notion that commitment may be valued and measured as a commodity, as a category also suggested that it should form part of future interviews. Changes to the focus of data collection were reflected in an amended interview guide, a copy of which is shown at Appendix “F”.

Before commencing the fifth interview the researcher sought the assistance of two experienced qualitative researchers. Each co-researcher was given transcripts of the four completed interviews. Co-researchers independently analysed the four interviews, then met the researcher to compare the results of analysis. While there was not an expectation that independent analysis would produce *exactly* the same results (Swanson, 1986a), the analysis of all three researchers had fundamental similarities, for example the categories of presenteeism, passion and the commodification of commitment were identified by all three researchers along with similar concepts including stereotyping and availability for work. Following the review the researcher commenced the fifth interview.

The fifth interview was conducted following the approaches used in the first four interviews. Following audio-tape recording of the interview it was transcribed by the researcher. Open coding and axial coding then followed during which data were constantly compared both within and between the current interview and previous ones. Where appropriate, existing categories were enriched and new categories

created. Individual concepts identified in transcripts were highlighted for comparison with future interview data. The sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth interviews were conducted following the same processes as earlier interviews, as discussed above.

When the tenth interview had been analysed 32 categories had been created and numerous additional individual concepts identified. At this point the researcher again reviewed the data collection and analysis processes for continued effectiveness.

Reviewing the data collection process led the researcher to make further changes to the interview guide in order to clarify perceived differences in staff commitment to organisational and academic units. Future interviews would contain questions about attitudes towards heads of academic units and research centres in order to understand staff perceptions about work elements more clearly. Changes to the focus of data collection were reflected in an amended interview guide, a copy of which is shown at Appendix “G”.

Prior to commencing the eleventh interview the researcher again sought the assistance of two experienced qualitative researchers. Each co-researcher was given transcripts of interviews five to ten inclusive. Co-researchers independently analysed the six interviews and met the researcher to compare the results of analysis. Again there was not an expectation that independent analysis would produce *exactly* the same results (Swanson, 1986a). However, the analysis of all three researchers again showed fundamental similarities, for example the categories of greedy organisation and emotional labour were identified by all three researchers along with similar concepts including non-participation, peer support and coping. Following the review the researcher commenced the eleventh interview.

Interviews 11 to 17 were undertaken and analysed by the researcher following the procedures used for previous interviews in the study, with the constant comparison of data continuing throughout. As open and axial coding progressed a number of existing categories were enriched, new categories were created where appropriate, and individual concepts were identified for future comparison of data. At the completion of interview 17 a total of 67 provisional categories had been created by the open and axial coding processes. As the interviews progressed from interview 11 onwards, the number of new categories identified from analysing interviews steadily decreased, with no new category being identified during analysis of interview 17. At this point the researcher believed that saturation of categories *may* have occurred, that is no new categories would be discovered from future interviews (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998). In order to ensure that saturation had occurred the researcher continued interviewing academic staff until 22 interviews had been completed. Despite continuing analysis with the aim of finding new categories aligned with the research question, none were added from analysis of interviews 17 to 22 inclusive; although each interview enriched existing categories to some degree. A schedule of the 22 interviews of academic staff is listed at Table 2, below.

Theoretical coding

Strauss and Corbin (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998) have suggested that as a researcher becomes familiar with data he or she may conduct theoretical coding, that is, coding on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, rather than the time consuming process of line-by-line analysis. Charmaz (1990) has further argued that analysis on a paragraph basis is acceptable until a new category is discovered, at which point

Table 2. Schedule of Interviews

Interview	Pseudonym	Position	Job Title	Sex
1	Pam	C	Senior Lecturer	F
2	John	B	Lecturer	M
3	Peter	B	Lecturer	M
4	Mary	S	Sessional	F
5	Richard	D	Associate Professor	M
6	Sue	B	Lecturer	F
7	Shaun	C	Senior Lecturer	M
8	Shirley	B	Lecturer	F
9	Zoe	B	Lecturer	F
10	Ruth	A	Associate Lecturer	F
11	Michael	C	Senior Lecturer	M
12	Zane	E	Professor	M
13	Martha	C	Senior Lecturer	F
14	Jillian	E	Professor	F
15	Jane	C	Senior Lecturer	F
16	Fleur	A	Associate Lecturer	F
17	Derek	B	Lecturer	M
18	Kathryn	B	Lecturer	F
19	Louise	C	Senior Lecturer	F
20	James	B	Lecturer	M
21	Lucy	B	Lecturer	F
22	Jo	C	Senior Lecturer	F

coding should revert to a line-by-line basis. In this study each interview was analysed on a line-by-line basis throughout, in an attempt to ensure that *no* concepts escaped the process of analysis. Although conducting analysis on a line-by-line basis throughout was time consuming, and possibly unnecessary on some occasions, the

researcher was new to grounded theory research and wished to ensure that a thorough analysis was carried out.

At the conclusion of open and axial coding, 457 pages of interview data had been analysed and 67 provisional categories identified. As open and axial coding were taking place the researcher had also been attempting to think of the data at a theoretical level in order ultimately to reorganise the data back into a meaningful whole. Reorganising data in a grounded theory study has been described as a process based on examining the relationships between and among categories (Schreiber, 2001), following the coding schema proposed by Straus and Corbin (1990; 1998).

At this point in the study the researcher reflected on the data analysis carried out so far. Data had been collected from different sources, both interviews and observations, as Corbin (1986b) has suggested, with multiple data sources being an important condition that had influenced the research process positively. Data collected had been validated through the constant comparison of data both within and between interviews. In the early stages of analysis categories had developed quickly, slowing as data analysis progressed, following the pattern for a grounded theory study (Corbin, 1986b). Understanding concepts arising from the open coding process had been accomplished by utilising an ongoing process of asking questions of the data in the manner suggested by Corbin (1986b), Glaser (1978), and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998). Categories had been built from data until saturation was reached, as indicated by no new categories emerging during the last six interviews. Continuing interviews and analysis after saturation ensured that categories were robust and dense.

An important feature of grounded theory is the simultaneous use of open, axial and selective coding (Corbin, 1986a; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). During open and axial coding the researcher had also commenced the third level of coding, also referred to as selective coding (McCann & Clark, 2003a; 2003c), contemporaneously. At the third level, links between categories are examined and a core category may be identified (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), although a core category may only emerge during the latter stages of analysis (Glaser, 1978). As third level coding continued, the researcher attempted to make linkages between categories by moving categories from lower to higher levels of abstraction in order to provide a conceptual ordering of the data (Corbin, 1986b). From making linkages between categories, it appeared to the researcher that the meaning of work commitment at the university in question, as constructed by its academic staff, could be grouped into three main domains or sub-core categories.

Identifying Core and Sub-core Categories

Sub-core categories identified by the researcher were named “Gendering Work Commitment”, “Emotionalising Work Commitment”, and “Achieving Work Commitment”, each title reflecting the characteristics of the sub-core category. The sub-core categories are processes which in turn lead to the Basic Social Process that together form the substantive grounded theory of work commitment in the context in which the study is based.

Following the linking, identifying and labelling of the sub-core categories, the researcher continued working with the data in order to identify a core category. Every grounded theory contains a core category, which emerges from the data, and which represents the main concerns of the subjects of the study, as seen through their eyes

(Schreiber, 2001). Identifying the core category is another point of difference between Glaser's (1978; 1992) approach to grounded theory generation and that of Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998). Utilising Glaser's approach, the core category requires little effort to discover it, having emerged in a fairly obvious manner from the data. Alternatively, Strauss and Corbin's approach has been described as often requiring considerable data manipulation before the core category can be identified, with discovery often being an intuitive process resulting from consciously or unconsciously reflecting on the data over time (May, 1994; Schreiber, 2001). In this study the researcher arranged and re-arranged categories in various hierarchical orders. The researcher also developed a diagram of categories in order to facilitate their interchange, as suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998). Eventually, a category that accounted for the main patterns or themes existing in the data was identified, and established as the core category. The core category is discussed in greater detail in chapter eight.

Judging the Goodness of Qualitative Research

Researchers, including some qualitative researchers (e.g., Silverman, 2001), often attempt to judge qualitative research in positivistic terms. Words like "validity", "generalisability" and "reliability" tend to be used to confirm that a particular project meets appropriate standards of "rigour". In an attempt to devise standards that were more in line with qualitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (2000a) have suggested that in interpretive qualitative research, terms such as "credibility", "transferability" and "dependability" are more appropriate. Building on Denzin and Lincoln's (2000a) suggestion, Arminio and Hultgren (2002) have proposed that using the term "goodness" in relation to qualitative research is a way of moving the focus away from

traditional positivistic language and measures. Using goodness to describe the worth of a qualitative study reflects the purpose of qualitative interpretive research, that of generating meaning rather than verifying or falsifying objective facts. Goodness is an integral part of qualitative research, not something that is separate from it (Mishler, 2000). Arminio and Hultgren (2002) have suggested that the dimensions in which to “...situate research goodness, forming the lens of goodness”, from which a qualitative study is judged, are: (a) a clear philosophical position set out in epistemology; (b) logic and criteria grounded in methodology; (c) clear description of data collection set out in method; (d) the position of the researcher in relation to participants, and recognition of power relationships; (e) insights gained through interpretation that results from the correct application of methodology and method; and (f) dissemination of the results of research in order to improve the lives of others. Arminio and Hultgren (2002) have argued that addressing each of the items, and linking them together in a study, should ensure that goodness is achieved. The items will therefore be considered in connection with the current study.

The epistemological assumptions, on which this study is based, have been articulated in earlier chapters. The need for the study has been clearly shown as stemming from the failure of past, mainly positivistic, research to consider important organisational issues such as gender and emotions in the context of commitment. Understanding the work commitment of academic staff, through the ways in which staff interpret their social world, is informed by the epistemological basis for the study, namely symbolic interactionism. It is the epistemological foundations of the study that provide the theoretical perspective from which decisions of methodology and method are made (Arminio & Hultgren, 2002; Bailey, 1996).

Methodology is dependent on epistemological and theoretical assumptions. Methodology provides the path between epistemology and method, adding clarity, direction and logic to the ways in which data are collected and analysed (Arminio & Hultgren, 2002). Researchers should justify the methodology chosen on the basis of the theoretical position grounded in epistemology (Arminio & Hultgren, 2002). In the current study the methodology chosen is grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), an inductive interpretive methodology designed to generate substantive and formal theories. Grounded theory is a methodology that is distilled from symbolic interactionism; therefore the fit between epistemology and methodology is appropriate. Also, as the re-conceptualisation of work commitment, through a theory-building process, is the purpose of the study, grounded theory is an appropriate methodology to achieve this.

Grounded theory methodology points the way towards the method used for data collection and analysis, although Glaser (1978; 1992) and Strauss (1987) have proposed different methods for employing grounded theory, based primarily on issues of whether theory “emerges” or is “forced”. Strauss’ approach has been followed in this study. Grounded theory data collection methods mainly involve interpreting the ways in which actors construct reality in their social worlds, in the case of this study captured through interviews and observation. Measures of the goodness of data collection include thick description (Johnson & Duberley, 2000), selection of participants and interpretations of stories (Mishler, 2000), a clear audit trail of what was said, where it was said, by whom and under what conditions (Whitt, 1991), together with what biases the researcher brings to the research. Each of these measures has been considered and adhered to in this research. Also, within the

overarching concept of goodness, credibility and dependability have been enhanced by the constant comparison of data, and triangulation of method, source, site and analyst.

During the study, the researcher reflected on his relationship with both the participants and the phenomena being investigated. The researcher was mindful of the dynamics of the situation while engaging in dialogue with participants and obtaining observational data, and has represented the stories of participants accurately at all times during the research. In this study, the researcher has attempted to move beyond a superficial approach to analysing data, by treating data analysis as a conceptual process, in order to make connections that may not be evident in the accounts of participants alone (Arminio & Hultgren, 2002).

The final element is making a link between the theory generated by the research and application in the workplace. Links between theory and application will be made in the final chapter.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed how participants were selected for interview and how data were collected from them in order to address the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* and to re-conceptualise work commitment in the form of a theory of work commitment.. Transcription of interview data and initial analysis from early interviews were discussed, in particular the identification of concepts during the open coding process, followed by the reforming of concepts into provisional categories during the second or axial coding phase of analysis.

Use of computer database software to maintain interview data and categories has been discussed, along with a detailed account of how categories were generated or enriched by subsequent interviews. Changes to the interview guide, based on experience from earlier interviews, were made. Interviews were read by two experienced qualitative researchers on two occasions during the data analysis process, in order to confirm the researcher's analysis.

Building on the major themes emerging from the data, the researcher was able to identify three sub-core categories that accounted for the gendered, emotional and overall commitment of academic staff. Working further with the data, the researcher identified a core category which was also a Basic Social Process. The sub-core and core categories are discussed in later chapters.

Finally, the researcher has examined the notion of "goodness" as a means of evaluating qualitative research. The main elements of the concept of goodness have been presented, along with a brief account of the ways in which the researcher has attempted to ensure that the study has been conducted to meet the requirements of goodness.

The next chapter discusses the first of the sub-core categories that make up the grounded theory of academic work commitment. The gendered nature of academic work commitment is the theme of the sub-core category which contributes substantially to the overall grounded theory of academic work commitment at the university in question.

Chapter 5

Gendering Work Commitment

Introduction

This chapter presents the start of the grounded theory resulting from a study of work commitment in the context of academic work at an Australian university. It begins by discussing the first of the three sub-core categories identified in the previous chapter. Each of the sub-core categories relates to a key element in the meaning of work commitment to academic staff. Work commitment presented and discussed in the sub-core category detailed in this chapter is entitled “Gendering Work Commitment”. The composition of the sub-core category is shown in Table 3 below. This Table lists the categories that together make-up the sub-core category of “Gendering Academic Work Commitment”. Categories are discussed in detail below.

Table 3. The Core Sub-Category of Gendering Academic Work Commitment

Sub-core category	Categories
Gendering work commitment	University as a greedy institution Presenteeism as an indicator of commitment Balancing work and family life Female stereotypes Commitment through exceeding requirements Appraisal of commitment Harassment of female staff Perceptions of self and commitment Compliance Exploitive role model Different academic standards

Most female staff members interviewed in this study perceived that male counterparts often were not present to undertake the service elements of academic work, and also displayed minimal commitment to teaching, choosing instead to concentrate on research output which was more highly valued by the organisation. A male focus on research, at the expense of other aspects of academic work, placed an unfair burden of “lower value” work of female staff members.

As previously discussed the purpose of the research is to address the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* The study also aims to re-conceptualise work commitment by building a theory of work commitment. This chapter deals with the gendered nature of academic staff work commitment.

The chapter begins with an overview of academic work and the commitment of academic staff at university. The focus is on the main categories identified in the sub-core category.

University as a Greedy Institution

The flexibility of working hours, together with autonomy, makes university academic life appealing to many staff members. For example, Louise, talking about a colleague who she observed was working long hours, longer than she ever did in her professional life before working at university, said “But there’s obviously something there that still keeps her here, and I think it is the flexibility of the work hours, and the autonomy, which you don’t get in practice.” Kathryn made a similar observation citing flexibility, collegiality, the intellectual challenge along with the reward that you get from teaching, and interacting with students. She went on to say “...we’re fortunate, I think, that our job can be a job that is flexible within the confines of

attending our meetings and working our timetabled time.” Similar sentiments were expressed by Martha who said:

Honestly, I think there’s just wonderful things about this job that start, like there are things I’ll come to about the specifics of the job, but we’re both in a job where you’re highly autonomous, and you’ve got a lot of choice about when you work and reasonable amount of choice about what you do in your work, particularly in terms of say your research, and even some of how you do your teaching. You can choose some of what you choose to do for your service and you can choose to say I’ll work all day Saturday and Sunday but I’ll go to the kids swimming carnival on Friday. So those are really important parts of the job to me.

Flexibility, particularly at the intersection of work and family life, was rated very highly by Martha. Jillian also valued flexibility, but with more of a focus on work choices:

I think the fact that... it makes meaning because I’m in control of my work, because every day is a different day, because I can choose where I put my priorities in terms of timing and therefore if I’ve got a reasonable sort of idea of what’s important. I can accomplish something, and so at the end of the day, the end of the week, I always feel its been a good day. I very rarely have a bad day at work.

The final comment about the benefits of flexibility in the workplace was made by Peter, who when talking about research commented that “...there is the flexibility or the opportunity to get involved with real organisations, from a theoretical and practical approach, and have the flexibility to sit among different organisations. So there’s a dynamic you can get.”

Academic staff clearly saw themselves as having the means of determining the order, and degree to which, they carried out their work duties, within the constraints of scheduled activities such as teaching. Flexibility in planning and doing work, albeit subject to meeting agreed outcomes, was obviously highly desirable from a staff perspective. Flexibility and autonomy engendered commitment by making work more interesting and exciting (Wilkinson, 1998).

Working at the university that is the subject of this study, as seen through the eyes of academic staff, appeared to provide an ideal work environment. However, as Brandth and Kvande (2002) have argued, exciting and challenging work are often the catalyst for the establishment of greedy organisations. Such organisations exist by making unreasonable demands on their members, ultimately sustaining these demands in the main by the voluntary commitment of members. However, academic staff, while lauding both the flexibility and autonomy available to them, were also very aware of being required to undertake a demanding, often unreasonable, workload. One staff member, Shaun, spoke of success at university being dependent on a life commitment to work. In Shaun's view making such a commitment would lead to recognition by the university, based on measured outcomes, such as grants and research papers:

To be as honest as possible I would say that if you really are prepared to make it your life and your hobby then you're able to teach well and give the university what it wants more of and therefore show your commitment by grants and papers, and we get lots in the [his discipline] area, and the university will see that commitment and reward it, and rightly so.

The meaning that Shaun gave to work commitment also provided insight into how he saw university work being commodified; his reference to what the university "wants" indicating that organisational requirements are driving the process.

Other staff members also commented on heavy workloads and the strain of working seven days a week for periods of time. Jo commented that "Being an academic these days is bloody hard work, bloody hard work, and sometimes just coming to work each day is quite difficult..." She described how difficult her work had been over the past three years which had been demanding, groundbreaking work. She continued:

Here, we have to be at work eight till six, five days a week, we can't leave...we're not really allowed to leave our desks or leave the building and we have numerous meetings at night, and on weekends and we're really tested all the time.

Jo explained that she recently had to attend a meeting at another campus during the daytime, and as a consequence "...my boss was just ropeable because I was not here..." Staff were not allowed to leave the building despite the demands of a multi-campus university. The expectations of Jo's manager were that academic staff would be available during normal daytime working hours. Jo's position involved teaching, research and the administration of a "professional" qualification. In addition to a requirement to work long hours during "normal" working time from Monday to Friday, Jo and her colleagues were expected to attend meetings at night and during weekends.

Jane also spoke about the demands of marking and other "hectic times" which presented her with time demands; time which once expended was not able to be recovered. Jane commented on what to her was perceived as an excessive work load, saying "Yes, yes I mean, of course sometimes it gets on my nerves when we have to... every Saturday, every Sunday, marking or when it's hectic times here...and you never recover it. In theory we can recover it, yes, but in practice we never do." Jane also disclosed how she would do university work until the early hours of the morning, and then continue after just a few hours sleep. Long hours of work, over sustained periods, also appeared to be the norm for work colleagues, with Jane recalling communicating with them during the night "I went to sleep at four o'clock in the night, of course I get up at six o'clock again but in that time I have exchanged emails with other peers which means I'm not the only one...", continuing with "...of course it's not every day, but it would be more that 50 per cent of the days."

Similar sentiments about the periodic high workloads of academic staff were also expressed by Kathryn, also highlighting another issue, one concerning the expectations of the organisation regarding fractional staff:

...over a period of five or six weeks at the end of last semester, when our marking was on, and I'm teaching a large core subject across two campuses, probably completed about one hundred hours of marking all of which I'm doing at five 'o' clock in the morning, and at night, and on the weekends, and really, no one says well, 'you're sixty percent so therefore if you've done your twenty one hours then don't worry about that marking' you just complete it, so I don't think we actually do that much less work here. But we're outcome focused and however many hours it takes to achieve that outcome, it takes.

For Kathryn, the work expectations of fractional staff were not proportional to paid hours, a trend also noted by Shirley. When discussing the demands of organising a course for overseas students, Shirley said "There is a residential week and I used to do all the logistics for the accommodation, you name it, and I was doing that on a half load and still teaching as well." Shirley also expressed the view that overall the university's expectations were unreasonable, as even a "good time manager like me" was unable to produce the level of research output that she wished. She continued "... the expectation is that to get anywhere you've got to work 24 hours a day" and "...there are too many balls floating in the air and at times I get so tired I think what am I doing all this for?"

Comparisons with other occupations were also made. Louise, formerly a member of a recognised profession where long hours and high expectations of workers were the norm, told of an academic colleague who had also worked in the same profession. Louise recalled a recent conversation with her colleague, who in response to a question from Louise asking why she was at work so early, replied "I know, I could be back in [the profession] if I knew these were the hours I'd be working as an academic." The comparison between the hours worked at university

and a profession known for the demands it places on its workforce, reinforced the notion that university was a greedy organisation, one that placed high demands on its workers. Louise's story was consistent with a workplace where increased work pressure, caused by changing academic work, has led to an expectation on the part of the organisation that staff will spend excessive time in the workplace. Fleur also provided a comparison between high school teachers and university staff, commenting that teachers also work long hours but get "...all those extra holidays that we don't get."

The theme of the university as a greedy, gendered organisation was evident throughout the data collection stage of the research. In the first interview Pam gave an account of her academic workload which involved ten to twelve hours a day. In discussing her work, Fleur stated that she had not realised the work expectations placed on academic staff. Commenting on hours of work she said, "Get real! Thirty seven hour working week [laughs]...before I started in academia someone said if want to be an academic get used to working sixty hour weeks." For Fleur the sixty hour working week was now a reality in order to balance the research, teaching and service roles. As a so-called junior staff member Fleur had also realised that the demands of academic work did not diminish as one moved upwards through the ranks. She confessed to being "scared" about promotion, particularly the additional administrative work involved at higher levels. Reflecting on the ways in which a senior colleague managed her time, Fleur said:

I don't know how she does it all, and as I said she seems to do that as well as manage to have some sort of home life as well...and um...you know, I wish she'd sit me down one day and tell me the magic way to do this all. Because I'm...currently this year I've been busy rebuilding relationships that I've really whittled away through lack of time.

Talking to Fleur one got the feeling that she was not coping well with the demands of the greedy organisation as she reflected wistfully on an apparently “magic” way of obtaining a balance between home and work. Fleur was also resentful about what she perceived as lost relationships, due wholly in her mind to the demands of a greedy organisation. She also confessed that she was working on what she termed an “exit strategy.” As a consequence of the demands of a greedy organisation, poor work/life balance, and forgone relationships, Fleur was experiencing low organisational commitment.

Beyond an overall impression of working in a greedy organisation, an undertone of exploitation existed for some academic staff members. Unreasonable expectations of fractional staff members at the organisational level have been noted above, but beyond that several staff members expressed the view that they felt that they had been exploited. Richard, a senior academic, began by commenting on the effect of time constraints on research output, then went on to say that in his view the university had exploited sessional staff by expecting them, on occasions, to undertake full-time academic work loads. Richard continued by reflecting on a previous supervisor as “...a bad supervisor, and he should never have allowed me to do so much work.” The notion of exploitation by the organisation was also raised by Martha who said “I was a senior lecturer but having to take on huge roles. I had work overload, major work stress, developed an RSI condition out of it.” Martha’s use of “...having to take on...” quite clearly identified the lack of discretion she had in the process, and the expectation of the organisation that the work would be carried out.

Work overload, with staff ...”having nothing left over” to give students and “...being stretched so thin...” was also evident in Fleur’s account of her work. A

similar story was told by Kathryn who, as a fractional staff member, spoke of not doing any less work than when she was a full-time staff member. Kathryn went on to detail her difficulties in balancing teaching, research output, sitting on committees and trying to complete her PhD. In Kathryn's case, the problems were exacerbated by being a fractional staff member, as discussed above. However, the organisation was complicit in the exploitation of staff, having provided university asset computers for members of Kathryn's school to use at home, as she explained "...so it gives you the flexibility to structure your work load..." The researcher's interpretation of this arrangement was the active involvement of a greedy organisation in exploiting its staff by blurring the boundaries between work and home. Kathryn stated that she attended her office at university on two days of the week and worked the rest of the week from home, using the university computer asset to accomplish this. The organisation had unreasonably high expectations of Kathryn's work outputs over and above those recognised in a normal working week. Kathryn's extra effort was neither brought to account nor was it recognised by the organisation.

The theme of seemingly never-ending work suggested by Pam, Kathryn and Shirley was continued by Louise, who told a story that provided insight into the expectation of the organisation that its academic staff would work long hours. Following an attempt to undertake work for an external organisation she had been advised that academic staff are employed by the university on a 24 hours a day basis. From this advice Louise got a sense that there was an expectation, on the organisation's part, that staff should work all hours. Shortly after, Louise received email correspondence from the organisation requesting staff home contact details for the purpose of "media contact"; which ultimately she declined to provide. Louise

concluded her story with the comment “It’s easy to take it home. I mean it never really ends you know, the semester ends but there’s just so many things that keep going.” The researcher noted that accounts of the effects of the organisation as a greedy institution, and their impact on organisational commitment in particular, were overwhelmingly made by women, reinforcing the gendered nature of the construct.

In most academic institutions research performance has primacy and teaching is relegated to a secondary business activity. Often the focus is on research and obtaining grants at the expense of teaching, a phenomenon that is reflected in a decline in the importance of teaching credentials in university job advertisements (Mahaffy & Caffrey, 2003). Wright et al., (2004) have argued that greediness is a common thread that links all academic institutions. Common characteristics include high, often conflicting demands on time, and variable standards of teaching. Wright et al., (2004) have also suggested that institutions that seek core business in teaching and research are the greediest of all, adopting the characteristics and expectations of student-centred teaching universities, together with the research and grant productivity of research-centred universities.

Coser (1974) has argued that the greater the investment in an object, the greater the hold exercised by the object over the individual. Applying Coser’s (1974) argument to working women, the more they sacrifice to a greedy institution, the more they are bound to it (Currie, Harris, & Thiele, 2000). Weick (1995) has argued along similar lines, suggesting that individuals invest greater effort in understanding actions to which they are most strongly committed. The tension that then arises for women is determining which greedy institution, work or family, takes priority. The greedy organisation lens, supported by literature (e.g. Coser, 1974; Weick, 1995) suggests

that *all* employees are affected by greediness. The stories told by academic staff in this research suggest otherwise.

Currie et al., (2000) have suggested that academic work is never really done, with increasing demands from administrative and managerial work. Many academics face a time bind, where the demands of the job are constantly juggled, and more and more time is “borrowed” from activities such as leisure, family and sleep. From the outside, universities appear to be gender neutral organisations (Currie et al., 2000). However, previous studies (Allport, 1996; Castleman, Allen, Bastalich, & Wright, 1995; Pointer, 1991; Wilson & Byrne, 1987) have suggested that universities are highly gendered organisations; workplaces that are pervaded by male culture and male experiences.

One of the characteristics of the gendered organisation is the sacrificing of teaching for research, this being deemed necessary for academic career advancement (Currie et al., 2000). Although universities were recognised as highly gendered organisations, Currie et al.,’s (2000) research has also suggested that there is little difference between men and women in terms of sacrifices made in the service of a greedy institution. Currie et al.,’s (2000) findings of no differences between male and female academics, in terms of sacrifice while working in the greedy institution of university, is surprising. The researcher suspects that the use of focus groups as a data collection approach may have contributed to the lack of difference. Morse (2001, p. 4) has argued that focus group data, which she refers to as “snippet data”, tend not to consider process adequately. As a consequence, the ways in which events proceed, together with their structure, tend not to be as readily identifiable in focus group data, compared with data obtained from accounts of events as they have unfolded, as told

in narrative form in one-on-one interviews (Morse, 2001). The research of Currie et al., (2000) has provided a snapshot of organisational life, but has failed to capture the linked perspective that continuous narrative data provide (Morse, 2001). As a consequence the sacrifices of female academic staff, along with the different ways in which women express work commitment, have not been adequately recognised and discussed.

The higher education industry *is* greedy due to the multiple roles that it expects of academic staff, with workloads often exceeding the time available in a normal working week. Autonomy in the performance of roles does not compensate for excessive demands, as the amount of time required for successful task completion is often not sufficient.

Citing Gale's (1997) research into gender imbalance in academic careers, Currie et al., (2000) have suggested that while there is an expectation that academic staff have unlimited time to devote to university work, women find it difficult, if not impossible, to meet organisational expectations. Probert, Ewer and Whiting (1998) have suggested that women value their careers as much as men do, and are equally committed to research. Also, academic careers could be appealing to women, providing they were content to meet the organisational norm, that is behave like men, which mostly they are not (Probert et al., 1998).

In organisations that are supposedly gender-neutral, research has shown that many of these are dominated by masculine structures and principles which tend to advantage men and disadvantage women (Park, 1996). Some jobs are gender-typed, which leads to the filling of these positions with particular persons who are biologically female or male. Examples of male-typed jobs include managing money,

while jobs requiring interpersonal skills, like dealing with clients, tend to be female-typed. Gender-typing leads to, and reinforces, the notion of “men’s work” and “women’s work”. Men’s work is usually portrayed as being complex and difficult, and therefore is usually more highly regarded and rewarded than is “women’s work”, which is often portrayed as less complex and of lower value (Park, 1996).

Advancement at university is determined by individual achievement in research, teaching and service. The most important of the three elements of academic work is research, adequate performance in research being a requirement for promotion and tenure. If research performance is deemed to be inadequate, outstanding performance in teaching and service will usually not be sufficient as a measure of performance (Park, 1996). However, the reverse does not apply, with deficiencies in teaching and service often compensated for by an excellent research record.

The privileging of research over teaching and service continues within research itself. For example, scholarly articles are deemed more prestigious than teaching related publications, such as text books. Theoretical publications are deemed to be of higher value than applied research, while both are ranked higher than educational research (Campbell, Gaertner, & Vecchio, 1983).

Service also is organised notionally based on its “noteworthiness” or relative importance, ranging from, at the higher end, service to professional organisations, through to service to the public at the lower end. Service to campus, faculty or department is expected and relatively unimportant (Park, 1996).

The focus on research as the primary indicator of achievement in the academy is highly gendered. Arguments supporting the primacy of research hold that it is the

only way to differentiate objectively between faculty (Park, 1996). Teaching and service are deemed to be not sufficient, neither offering suitable means of evaluation, lending support to the argument that “everyone teaches” (Park, 1996), itself a critical issue for female academic staff. Asserting that everyone teaches or everyone does service, belies the fact that not all teaching and service is the same. As Park (1996) has argued, workloads vary, postgraduate and undergraduate teaching present different challenges, class sizes differ, core subjects are different to teach than electives, assessment is different, and some staff spend hours writing detailed notes on assessments while other “tick and flick” (Park, 1996).

Park (1996) has argued that treating teaching and service as undifferentiated work is tantamount to arguing that everyone can teach well, teaching being an activity that does not demand high levels of skill, creativity and challenge. Research has shown that teaching is academic work that has been increasingly carried out by women (Astin & Snyder, 1982; Hornig, 1980; Park, 1996). The result is that women are perceived to be predominantly engaged in less-skilled, less-challenging and less-creative work activities than their male colleagues.

The caring nature of women has been identified in studies of occupations usually associated with women (e.g., nursing, care work) (England & Folbre, 1999; McKie, Bowlby, & Gregory, 2001). England and Folbre (1999) have also suggested that people who do caring work have an emotional connection with those for whom they care. Dockery and Barnes (2005) in a qualitative study of nurses linked people undertaking what are traditionally “women’s occupations” (e.g., nursing) with caring. In the context of commitment, Singh and Vinnicombe (2000a) argued that in the main women display commitment in a more caring and giving way .

Presenteeism as an Indicator of Commitment

At university, commitment through the culture of presenteeism, as seen through the eyes of academic staff, was constructed in different ways. Some staff members felt that being present in the workplace was clear evidence of commitment, mainly to the university but also to career. Others felt that presenteeism had no bearing on commitment.

In an early interview Pam, discussing two senior male colleagues, spoke of them as "...working ridiculously long hours" and of them having "...an unhealthy level of commitment." Interestingly Pam used the term "commitment" to describe what she perceived to be undesirable work practices, however, this was not surprising as Pam herself claimed to work ten or twelve hours a day.

Another staff member also interpreted presence at work as an expression of commitment, making a link between presenteeism and eligibility for promotion. For Peter, commitment was an essential criterion in determining academic advancement, with commitment displayed by presence at work. Indeed it was not just promotion it was *ease* of promotion along with lack of presence in the workplace that concerned Peter, whose critical comments were "...I am aware of people who get readily promoted but don't necessarily have to be on campus." James commented that he could understand how there could be a perception that if a person attended the workplace infrequently this indicated a lack of commitment. However, he argued that "...just visibility to me isn't really an accurate measure" citing an example of another staff member who "...closes the door and she gets with it." Interestingly, the example that James cited was a female staff member.

Yet another staff member, Michael, had a different perspective on the importance of being present at work, a physical presence being a demonstration of commitment to the organisation. For Michael, just walking along the corridor was sufficient for him to see who was present on a regular basis. Michael went on to say that other staff members were present to deal with students, but then undertook research at home or somewhere else. Conducting research outside the university environment was viewed by Michael as a sign of low organisational commitment, with regular attendance at university being the criterion for commitment.

Another interviewee spoke of time commitment and effort as the main determinants of commitment. In explaining how she recognised commitment in her colleagues, Sue said, “The amount of time, but it’s not just the time, it’s the *amount* of time and effort that they put into their work, both in terms of teaching, their research productivity, the service that they do to the university.” Taken at face value Sue’s account appeared to be a clear account of presence in the workplace being associated with commitment, however, she continued, saying:

Well yes and no [pause] I don’t know if this happens elsewhere but, we have had colleagues who work here but you would be lucky to see them one day a week kind of thing. In that kind of situation I perceive that perhaps they’re not as committed to the organisation, to the school, as some of the other people, so I have no doubt they’re probably working very productively at home, but more on their own research, on their career path, and because they’re not around they don’t get asked to do the extra jobs like go to this meeting, do this kind of thing.

What Sue was identifying was not a matter of staff needing to be present in the workplace for long hours, and possibly at weekends as a sign of commitment, but one of staff not being available for everyday duties because they were working from home. In Sue’s story there was tension between career commitment and organisational commitment. Sue’s main issue with “selfish” colleagues was that

while they were investing in career building activities, other staff member were left to fill the void caused by their absence. The additional work undertaken by staff who attended work regularly was seen as a barrier to building their own careers. Sue went on to say that “in the past we’ve had like a number of staff members who like you rarely see and consequently other people are ending up doing more than their fair share of these other activities and other people get away with it.” Sue’s comments reinforced that for her the issue was one of availability as an indication of commitment to both organisation and colleagues. As a consequence of non-availability the individual did not contribute to school or organisational activities and was not able to communicate collegially with fellow staff members. Sue continued:

The way I would perceive it anyway, those people who for whatever reasons rarely come into work, who then don’t play as part of the team, so they don’t attend the seminars, they don’t attend the school meetings, they don’t get asked to do these extra kind of jobs because they’re not around and I think they almost do like the bare minimum in terms of come in, do their teaching, go off.

Sue again elaborated on the issue of non-availability of some staff, her persistence with the issue indicating to the researcher that this was important to her. In terms of the “three elements” of academic work the suggestion was that some staff members in Sue’s school did the bare minimum in relation to teaching, and in the main were not available for service tasks, in order to devote maximum time and effort to their research at the expense of work colleagues. By not being available at university, other than to meet the bare requirements of teaching, “phantom” staff imposed on colleagues who did attend regularly, and consequently were forced to bear a disproportionate service workload. This disproportionate workload was borne by a minority of men who were not particularly focussed on career building, and women.

Men who were “phantoms” also avoided service work they regarded as mundane, while selectively undertaking work regarded as more prestigious.

Women in this study demonstrated work commitment by excessive teaching, thus confusing performance with commitment. A huge divide exists in what counts as commitment, with multiple applications of what is regarded as commitment. What does seem clear from the service roles discussed by academic staff is that the organisation does not reward commitment to itself.

In an attempt to gain insight into whether the non-participating staff members had any common characteristics, Sue was asked to elaborate on this. After a long pause she replied:

Um... I get again this kind of thing about the commitment, the effort for other kind of activities, you know. For whatever reason a male can get away with this more than a female and I do know that things that some of the male academics seem to be less organised than the female academics, and if you ever had to co-teach on a course with them, the female one's there trying to sort of to get up and organise it kind of thing. When I think, like within our school, the ones that are fairly frequent attendees, the majority tend to be females. That makes a lot of sense.

For this staff member, commitment to the university was clearly a gendered construct, with men absenting themselves from the workplace in order to engage in research as a career building activity. Tension between commitment to career or organisation was reinforced by the expectation that men could “get away” with low organisational commitment while investing in career building activities. Juxtaposed is the notion that women can “get away” with low commitment to neither organisation nor career. Kathryn made a similar observation about the expectations of women academics disclosing that the commitment of so called junior staff was shown by the high workload of “junior female colleagues” who bear the brunt of committee work,

extra curricular work with students, and other activities like coaching teams for competitions, saying:

...certainly amongst female colleagues of mine we would probably consider that we would get more of the, how can I...I...ah...not trying to make this sound negative but, sort of the hand holding, the advisory sort of bodies, the um, the ah...looking after the first years, the um motherly sorts of roles, perhaps a little bit more and perhaps we're a little more reluctant to say no, when perhaps we should be saying no.

She also described attendance at school teaching meetings as "...a very balanced group", then reflecting on what she had said, added "...although probably, in some senses there is probably a little bit of a feeling that women are more intrinsically concerned with their teaching, men are more intrinsically concerned with their research..." The issue that Sue had raised was about women being judged more harshly in relation to their teaching, so the concern was evident.

Commitment to both university and teaching, as displayed by absent staff members, was perceived by other staff members as being low. Feelings about the gendered nature of presence at work were expressed by Martha, who believed that there were "phantom" staff members who were rarely seen at university. Again, when questioned further, she indicated that in her academic unit it was men who tended to be regularly absent from the workplace, leaving women to fill the void. Martha expressed herself forcefully saying:

...there are some bloody people that often go virtually the whole 12 months and you never see them. And I know they turn up to give their classes, because you have to do that, and they might periodically turn up to a really important school meeting. Not just one week or one month, I went a whole semester without seeing a couple of people. If you're not here enough it's not just about whether your doing your job well or not because some people do sit at home and they do still do their research but that sense of working together with one another, of really being here and available for...

Like Sue, Martha was particularly critical of some of her male colleagues whom she perceived as having low commitment to the university, school and colleagues. Again there was a feeling that work perceived as being “less valuable”, such as service to the university and teaching, tended to be considered the domain of women, while men were engaged in more important work, a similar view of the value of university work expressed by Baxter and Hughes (2004). Shaun also raised the issue of the lack of commitment of some male colleagues to work that they perceived to be less valuable. He believed that some male colleagues had a lack of commitment to students and teaching, and therefore a lack of professional commitment, due to a perception that research was of higher value to their careers, saying, “... definitely there are people who are not committed to doing the right thing by students because they have a strong research interest, and the research interest is rewarded and the teaching is not.” Elaborating on the issue of rewards Richard also had concerns for the ways in which people were rewarded at university, citing inconsistencies in relation to research output as a major issue, and saying:

I have seen instances where people with a high level of commitment to their jobs are treated badly because they've, you know not dotted the “ts”... It's madness, these people obviously are highly committed individuals and I think that's a very sad state of affairs.

Martha also had concerns about the absence of male staff, predicting a future situation where major decisions at school level would be made without appropriate input from staff due to a lack of engagement in the process, referring to it as a “big divide.” In her view the same low levels of engagement and commitment of absent staff members also extended to their dealings with students and the university. Non-engagement and lack of commitment in relation to students was typified by low

levels of care and service to students, which Martha described as a “minimalist approach.”

Other members of academic staff expressed a range of views about the need to be present in the workplace, both in terms of spending long hours and also about contributing more than just the bare minimum to service and teaching roles. It was interesting to note that male members of staff mainly believed that commitment to academic work was not expressed by time spent at university, a contrasting view to that expressed by male workers trade unions in Franzway’s (2000) research, which equated long hours of work with commitment. For example, John commented that “...you can’t take office hours as an expression of commitment”, while Zane, a Professor, said “...you don’t necessarily have to be in your office” in the context of doing more productive work at home when interruptions to research from telephone calls and people “popping in”, presumably including students, were less frequent. Probert (2005) has argued that managing absence from the home is a key factor in the frequency and type of work that women undertake. Flexibility in academic work, which as Zane has stated can sometimes be conducted more effectively from the home, may be a reason for pursuing an academic career (Probert, 2005). However, because much academic work may be undertaken from the home this impacts adversely on women by making it more difficult for them to exercise “power of absence” (Probert, 2005, p. 70).

Presenteeism is the notion that being present at work, often for long hours or on weekends, is an indication of organisational commitment (Baxter & Hughes, 2004). As an extension of the greedy organisation, presenteeism is manifest through workers perceiving that commitment is engendered by spending excessive time in the

workplace. Presenteeism has clearly gendered dimensions, being premised on the notion that individuals have the capacity to spend excessive time in the workplace, which clearly is not the case. While many men, able to pursue a career as their main focus, have the capacity to devote long hours and weekends to work activities, women, and arguably some men, tend to have competing agendas such as family or carer responsibilities.

Balancing Work and Family Life

Striking a balance between work and family commitments was an important issue for academic staff. Obtaining a healthy balance was seen by staff as an essential element in engendering work commitment.

Some members of academic staff spoke of the difficulties of competing commitments emanating from work and family. Lucy spoke of the “challenges” of night-time lectures as a single mother with young children. A contrasting viewpoint was advanced by Jo, who told of not having a husband or family to go home to at night, speaking of these as “distractions” that interfered with work. Richard told a story about how he had decided, when faced with such a dilemma, that he would give up work and become the main child carer in order to enable his wife to return to work. He stated that he preferred to become the main carer rather than have his child brought up by child care workers. However, many people do not have either the opportunity or the desire to remain at home. Academic staff, with the competing demands of work and home, face having to make sacrifices at the hands of two greedy institutions that readily compete for their attention and commitment.

Continuing with the theme of competing demands, Shaun expressed the belief that the university was not particularly interested in what sacrifices its employees

made, with wholeness of life being a low priority for the organisation. He elaborated further, saying that not only did the university encourage academic staff to make work the focus of their whole life, but for those who didn't, such as staff with family or carer responsibilities; life was "made difficult" through perceptions of low commitment. Speaking of successful academic staff as compliant, he used the term "expediency", Shaun painted a picture of co-workers who pursued their careers remorselessly, with little regard for colleagues and students alike, terming such colleagues as "psychotic".

Shaun stated (off tape) that he had experienced what happened to staff whose focus was on their family at the "expense" of the organisation. He indicated that he had been rejected for promotion based on his decision to prioritise the needs of his family over those of the organisation, citing his perceived lack of commitment by decision makers as the reason. Shaun also said that he had moved from another university in the belief that his children would be better served living in the new location, "That was one of the reasons that I came to [his current work location] to give them opportunities. I saw those as more important than my career, and I don't have a problem with saying that." To the researcher, Shaun was presenting a side to his nature that was different to other men interviewed, one that did not portray him as a true "academic" man. Shaun added, talking about people who are perceived as being committed to teaching and research, "You see that in the fact that a lot of the people who are good at both, interestingly don't have children ." He continued "...so if you have the desire to bring your children up well, I would say the university career is a very difficult one, very difficult."

Managing work, family and other interests was also problematic for another staff member who told of how pressures “weigh down heavily on academic staff.” Elaborating on the pressures of academic life, Shirley spoke of the difficulties of managing a full teaching load, coordinating a residential program for overseas students that she had initiated some years ago, undertaking research, conducting volunteer work as a counsellor which included student counselling, performing duties as a Justice of the Peace, and caring for an elderly parent. Shirley said “I’m a good time manager, but at university the expectation is that to get anywhere you’ve got to work 24 hours a day.” She went on to talk about how she was unable to publish as many research papers as she would like due to time constraints resulting from the many activities competing for her time. She also said she had “... too many balls floating in the air and at times I get so tired, and I think what am I doing all this for?”

Other staff spoke of the need to strike a balance between work and family. Fleur told of how she had not had a balance between work and family during the past year having worked seven days a week during that period. As a consequence “...a lot of personal relationships got sacrificed, which wasn’t good.” Jane, speaking of a time debt accruing from working long hours, seven days a week, said “...it’s hectic times here and you never recover it. In theory we can recover it, yes, but in practice we never do.” Jane was making an important point that time expended in the course of academic life was effectively a sunk cost or overinvestment in a potential career that could never be recovered even if academic career advancement occurred.

Kathryn, a fractional-time academic, also held strong views on the difficulties in balancing an academic career and a family life. Kathryn said:

I think that in many senses that is particular for women like myself who are working part time, who have family commitments and things, that’s the

hardest part to work on because your teaching you have to do, so you can't evade doing your preparation, it's your research which suffers when you've got work balance tension. It's that which you're always chasing your tail on.

The concern expressed by Kathryn was that there are many women at university who are forced to make decisions between commitment to work and commitment to family. Continuing, she said "Even if...you know, you could be committed to that [research] and not participate in going to the students functions, you know, not be doing good teaching, but the university will say, you know well, the person most committed is, it's the research performer." When women reduce university workload it is usually research output that suffers. Most appraisals, those involving promotions in particular, are judged predominantly on the research component of academic work. This has an adverse effect on female academic staff members, particularly those employed on a fractional basis. In Kathryn's view being a successful and high profile researcher "...is the measure of your ultimate commitment."

Kathryn's account of the barriers to commitment faced by part-time workers continued, moving on to talk about how initial criteria set for a proposed Research Quality Framework (RQF) had failed to recognise the efforts, and therefore the commitment, of part-time workers, saying, "...and we've got quite a lot of women with families, and we've also got some men here on fractional appointments, they're doing the childcare and um it's not just female gendered, you know, how are you planning to get those people into the process?" Kathryn's concern was that the parameters set for identifying research "stars" did not accommodate staff with less than full-time workloads. Her account also identified that the gendered nature of commitment in the academic workplace was not restricted to women alone; some men were also affected.

Zane, who was a staff member in a managerial administrative position, provided an interesting perspective on the gendered aspects of commitment and the need for a balance between work and home. His view of female academic colleagues was that they tended to "...perhaps work too hard" and that they needed to balance work and outside life more effectively. He continued, talking about the commitment of female staff, saying "...but I certainly know in my department a number of females that are very committed and perhaps, you know, I think they might want to scale back on their commitment a little bit."

The difficulty of achieving a satisfactory balance between work and home was highlighted by the stories told by academic staff. Maintaining a balance between work and home was an issue faced mainly by women. The academic workplace was portrayed as gendered due to the additional difficulties faced by women, which men mainly did not have to deal with.

Female Stereotypes

The notion of women doing "less valuable" work, such as teaching and service roles, while men concentrate on higher value work like research, suggested the development of a female academic stereotype. Reinforcing the stereotype, with a counterexample of a male colleague, Sue said "... things that I'd like to develop is that they are very good at allocating time to their research, to get publications, to improve that kind of aspect of their career." In the context of Sue's interview, her views on the career management of male colleagues were interesting. Earlier in her interview she had made critical comments about some male colleagues in the context of absence from the workplace, for example saying, "...a number of staff members who like you rarely see and consequently other people are ending up doing more than

their fair share of these other activities and other people get away with it”, yet now she was aspiring to adopt similar characteristics.

Another aspect of the female academic stereotype was evident in accounts of interactions with students. Several staff members spoke of the ways in which students expected female staff members to be more lenient, caring and understanding than their male counterparts. Fleur commented:

I’ve actually been having this discussion with some other people about what students expect and um, students expect from female teachers, far more than they expect from males. They expect to be able to literally come and cry on your shoulder, they expect the empathy, they expect the sympathy, they expect that you’re going to be easier on them, and we’ve had this discussion about male roles versus female roles.

The female stereotype mentioned by Fleur, although different from that raised by Sue, was a stereotype no less. From Fleur’s account, some students had the expectation that female academic staff would be more lenient, possibly more compliant, than male staff members. Other staff members had similar stories to tell.

Kathryn also believed that female staff were perceived differently to male staff by students, adding:

... there are certain ways in which we come across [pause] that send students a message that they can come, or that we’re more likely to be sympathetic or more likely that we’re more likely to be taken for a ride. Whether male colleagues set their boundaries a little bit better, or more strategically, you know, certainly there are female colleagues of mine who I know, students will just turn up to and talk through all their problems...

Kathryn continued with a story about female staff commitment to students, based on caring. She confirmed the roles that female staff adopted, highlighting the commitment of a colleague who voluntarily provided care to students as a first-year advisor.

I mean that probably is a really good thing, that relationship forming is going on, but on the other hand if you get drawn into that too much, then your

research suffers or your [pause] you know, you end up [pause] there's a price you pay. I mean you know, for example one of my colleagues is a first year advisor, because she cares, and so she's always sort of taken on that role anyway, and she kind of de facto becomes a role that probably other people wouldn't want to do.

What Kathryn's story also highlighted was the cost to women resulting from the student commitment stereotype, as measured in reduced research output. Showing commitment in ways other than the recognised, male-centred manner was another issue that alienated women from the male-oriented commitment model. Louise also spoke of instances, both within her own experience and from the experiences of colleagues, saying that "...students think that they can complain about female staff members or, [pause] harassing is going a bit far but it's almost bordering on that, the female staff members." She continued:

And even in terms of like, complaining emails, they're never quite as aggressive towards male members of staff as they are towards female, not all females, but I guess the ah, younger female staff members so that's the only sort of differences I've sort of observed in terms of the way students treat staff members.

Stories told by women reinforced the gender stereotype that women are expected to be warm and friendly (Simpson & Stroh, 2004). Also, Simpson and Stroh (2004) have argued that the possibility exists that student evaluations are biased, with women having to be better teachers than men to achieve "equal" rating. Being warm and friendly involves a time commitment from women, often accompanied by emotion work (Brown, 2002), which detract from other aspects of academic work, such as research.

Commitment Through Exceeding Requirements

Much has already been said by respondents about the perceived role of women in the less valued areas of teaching, along with availability for service to the

university. Doing women's work continued as a theme by highlighting further instances where women "go the extra mile" for the organisation, often in areas that, although essential for core business, are not as highly regarded in terms of career advancement. Louise identified this saying "...they seem to do a lot more service um, and teaching than male members of staff, so their commitment to those two areas seems to be much higher." Kathryn also recalled similar experiences, saying "And if you look across the teaching award winners there's a lot of women who win teaching awards..." qualifying this by commenting that of course men also won awards, but there was an over representation of women recipients. Louise suggested that some male colleagues adopted an avoidance strategy where teaching was concerned, commenting that "...men tend to be able to manage the teaching responsibilities, I'm not going to say *better* but they tend to be able to manage it in terms of it taking up less of their time, than women. I don't think that's a time management thing [laughs]."

Lack of recognition for women who carry out the activities that are regarded as "less valuable" was also taken up by Martha, "... but women who sit there going the extra mile and all that, going the extra mile of doing what's about citizenship behaviour, where do you get to put that stuff?" She continued "...and strategic people obviously think that's not valuable, so I pick these activities and there are some who aren't as strategic."

Louise, who was unmarried at the time she was describing, spoke about attending departmental functions outside normal working hours. She said, "...we tended to find a lot of the times that the males wouldn't attend a lot of the after hours..." She told of colleagues, mostly male, who would expect her to attend

functions that they were unable, or unwilling, to attend "...due to family commitments." After a period of time Louise realised that family commitments were not a sufficient reason to avoid extra curricula activities, and that what she was forgoing was the time that she would normally spend with people of her choosing, time that once expended could not be recovered. Regarding male members of staff, Louise found the reasons for non-attendance given by male colleagues interesting, commenting that "... when you think about the commitment to family or children, it's usually the other way around." Paradoxically, male staff members were using to their own advantage the work/family bind that some of their female colleagues were experiencing. Louise continued:

... there are certain things where it is generally females that will do things for example if it's organising a morning tea, or if it's organising a dinner, or you know, it will always be a female that has to do that, some kind of celebration...but you know when it comes to I guess, event in the school, yeah...I kind of think it tends to be the females as well. I don't know whether it's the fact that...I mean the excuse they usually use is family commitments so yeah...I don't know.

Other female staff members also provided examples of the commitment of female academic staff. Examples included female staff being "... committed to doing the best job possible..." in the knowledge that it was "... the most effective for the students that they are working with or the role that they have to play, in fulfilling their role commitment to their best potential." Another female staff member gave the example of a "... willingness to sort of help out colleagues with extra like tasks, or additional marking or second markings of things, step in do guest lectures when somebody has to be away for a period of time..." and examples of how one reacted when asked to "go the extra mile" by taking on additional work "I'm empathetic, yes,

for the most part when I'm asked to do additional things, yes." Martha summed up succinctly what her female colleagues had been saying when she said:

But you can have a bunch of people who are just quietly, without drawing a lot of attention to themselves, concerned and doing a good job right across the board, they will do that bit of citizenship behaviour, go that extra mile *without fuss*. You know I really admire that person.

Martha emphasised that she was not just referring to extra role behaviour, it was also the *manner* in which the behaviour was delivered that was the differentiating factor. Continuing, Martha also provided a counterexample of male colleagues who "... did no service. You were lucky if they did the service related to course delivery. You know, there's just nothing there and they would certainly *never* go the extra mile for someone." Fleur also gave an example of putting extra effort into her teaching despite having a full teaching load, while another member of her academic unit had only two hours of teaching per week.

Male members of academic staff also spoke of exceeding requirements as a mark of commitment. John mentioned that "The indicators that should be used are probably more substantive, related to your job, to one's job description and readiness to put your hand up to do that little bit extra, to go the extra mile." Use of terms like "indicators", "substantive" and "formal documentation" had a prescriptive air about them. The prescriptive theme was continued by Peter who understood commitment as "... people who go beyond the norm..." elaborating further by saying "They're prepared to put in an extra effort, take a risk, express a view, undertake an extra activity. If someone is truly committed the success of the outcome is what is important, not the effort that you put in." Building on the prescriptive theme, Peter's view of commitment was consistent with that of John, but at odds with commitment as displayed by female staff members. Commitment for female staff members was

constructed as exceeding requirements by undertaking acts of care, concern and consideration for colleagues, students and organisation alike, even though they may not represent the best career investments. In contrast, commitment for John and Peter was constructed and expressed in normative terms, suggesting *a priori* standards and a strong focus on measurement.

Appraisal of Commitment

Asked to comment on how commitment was appraised, most staff members related the question to the university's formal performance appraisal system. Richard commented that it was a "bland system" that occasionally generated erroneous outcomes involving people who were "...obviously highly committed individuals." However, beyond a general feeling about the inadequacy of the process, Richard did not see any difference in the ways in which men and women were treated in terms of appraising their commitment.

John stated that in his view appraisal was a measuring exercise, albeit one that used weak indicators. What was needed were "...more substantive" indicators, ones that were ... "related to your job." Zane had a similar perspective, describing the current process as "outcome driven". He believed that appraisal should be more meaningful and deeper, but he based this on a general premise of inadequacy rather than one of non-recognition of particular gendered expressions of commitment. Both John and Zane failed to recognise the gendered nature of the appraisal process resulting from a focus on outcomes and measurement rather than on the different ways in which men and women construct commitment.

Measuring commitment was also emphasised in Shaun's account, citing "... grants and papers" as the main indicators. Elaborating on whether in his view

perceptions of commitment were gendered, he indicated that he believed it wasn't so much a male and female issue; rather it was based on the university's expectation of sacrifice and entire life devotion to work. Another male member of staff, Derek, also did not perceive any gendered issues in the appraisal of commitment. He believed that he was seen as a responsible and committed individual.

Most of the female staff members viewed the appraisal of commitment as a biased, gendered and onerous process. Sue believed that there was an informal process, however, the formal process with its "...external kind of mechanism..." was the main determinant of satisfactory work performance and commitment. Kathryn viewed the process as a system in need of refocussing, being unable in its current state to make any realistic assessment of people's commitment, and designed to "...pick up if you have passed a base-line standard." She also added that the way that the formal appraisal system operated was unfair to women "... because they're not being mentored, or because no one's giving them strategies, or their teaching load is out of this world." Martha also reinforced a bias towards male staff in terms of access to mentoring. Talking about opportunities for staff to gain experience in other roles she identified an imbalance "So even at that very basic level of mentorship, the mentoring was going on more, particularly in some areas of the university, more for men than for women."

Fleur suggested that the way that work commitment was appraised, both formally and informally, did not give work done by women the credence that it deserved. For her, appraisal was a process that took no account of attempts at self-improvement, with efforts made being largely overlooked. She also questioned a perceived imbalance in workload that in the main went unnoticed in appraisal, citing

her own full workload compared with several instances of males who "...get two hours of classes" and "I've seen people not get service roles while I've had service roles, the allocation of work is not equitable. By the way it's another thing that really pisses me off, very inequitable I can't understand why I've got a full teaching load while I'm doing my PhD, getting full allocation and while others are getting none." Fleur regarded herself as having a high commitment to teaching and to the care and welfare of students, a common theme amongst female staff members. It seemed obvious to her that the commitment she was displaying and experiencing was either not recognised or not valued by the university's processes.

A similar story about the non-recognition of commitment was told by Zoe, a lecturer, who also identified the bias in evaluating work perceived by women to be male-oriented, saying:

In terms of promotion and recognition it seems to prove you're committed you need to research and publish, um and I think there's not enough emphasis placed upon commitment to teaching excellence. So I feel it's extremely problematic that our system is geared towards the rewards of research and not the rewards of teaching.

Lucy, also a lecturer, reinforced the gendered theme of men's focus on research, at the expense of women, resulting in greater success for them in terms of career advancement and perceptions of commitment towards them from the organisation. She also reinforced the notion that if the expectation was that the women would take care of teaching and the extra curricular duties then they would be disadvantaged.

Louise reinforced the imbalance in appraising work and commitment at university. She said, "I think research will always be valued much higher. And um, it

is always, service... you know, you might have someone who had done quite a lot of service but that very rarely ever gets mentioned in the staff committee meeting.”

Martha then spoke about the outcomes for women resulting from association with “less valuable” work activities and the perceived “lower” commitment of these staff, saying:

But then women can be their own worse enemies... we’re finding that women are much less likely to apply for promotion, like they wait until they’re absolutely sure that they’re well over the bar and then apply, whereas a lot of men would just make an ambit claim and have a go for promotion.

Jo, a Senior Lecturer, also told a story of female academics themselves exacerbating the disadvantaged position in which they found themselves, citing a refusal of some women to invest in their own futures. Using as an example a predominantly female professional group, she said, “...won’t pay professional fees to our professional association, they won’t pay union fees, they won’t pay for conferences, they won’t pay for continuing education, they won’t buy a book, they literally will not spend one cent on their career.” Jo clarified the point that she was making by continuing to talk about the reluctance of female staff to spend money on careers, as this was money that they believed should be spent on their children. However, while wives were making career sacrifices, they accepted an expectation that their husbands needed to make financial investments in their careers.

Louise continued with an assessment of the perceptions of decision makers towards women’s work. Speaking about how committees tended to view women in terms of their commitment to work, she confirmed that in her experience as a committee member, decisions on promotion and tenure were gendered and biased, often being based on perceptions of women’s commitment to “less valuable” work. She said:

I definitely agree with that. I mean I've sat on committees where you know determination of promotion or tenure are made and it's not only the differences between males and females, but it's the differences between cultural...[remainder left unsaid]

The failure of the university to recognise adequately staff commitment to teaching, its joint core business activity along with research, was marginalising those staff whose strength was in this area, mainly women. Another issue, discussed earlier in this chapter, was that female staff did not always *choose* the service and teaching roles. The downplaying of commitment relating to service and teaching was a double bind for female staff that often did not choose to concentrate their efforts in these areas, yet when they did their efforts to “fill the gap”, and their commitment to work, were not recognised. In the main women felt obliged to “fill the gap” otherwise the work would not get done.

Harassment of Female Staff

During the data collection stage of the research several female staff members suggested that they, or other female staff that they knew of, had been subjected to undue pressure from students. Female staff believed that student expectations were gendered, with requests for consideration and leniency being more frequent for female staff than for their male counterparts. Staff experiences ranged from feelings of annoyance due to unreasonable student expectations, through to conduct bordering on sexual harassment.

Fleur was the first female staff member to speak of unreasonable student expectations, based on her own experiences and those of other female colleagues. Discussing student expectations with several female colleagues confirmed for her that what students expected from female teachers was “... far more than they expect from males.” She continued, “They expect to be able to literally come and cry on your

shoulder, they expect the empathy, they expect the sympathy, they expect that you're going to be easier on them..." "...and we've had this discussion about male roles versus female roles and if you like have a male persona you know, non-empathetic, then you're going to get crap reviews from the students." Fleur was suggesting that students were gendering their experiences with academic staff.

Kathryn, when told that some staff members believed that female academic staff might be viewed by students as more sympathetic or more approachable than male counterparts, told a similar story, saying:

Aaahhhhh, I think that's certainly true, and I think that, now whether that happens because there are certain ways in which we come across...that sends students a message that they can come, or that we're more likely to be sympathetic or more likely that we're more likely to be taken for a ride.

She believed that male colleagues may be more effective at setting boundaries than female staff, or that males may do so "...more strategically". She continued:

Certainly there are female colleagues of mine who I know [pause] students will just turn up to and talk through all their problems [pause] I mean that probably is a really good thing, that relationship form is going on but on the other hand if you get drawn into that too much, then your research suffers or your [pause] you know, you end up [pause] there's a price you pay.

Kathryn reinforced the notion that female academic staff tended to be regarded by students as more willing to give consideration to student matters. Importantly, she also raised the issue of the costs, borne in the main by female academic staff, of high commitment to students. Being available to deal with student issues, beyond the workload requirements of learning and teaching, could have a deleterious effect on research. Being available for students, together with an over-emphasis on teaching and service roles undertaken by female staff, indicated the marginalisation of female staff in a gendered workplace. Implicit in Kathryn's story, and similar to the issues

previously raised by Jane and other staff, was the price in time that female academic staff expend, time that once spent cannot be recovered.

The theme of unreasonable expectations of female staff by students continued with Louise, who speaking from her own experience, and from discussions with other staff, suggested that, "...students think that they can complain about female staff members or [pause] harassing is going a bit far but, it's almost bordering on that, the female staff members." She continued:

And the reason I say that is myself and a couple of other female colleagues have had quite abusive emails from students um, I mean I had one that was bordering on sexual harassment, um, it wasn't within the content of the email, but in the email address that it had been sent from in their pseudonym. And another colleague of mine she's had comments like that on teaching evaluations whereas you never find that with male members of staff.

Kathryn also made the point that students were less aggressive in their dealings with male staff members than with some female staff, particular younger female staff members.

Again, the university had failed to recognise adequately staff commitment to teaching, its joint core business activity along with research. As noted in the discussion about the appraisal of commitment above, women have strengths in teaching and as a consequence are marginalised . As discussed above, women may fill teaching and service roles, but they may not always *choose* to do so.

Perceptions of Self and Commitment to Work

Most respondents expressed a clear understanding of how they perceived themselves as individuals, in conjunction with the ways in which they carried out their jobs. Interpreting interview data and observations of interviewees showed a clear distinction between the perceptions of commitment of male and female staff members. Thematically, men expressed a commitment to self-interest with a focus on

research. Alternatively, for women, expressions of commitment were built around the themes of interaction with people and students.

Male perceptions of self and work

A focus on the self in relation to work was evident in the first interview with a male staff member, when John disclosed that he liked to work alone, saying “not that I have much to do with most of my colleagues.” He continued, saying that his commitment in academic life was to research as it allowed him to “explore areas that are of interest to you.” John was unequivocal in his desire to work alone, indicating that working with others, or in a team, did not interest him.

Shaun confirmed the thread of male self-interest, based on the desire to advance one’s career, through his observations about male commitment towards academic work. Talking about other male academic colleagues, he said, “I’ve also seen people who I would describe as psychotics do very well here, people who lack any compassion, who are unable to relate to others apart from their self-advancement.” Continuing, he described some colleagues as “deceitful and egotistical” in their pursuit of research. The theme of self-interest was continued by Michael, who reflecting on stepping down from a long period as Head of School, expressed a desire to increase his research output, describing his commitment to this as being able to “...focus on some of the things that you are interested in.”

Female perceptions of self and work

The theme of personal growth and self-actualisation was evident in the interpretation of female staff interviews and observations. In the first interview undertaken, Pam expressed the need to challenge herself by setting and achieving high standards. She expressed her commitment through a sense of achievement,

saying “If you feel that you’re not self-actualised, then you’re not very good at your job, or that that would deplete your commitment.” Pam also disclosed that she was not comfortable teaching subjects of which she had no practical experience, describing herself as feeling like “a fraud”, an experience which undermined her confidence and diminished her commitment to work. As a consequence her research output also decreased.

Mary, a sessional staff member, also expressed her need, as a person, for challenging work, stating that she was “...aware of my own understanding shifting and being challenged.” She continued, saying that “The whole thing about self-awareness and my own growth I’m really enjoying.” Mary also showed that teaching was the main focus of her academic life, having “...a great passion for learning and for helping others to learn.” The use of words like “enjoying” and “passion” showed the depth of feeling that Mary had for her work, a perspective that was missing from the accounts of self and work advanced by male respondents.

Helping others to learn, expressed by most respondents as “teaching”, constituted the strongest theme amongst female academic staff. Student focussed outcomes ranked high in the commitment expressed by Shirley, and had a therapeutic benefit for her during a time when she suffered harassment by a male colleague. She told of the satisfaction and comfort gained from being able to focus on students, “...teaching the students, marking, making sure my door was always open to the students and I actually feel that helped me get on top of the situation because the students were the ones that really made my day.” She also expressed a claim that she was doggedly determined.

Commitment to student learning, through a focus on the classroom, was also how Zoe interpreted the relationship between self and work, describing herself as, “...very much a coal face, chalk face kind of person.” Speaking of a colleague on whom she had modelled her career, Zoe said, “In terms of commitment she’s following the same sort of line of making a difference, of having a transformative view of what she’s doing, what she’s trying to achieve.” Zoe explained that, like her role model, her commitment was to advance pedagogy through research, and to apply the outcomes of research in the classroom.

Fleur continued with the theme of commitment through involvement with student learning. She had just told a story about how her commitment was alienated by being allocated teaching in areas in which she had no expertise. Fleur referred to what she had experienced as a lack of planning and poor management skills on the part of her manager who allocated the work. Spurious work allocations appeared to be a feature of the academic unit in which she worked, a practice that had recently caused her to “...work on an exit strategy.” Speaking of the relationship between herself and work, in relation to teaching, she said:

When I’m teaching [in her area of expertise], or other subjects that I really enjoy, I get excited, the students get excited, and we all have a good time. And to see students actually go ‘wow’, hey this is really interesting, and you know...they’re sort of learning and they’re interested and we’re all having fun. I mean...to me, that’s what makes...

Constructing her world in terms of excitement, interest and having fun, presented Fleur as a warm and caring person who achieved self actualisation and commitment through the positive nature of her interaction with students.

Other female staff members told of commitment through a sense of belonging, working with others, and being well organised. Sue spoke of her commitment as

being built on "...a sense of belonging, being part of the school as a whole." She continued "...there's also what I would call a sub-section of individuals who work in similar kind of areas that I do, we work on a number of joint projects, so there's another element of commitment, motivation, working ahead with those." Martha continued with the theme of team work, expressing an interest in people along with a commitment to "...connect with others." She also spoke of a commitment to decency and human values which she attempted to incorporate into her work life. Important to Jane was the notion of herself as being well organised.

Compliance

Commitment through compliance was an issue for some participants in the study, albeit for different reasons. Lucy spoke of commitment through compliance as "...an expectation that women will be more compliant with the expectations of those extra-curricula roles..." with men avoiding extra-curricula responsibilities where possible, which she perceived as career investments. In Mary's view, people could be committed to their organisation in ways that did not enhance their own sense of self-actualisation or self-development. She spoke of academic staff members who were obviously committed to their organisation, as expressed through words and actions, yet they pursued that commitment unrelentingly and uncritically, almost as though it was a duty. Mary expressed her concerns as "Sometimes I'm concerned about the way in which they express that, in that they go with things without really thinking about, beyond other than 'this is what the organisation demands' so they are really what we would call a 'yes' person." Commitment as reported by Mary would appear to be prescriptive in nature, similar to Allen and Meyer's (1990) notion of normative commitment, a form of commitment based on a duty or obligation.

Fleur also discussed how commitment may be incorrectly interpreted at the organisational level, due to compliant staff deliberately not expressing their true feelings, in this instance about student learning. Speaking about staff commitment to the organisation she said, “That’s right you keep your mouth shut, don’t make waves, but I wish we had some sort of feedback system going because...um at the moment...naturally they’re all going to hear that they’re all doing great...” Fleur also believed that staff that were not compliant would be disadvantaged in terms of non-promotion and unsuccessful tenure review. Also, in terms of teaching, her perception was that although student expectations of consideration from female staff were unreasonable, staff who did not comply received poor student evaluations. In turn, poor evaluations lead to poor staff reviews. Compliance was a gender issue in this study, as female staff, given their additional focus on teaching, experienced greater exposure to unreasonable expectations and therefore felt they were disadvantaged to a greater degree than their male counterparts.

Exploitive Role Model

Commitment to work and students to the point of exploitation was also highlighted in conversation with Pam. She spoke of a female colleague, one who she regarded as a role model, whose commitment to students bordered on dedication. Pam gave examples of her colleague working late into the evenings in order to meet student expectations. Working to meet expectations meant that Pam’s colleague was effectively being exploited by the organisation, with the expectation that Pam would continue to work extended hours as a matter of course. Pam described her colleague as being “very flexible” insisting that if work had to be completed the colleague would “...never just go home and leave it unfinished. She’ll be there till seven or

eight o'clock at night if something has to be done that day." Pam's story told of a colleague who typified people who mirror expectations of a greedy organisation and consequently cause stress for others.

In addition to commitment to work itself, Pam's colleague also had high levels of commitment to the people she served. Pam spoke in terms of her colleague having "...an obligation to them and that's why she just wouldn't just leave something undone."

Differing Standards

Different standards encountered by staff in academic life were discussed by both male and female staff members. John identified one issue in this domain when he spoke about the espoused values placed on teaching, service to the university and research, and compared them with the values that actually pertained. What John was articulating would not be a surprise in most academic institutions, where the primacy of research reigns. He spoke of "...a bit of tension in the way they want you to address all these things but are only going to promote you on that." Kathryn also recognised the gendered nature of the workplace by recasting the story through the eyes of male colleagues, saying about research, "...you could be committed to that and not participate in going to the students functions, you know, not be doing good teaching, but the university will say, you know, well the person most committed is, it's the research performer." She added:

...there's still a very strong ethos in the university that those who are most committed, those who are the ultra stars in the university are showing their commitment, you show your commitment by getting research grants, and being a high profile researcher etc. I mean, that is the measure of your ultimate commitment.

The issue that Kathryn had identified was important as it showed that the gendered university workplace was constructed not only by male peers not pulling their weight, but also tacitly by gendered organisational policies.

Derek had another perspective on the issue of a positive bias towards research, suggesting that the university was not really interested in research quality despite espousing that quality was a primary measure of research output. He believed that the length of a person's curriculum vitae, that is the *number* of publications, was the real measure.

Reinforcing the reality of a gendered workplace constructed by male academic colleagues, Sue confirmed her perceptions of the imbalance and inequity that existed as a result of a male focus on research as a value adding activity, undertaken at the expense of female academic colleagues. She related the difference in the ways that some male academics were treated compared with some female staff, saying:

...what some of the male members of staff could, for example do or not do, was different to like, you know. If some of the female members of staff had tried to do this or whatever they would probably get pulled up, you're not pulling your weight kind of thing.

She concluded saying, "I get again this kind of thing about the commitment, the effort for other kind of activities, you know. For whatever reason a male can get away with this more than a female..."

In John's account he was purporting to highlight the differences between espoused values and values in practice, a characteristic prevalent in organisations as originally proposed by Argyris (1976). In doing this, John did not seem to realise that what he was actually highlighting was a gendered practice. Espousing equal value for teaching and for research, then regarding research more highly, disadvantages many

women whose interests are biased towards teaching, or those who apply equal weight to each activity and are then obliged to undertake additional extra curricula activities, such as attending seminars and meetings, when many men are busy working on research.

Conclusion

This chapter has reported the gendered aspects of work commitment contained in the sub-core category entitled “Gendering Work Commitment”. The ways in which participants in the research interpreted their commitment to work as gendered was presented and discussed. The accounts of organisational members reported in this chapter have assisted in addressing the purpose of the research, expressed in the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* and the aim to re-conceptualise work commitment in the form of a theory of work commitment, particularly in respect of commitment’s gendered nature. Gendered aspects of work commitment fell into three main areas: coping with the demands of a greedy organisation; competing commitments to work and family; and women’s focus on teaching, often at the expense of their careers.

Many women academics constructed their organisational life as never ending work, which in turn impacted on their commitment to work. Stories of women having to work long hours, of “always chasing your tail”, to meet the insatiable needs of the organisation were frequent. Commitment to oneself in the organisational context was difficult, due to high workloads. In some instances, the demands of teaching resulted in students gendering experiences with staff. While most women had high levels of commitment to teaching and service to the university, this commitment was neither recognised nor valued by the organisation.

Competing commitment to work and family meant that women were never able to meet the archetypal male construct of the “ideal worker”; one who was always ready and available for work, if not already present in the workplace. Women also tended to fall short of the notional “ideal mother” as they attempted to balance work and family, as Raddon (2001) has argued. A male staff member expressed concern for family over career, highlighting the tensions that women, and some men, face in balancing commitment to work and family. Placing family ahead of career reinforced the notion that this staff member, in displaying attitudes usually associated with women, was not a “true academic”. Tensions between commitment to work and family were also identified, suggesting that women were loathe to invest financially in their careers as they saw this as money that should be spent on family and children. In another instance, a woman academic spoke of working on her “exit strategy” as a result of her lack of commitment which she attributed to excessive work hours and forgone relationships. This is a finding that is gendered, as men, even when experiencing alienation, did not express these views.

Tension between commitment to career, profession and organisation were evident in the interpretations of many staff members. The expectation was that men could get away with low organisational commitment while concentrating on building their careers. Women could get away with neither. Women were also judged more harshly on their professional commitment (i.e., teaching) as expectations of sound performance were higher. It was the view of most women that men appeared to pay scant attention to what they regarded as mundane service work and teaching, areas in which they mainly appeared to be phantom workers. Men tended to “cherry pick” the most desirable service roles. Lack of engagement by men who adopted a minimalist

approach to work was regarded as a big divide. Finally, a male academic who presented a feminised account of commitment, spoke of psychotic male colleagues who pursued an academic career remorselessly.

The next chapter discusses the second of the three sub-core categories that constitute the grounded theory of academic work commitment. Chapter Six is entitled “Emotionalising Work Commitment”, reflecting the emotional aspects of commitment at the university in question.

Chapter 6

Emotionalising Work Commitment

Introduction

The sub-core category “Gendering Work Commitment” has considered the gendered aspects of the work commitment of academic staff. Links between gender and emotion are evident in the previous chapter. Such links have been inadequately addressed within previous work commitment research (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990; Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974) which has tended to regard gender as a non-issue and emotions as a discrete part of attitudes. The composition of the sub-core category is shown in Table 4 below. This Table lists the categories that together make-up the sub-core category entitled “Emotionalising Work Commitment”. Categories are discussed in detail below.

Table 4. The Core Sub-Category of “Emotionalising Work Commitment”

Sub-core category	Categories
Emotionalising academic work commitment	Fear of work through skill deficits and diminished organisational support Anger/annoyance with poor organisational work allocation Passion/enthusiasm for work Emotional attachment to work Emotional work and dissonance Excitement about teaching and research Obsession with work as manifest by presenteeism Concern for others/care for students and quality Obligation/duty of care to organisation

Conceptualising commitment in this way is ineffective as it doesn't consider the intertwining relationships between the cognitive, behavioural and affective components of attitudes. Although gender and emotions are dealt with in this research as separate entities for the purpose of identifying sub-core categories from which a grounded theory will be constructed, the researcher acknowledges that in reality gender and emotions are inextricably linked. The sub-core category of "Emotionalising Work Commitment" assists in meeting the purpose of the research, as expressed in the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* by addressing the emotional aspects of commitment.

The chapter begins with an overview of emotions and the links with gender and commitment. Analysis of the data collected from academic staff by means of interviews and observations is then conducted. Finally, the links between gender and emotions are considered. The composition of the sub-core category is shown in Table 4 above.

Fear of Work through Skill Deficits and Diminished Organisational Support

Although the core business of the university is a dual focus on student learning and research, the previous chapter has shown that for male and female respondents alike, greater emphasis is placed on research, particularly when appraising performance, assessing candidates for promotion and awarding tenure. While many academic staff members would argue that research has always held primacy over student learning, changes in government policy have forced universities to focus on research quality, and to a lesser extent quantity, as potential key performance indicators of research output. Changing the focus of academic work has

posed challenges for those staff who have been predominantly teachers, and who are now expected to meet higher levels of research output.

In an interview with Pam, herself an accomplished researcher, she spoke of the impact of a changed research focus on some of her colleagues, saying, “I feel like a lot of the people who perhaps are I would say, maybe unfairly, are lacking commitment in um my school, are a bit like that because they are intimidated by what’s expected of them.” Pam also disclosed that the majority of the colleagues to whom she was referring were women, but also some men; staff members who had focussed on teaching and who were highly committed to this aspect of university core business. In the past the staff members Pam referred to were highly committed, now they were “intimidated” by organisational expectations and as a consequence were experiencing low commitment or alienation to their work:

“...they’re not researchers um and they’re very, they’re scared of research and they feel that they’re never going to be able to be model employees because they can’t contribute on that front.”

What Pam was suggesting here was that colleagues were not just challenged by the notion of the need to embrace research, they were experiencing a much stronger emotion, one bordering on fear. She also linked alienation of the kind experienced by staff to a lack of self-actualisation, which she believed had a negative effect on commitment.

Pam also disclosed that she could relate to what her colleagues were feeling as she also found aspects of her work challenging. For Pam, the challenge was centred on teaching. Continuing to talk about work challenges and commitment she commented, “I can certainly relate to that, I don’t feel very comfortable teaching.” Elaborating on her feelings about teaching she said, “I really felt like a fraud

standing up in front of those kids um you know telling them things that I've never done in my whole life." She continued, "And it really undermined my confidence in my job and it then affected all aspects of my job, my research output decreased as well and I think that that really lowers your commitment..." "...and I'm not comfortable at work, I'm having bad days at work so my overall level of commitment declined while I was doing that."

Pam's story highlighted a lowering of commitment felt by herself and other staff, albeit stemming from different work related antecedents. In both cases, feelings of inadequacy, building to fear, led to apprehension towards some aspects of work. As a result staff experienced a lowering of commitment, not only to the activity causing the issue, but also to the organisation. In Pam's case there was a link between lower levels of commitment and reduced output in research, her preferred work activity.

Anger/Annoyance with Poor Organisational Work Allocation

It was evident during data collection and analysis that another powerful emotion, anger, was also a cause of negative feelings about commitment. Martha was forthright in her condemnation of male colleagues, referred to as "phantoms" in the previous chapter, who contributed minimally to teaching and the day-to-day school administrative duties, such as attending seminars, meetings and committee work. For phantom colleagues the best return on their "investment" in work was through research. Martha's anger was expressed in her comment that "...there are some bloody people that often go virtually the whole 12 months and you never see." Martha's commitment to teaching, and to the university, was diminished as a result of the anger caused by her colleagues' behaviours.

Anger was also shown by Fleur who had suffered reduced commitment to all aspects of her work life, due to a number of reasons. She firstly expressed anger and annoyance about the expectations of her academic unit while completing her PhD degree. She told of excessive workload, being scheduled a full teaching workload comprised mainly of subjects not previously taught by her, allocation of PhD supervisions in areas that did not align with either her interests or expertise, and an expectation that she would attend seminars and meetings. However, the main issue of concern for Fleur was the *ad hoc* allocation of teaching, seldom teaching the same subject from year to year. Fleur commented:

So...and it's a managerial thing, and you know...ahhh...I just don't get it. I just don't get it and it makes me so unhappy. The ahhh, the arbitrary allocation without consulting, the lack of consultation gets me really angry.

Fleur then linked her anger about arbitrary teaching allocations to reduced levels of commitment to the university, saying, "That's what gets me that's, yeah, that's what causes the lack of commitment to this organisation." She continued, relating her anger with teaching allocations to a lowering of commitment to students:

Yeah...but, um unfortunately I tend to get a lot of subjects that I have no knowledge of, and no interest in as well, and to me it's like pulling my teeth out. And I find I don't enjoy it, and the students don't enjoy it...

Fleur spoke about the service aspects of academic work, also an area which caused her angst, saying, "...I don't know. I've seen people not get service roles while I've had service roles, the allocation of work is not equitable, by the way it's another thing that really pisses me off, very inequitable." Fleur's story is one of diminished commitment, in fact reduced to the level of alienation, expressed in the form of anger. Fleur was also working on a solution to her anger, saying "I...was ready to quit last

week actually I was so furious,” and “...I’m going to um, you know, I’m basically um, looking at my exit strategies.”

Derek also told a story of anger towards what he perceived to be ineffective management and poor decision making, essentially the organisation. Although initially he described his feelings as “frustration”, this understated the issue for him, his demeanour clearly showing the anger that he felt. Derek had drawn a parallel between the outcomes for poor managers and decision makers at university and those in the business world, saying, “Um, yes, I do tend to get frustrated with the decision making...the poor decision making that I see within the [his academic unit]... you just think how could people be that poor at the job...” Continuing, he spoke of a recent organisational change program that he perceived as unsuccessful, saying, “...we had no choice in the matter, and yet those that forced it upon us are not going to pay any price whatsoever. Whereas in a private organisation there’d be a few people get the boot...” Derek then showed an unusual perspective concerning how frustration and anger affected work commitment. Whereas one might have expected Derek to show lower commitment to the organisation, possibly even alienation, the view that he expressed was that “...when things are going badly um, the frustration that people feel, they’re the ones that are actually more committed.” He elaborated further:

The ones that keep their heads down, never leave their room, are the ones who are just committed in their own career because they’re basically, they’re essentially just saying we’re here, we do research, we do teaching, but this is just a temporary home for us...we’ll be here for a couple of years but we will go onto a better place.

Derek was making an interesting observation here. People who just accepted alleged incompetence, and carried on with their normal day-to-day activities, were actually

less committed to the university by choosing to ignore sub-optimal work outcomes at the university level while they concentrated on career building. Commitment to career came at the expense of commitment to the university. James also expressed similar sentiments to Derek, describing commitment expressed through staff venting their feelings about the organisation, saying "...the fact they are whinging and moaning about it. If they weren't committed they wouldn't be voicing those concerns, they'd be too busy looking for another job."

James continued, expressing anger about what he perceived as poor management at university. He was particularly concerned about the apparent low regard for people evident in contemporary organisations, commenting "...what's totally demoralising in this place is the people that run the joint, that's what really pisses me off. Pretty bizarre that they think they've got to keep squashing people instead of building them up. Can't figure it out...we teach it all the time yet no one does it." Lucy also expressed anger at poor management, citing duplication of resources, excessive administrative staff and duplication as examples of deficiencies at university. She identified a lack of motivation and low commitment as areas which could be improved by more effective university management.

Another staff member expressed anger in describing the difficulties that she faced in her day-to-day work. Jo described her philosophy as "...and that is, never work with dickheads...I will not work with dickheads." Jo indicated that her current colleagues were "...lovely people..." but that her usual high levels of commitment to work could be seriously compromised by being forced to work with less competent colleagues.

Passion/Enthusiasm for Work

Several academic staff members gave accounts of having passion for aspects of their work life, actualised by strong feelings of enthusiasm. Pam told of two senior staff members who were so driven by their work that it became almost an obsession for them. She associated enthusiasm for work with commitment to research and to the organisation. Zoe also constructed her commitment to research through a focus on an agenda that was "...based around my own passions." The importance of passion to Zoe, and its link to commitment, was evident when she spoke of a changing research focus at university. Expressing a concern that she would be "forced" into research areas in which she was not personally interested, she believed that she would "...feel a lack of commitment if that happened." Indeed, Zoe embraced passion in all of her work activities, and made a link between her passion and work commitment. She spoke of commitment in terms of being linked to constant learning and re-thinking, and having a passion for doing this. She suggested that commitment without passion was a veneer, and colleagues who undertook research which they were not passionate about *may* be perceived as being committed but in reality were "...playing the system." Zoe was particularly critical of a system that rewarded outputs rather than the challenging methodology that she was using, stating that it encouraged people to behave "strategically" rather than following their passion.

Lucy also spoke of teaching and interaction with students as "passion". She also linked enthusiasm with passion, stating that "...if you have a passion then you will be enthusiastic about it." She continued, "But, yes I do think that enthusiasm is important, I think it is important for commitment," adding that commitment was based on feelings and displayed through passion to a large extent.

Several other staff members spoke of colleagues who displayed their commitment through passion. Ruth, speaking about colleagues who had trialled new techniques and approaches in their teaching practice, constructed the link between commitment to both research and teaching, and the processes they used as passion, saying:

I believe you can recognise commitment in people. You've only got to listen sometimes to their conversations, the degree of knowledge they've accumulated, commitment to their research, I guess their networking to establish a larger knowledge base, and I recognise passion with quite a few people, the areas they're working in.

Mary also told a similar story about her commitment to learning, linking it to "...a great passion for learning and for helping others to learn..." Continuing, she spoke about investments that female colleagues also made to their work, often expending high levels of emotional, physical and intellectual energy but sometimes not making any gains. Despite occasional failures she described their persistence in terms of "...you can tell they have a lot of passion, they have a lot of commitment in regard to their time and their energy and their thoughts."

Mary's story also contained elements of the satisfaction and feelings of self-actualisation that resulted from the challenges of doing a job well and extending her frame of knowledge. Speaking about how little pride some people had in their work, describing this as "...just a way to get money," Mary spoke of having a real passion for her work and how she now extended this passion to all of her work activities, including work relationships with other staff, saying:

I didn't realise that until a couple of years ago, I always thought I see people were passionate about this and that and wondered why and I've been looking and looking and so I want to do the best that I can with my own learning but with other people that I work with. Things that I'm assigned to I always try to do the best I can.

Mary then spoke about her sister, who she described as a high achiever, always wanting to improve her own understanding and to improve the people that she served. Mary concluded with a remark that “So, [laughs] maybe it’s just that I know a lot of really [pause] I know a lot of women that are very committed.”

Jane expressed strong views on the emotional nature of commitment at university, particularly the responses of men to passion shown by women, often seeing it as a sign of weakness. She suggested that men did not understand that women could be “emotional” yet still be thinking at the same time. Continuing, she believed that instead of regarding women as inferior, due to a tendency to show emotions openly, women should actually be regarded as “higher creatures”. Jane also linked passion with teaching as an organisational value-adding activity as opposed to “...not bringing in new people,” a reference to a university policy seen as “buying” new senior staff based on the perceived values of their *curricula vitae*.

Passion for work was clearly gendered. Only women spoke of commitment to aspects of work in these terms. While some men were perceived as regarding passion as signs of weakness, women tended to construct their commitment to various aspects of work through passion. Differences in the perceptions of men and women, about commitment expressed through emotions, augers badly for women when decisions regarding commitment are made mainly by men.

Emotional Attachment to Work

Academic staff interpreted commitment as an emotional attachment to the university in three contrasting ways. John also spoke of an emotional attachment to the university; however, the attachment that he experienced was based on an exchange process, where commitment from the university by employing John was

reciprocated by a feeling of attachment in return. John stated that "...they've demonstrated a commitment to me and I demonstrated a commitment to them," suggesting that commitment to the organisation was based on a duty rather than deeply felt emotions.

Another staff member who told a story about emotional attachment was Jane who presented a "bitter-sweet" account of her feelings towards commitment and the university. When the researcher arrived at Jane's office to conduct an interview with her she was berating three students about their attitudes towards what she described to them as a "feedback session" to discuss examination results. Starting the interview twenty minutes late, and amidst profuse apologies from her, Jane commenced the interview by saying how she suffered frustration from her dealings with students and university, going on to detail strongly held views about student expectations and university governance. However, beneath the veneer of a disgruntled member of staff lay a great affection and attachment to academic life. Jane said:

I adore my life as an academic. I cannot imagine myself, well I've done it, trying to go to industry and I was absolutely unhappy. I love doing research. I love constantly being on the front end of the knowledge and everything like that.

Jane's interpretation of academic life showed a frustration with university politics, perceived unfairness, and an inability as an individual to make any noticeable difference. However, Jane realised that incremental change was possible through sound research and teaching, expressing a preference for the research aspects of academic life, but also realising that innovative learning and teaching informed her research.

Jo, a Senior Lecturer, also spoke of effecting change and influencing outcomes. At university, she believed that she was able to effect change through

interaction with students, which she described as sometimes being "...demanding and annoying." Nevertheless, in the main Jo described her interaction with students in terms of "love". Lucy, a Senior Lecturer, also described commitment to work in terms of "...what it is that you love, or what it is that you love to do."

Finally, Pam, a Senior Lecturer, told a story in which she spoke of "love" as an emotional aspect of her commitment to university. Asked at the commencement of her interview to tell briefly how she came to be working at the university, Pam replied "I love [name of university], I'm very attached to the place." She went on to say that her time at the university, which included undergraduate and doctoral studies, had been a "...great, really positive experience the whole time." However, while Pam's story of love for the university also extended to research, it did not include teaching. The requirements of teaching made Pam feel uneasy and undermined her self confidence.

Emotional Work and Dissonance

As a teacher, Pam delivered a range of teaching at both undergraduate and post graduate levels. Although she appeared to be confident and knowledgeable to her students, Pam suffered inner emotional turmoil whenever she had teaching to perform. The issue for Pam was that she "...felt like a fraud standing up in front of those kids um you know telling them things that I've never done in my whole life." Pam's lack of experience undermined her confidence and affected her ability to do her job, ultimately having an adverse effect on her research output as well. All the while that Pam was feeling self-doubt and was facing a crisis of confidence; she maintained a façade of confidence and competence. Pam's view was that academic staff are expected to teach competently by university and students alike. Any lack of

confidence, or hint of uncertainty, is seized upon by students in delivering end of semester course and teaching evaluations. Pam's dilemma was that she did not believe that she was a competent teacher, yet needed students to think otherwise.

Emotion laden teaching performance was also a concern for Fleur, an Associate Lecturer, who was challenged by having to teach large classes. Fleur felt comfortable teaching smaller classes, where interaction with students was easier to achieve, but felt overwhelmed by "...suddenly stand in front of a sea of faces, that you cannot have any interactive sessions going on, if you do you just end up with blank stares, um... The dilemma for Fleur, similar to that experienced by Pam, was the need to appear confident and to display an appropriate level of competence to students. Fleur felt that she was being asked to engage in a performance to which she was not committed, and which was emotionally draining. Failure would possibly result in "...crap reviews from the students", which had the potential to influence performance management adversely.

Fleur's situation was exacerbated by her lack of control over the subjects that she was expected to teach, which has been discussed previously. Having teaching regularly allocated in areas where she had no expertise was a major factor in the emotional labour that she was experiencing. Expecting Fleur to engage in teaching performances in situations in which she did not feel comfortable, and in areas in which she did not feel competent, while all the while performing her role under the imperative of "good" student reviews, had affected her commitment. While she had a commitment to students and to her research, she has experienced increasing alienation towards the university. Fleur spoke of her commitment as, "I don't have a

commitment level to the organisation, I have a commitment level to the students, and to my research but to the organisation...no! Why would I ?

Fleur continued, describing her situation as “stressful” and “unrewarding” saying, “...that’s the thing that’s really got up my nose, it’s like I was saying the stress, stress streams from a perceived lack of control.” The researcher interpreted Fleur’s perceived lack of control in respect of (a) class sizes, (b) teaching allocations, and (c) potentially poor student reviews resulting from (a) and (b), as central to the issue of her forced emotional labour. Fleur also felt powerless, believing that she could not raise her concerns with her head of academic unit without suffering repercussions. Suppressing her feelings only added to the pressures of emotional labour that Fleur was experiencing. Providing feedback to decision makers in her academic unit outlining her concerns would have relieved the situation for Fleur, who summed up her feelings in the following terms:

I wish we had some sort of feedback system going because...um at the moment...naturally they’re all going to hear that they’re all doing great...ahhhh...oh wow...I really appreciate that you know so and so it was so nice of you to do that, but it’s a load of hooie...if we really all said what we thought they’d get the rudest shock ever.

In Pam’s account of her performance as a teacher she was initially describing emotion work, where private feelings are suppressed (Brown, 2002). However, teaching requires not just the suppression of private feelings, it demands high levels of emotional labour through a requirement for interaction, entertainment and impression management (Bellas, 1999). The demands fall more heavily on women than on men, due to teaching being more closely aligned with the feminine stereotype (Bellas, 1999).

For Pam, teaching had developed into emotional labour as a requirement of her job (Brown, 2002), where the emotional labour was at the surface acting level. At this level the behaviours she displayed did not modify her internal feelings (Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005).

Excitement about Teaching and Research

Excitement was an emotion expressed by a number of academic staff, mainly in the context of students and teaching. Martha spoke warmly of how much she enjoyed seeing "...the wonderful excitement of some people of coming to university, of this world opening up for them, and enjoying that." She also told how she had experienced excitement herself from student activities and enterprise from first-year undergraduates through to postgraduate students. Intimating that she derived immense pleasure from observing and interacting with students, her enthusiasm was clear in her description of "serious" students as:

Really interesting people and on a good day I still do get excited about seeing, like I've had a bunch... it's really funny, first years, honours students, masters students this year, so you're doing, and I think there are immense rewards at both ends of that.

Arriving five minutes early for the interview with Martha, the researcher was invited to wait while Martha and an honours student finished their discussion. The researcher's interpretation of the concluding stages of Martha's meeting with her student confirmed to him the high levels enthusiasm, care and attention that Martha invested in her students. Clearly, from her disposition and manner, some benefits from the experience accrued to Martha as well.

Peter also disclosed that he experienced excitement when he encountered students who actually learned from university studies, rather than regarding higher education just as a process to obtain a qualification. For him, the most satisfying

aspect of teaching was being able to "...watch the growth within that person, and watch them come back, either during the course to say this is where I've taken it." Being able to apply knowledge gained at university was also highly regarded by Peter who spoke of the excitement he derived from students who contacted him "...three or five years later have them ring up or send an email saying when we covered that you were right because we actually used that." Although not a particularly accomplished researcher himself, Peter also experienced excitement from working with research students, saying "and the excitement of trying to generate a question, generate an understanding and through that take them on a path of discovery."

Sue presented a different perspective regarding excitement, focussing on research rather than the teaching or organisational aspects of work. Research was more appealing to Sue due to the ability to "...work on the sort of things that excite you that you enjoy..." a focus on *wanting* to undertake the work rather than *having* to do it just because it was part of one's job. She continued, describing research as "productive" and "almost self-indulgent", qualifying this by linking self-indulgence with enjoyment. Although research was the main source of commitment to Sue, as expressed by the excitement that she experienced from doing it, she also felt a commitment to teaching under certain circumstances. Sue's commitment to teaching was sustained by "...seeing the students get excited and interested in what you're teaching." In observing and listening to Sue, the researcher understood that there were women who also subscribed to what was primarily a research mindset, contrary to the stories of "gender commodification" (Bruni, Gherardi, & Poggio, 2005, p. 424) that underpinned the commitment of women to teaching.

Fleur's anger at what she perceived as unfair work allocations has been discussed in detail earlier in this chapter. However, the researcher saw a different side of Fleur when she spoke about teaching subjects that she enjoyed. Teaching subjects within the area of her expertise, or which she enjoyed teaching, were a source of excitement, for both her and students with the result that both parties "...have a good time." Listening to Fleur's account of her excitement it was clear to the researcher that although she had said earlier in the interview that she was contemplating leaving the university, as a result of perceived work allocation issues and the issues of employee equity engendered by them (Adams, 1963, 1965; Mowday, 1983), she had not let these issues compromise the commitment she felt for students and the knowledge that she could impart under the right circumstances. Fleur concluded her story about the excitement of student learning by saying, "And to see students actually go 'wow', hey this is really interesting, and you know [pause] they're sort of learning and they're interested and we're all having fun. I mean [pause] to me, that's what makes..."

Fleur also spoke about her feelings towards research, suggesting that her views had changed in recent times. She originally believed that it was research that excited her more than the other elements of academic work. However, she had now concluded that research was a more difficult proposition than she first realised, and was indeed a time-hungry and "...very, very draining" process.

Several staff members told stories about obsession with work, relating these either to themselves or to colleagues. Pam spoke about two male academics who she regarded as role models, discussing them in glowing terms in terms of their influence on her work life, through their commitment to work. Speaking of one colleague she told of how driven he was by work, and how he would work long hours to meet a busy schedule. Eventually, he was beset with health problems which led to him having to reduce his work load substantially. Pam related his health problems to an obsession with work; making the point that obsession with work should probably be distinguished from commitment.

Mary also spoke of obsession with work, prefacing her story with an example of women with a balanced commitment to both work and life outside work. She then spoke about other people that she knew, saying "...it's like their job is their whole life and it's hard for them to let go of it after hours, or let go a lot of the time." The point that Mary was making was that there are few examples of women who are able to balance work and family effectively. Where examples exist most women do not have families to consider.

Shirley disclosed that in addition to a full-time academic position, she also undertook a range of extra-work activities in addition to academic work. Although Shirley did not talk about an obsession with work, regarding herself as being highly committed, the way that she interpreted her working life seemed to indicate an unhealthy level of involvement rather than commitment to students, research or the university. The researcher interpreted Shirley's desire for involvement as being based on a feeling that *only she* could undertake the additional activities to the required standard, rather than a commitment to people, profession or career. Involvement of

kind described by Shirley was consistent with an inability to delegate tasks (Cuba, Decenzo, & Anish, 1983) or a high need to exercise control (Neider, 1987) rather than commitment.

The final story about commitment through an obsession for work came from Michael, who claimed that he "...didn't have any sabbatical for [a long period of] years...", as he was performing a continuous management administrative role during this period. Although Michael didn't specifically talk about an obsession for administrative work, his work record does question his commitment to the other aspects of his work as an academic staff member. Failing to take research leave for such a long period of time together with a substantially reduced teaching workload made the researcher wonder how committed Michael really was to what other academic staff members had been telling him was the most highly regarded element of academic work, namely research.

The male construct of presenteeism (Franzway, 2000; Sheridan, 2004), manifest through long hours doing and being involved in work, was present in the account of obsessive commitment among male research staff. Also evident in the accounts of women staff were the difficulties facing women in achieving a satisfactory work/life balance.

Concern for Others/Care for Students and Quality

The role models suggested by Pam in her story about obsession with work, discussed above, certainly were obsessive about their work, a characteristic that Pam did not perceive to be commitment, even to the individuals' careers. However, when Pam elaborated further it became evident that there was more than just an obsession with work at play here. Both individuals were committed to what Pam called "broad

work”, that is carrying out work for many people, rather than just for themselves. Pam saw this as largesse on the part of her role models, characterised by a desire and commitment to create opportunities for other people not just themselves. She then clarified her story further by interpreting the actions of her role models as being based on the fact that both individuals knew that “in the long term they’d be judged by the fact that they created opportunities for a lot of people not just for themselves.” The researcher understood the use of the term “judged” in the context of the story to mean evaluated in terms of performance as researchers, so ultimately there was a dual commitment to career and profession as researchers.

Mary took up the theme of concern for others with a story about the challenges of learning, set in the context of difficulties experienced by persons who are “novice” learners. She spoke of a fascination with the learning process which she had fashioned into an approach designed to assist students with the learning process, thus empowering them to understand how to move from current levels of understanding to new levels. Mary’s commitment to caring for students reflected her professionalism towards the teaching and pastoral care aspects of academic work.

A similar story of concern for students was told by Shaun, in relation to caring for students. Firstly, he constructed a generalisation about the characteristics of people who succeed in business, describing them as psychotics and “...people who lack any compassion, who are unable to relate to others apart from their self-advancement.” He spoke of many successful businesses that “needed” decision makers who were devoid of compassion. Shaun then narrowed the scope of the argument to university life and his belief that compassion and morality had been sacrificed as universities had been organised and managed, mainly by men, along

similar lines to businesses. He told of some individuals who although they were regarded as successful under the university system were "...people who lack any compassion, who are unable to relate to others apart from their self-advancement," continuing to say "I just think without any sense of compassion the rest starts to fall away, that's my view."

In linking a lack of compassion and morality to university life, along with a culture of poor inter-personal relationships and unswerving focus on career, Shaun was attempting to construct a context where the university could be seen as complicit in behaviours that would be widely regarded as undesirable. Reflecting on his story about the apparent lack of commitment of some colleagues to anything other than their own careers, Shaun then added a further comment about how colleagues who he regarded as the best, or some of the best, teachers "...towards the ends of their careers felt more and more obliged to do the best by the students and less and less obliged to, particularly if it means forsaking the students in order to advance in some other way, the university."

James also expressed a commitment to students through a concern for student learning by improving academic outcomes through all phases of university education. The concern expressed by James was one of integrating learning from earlier years at university with studies in the final year. James' commitment was expressed as a concern for the integration of content and process through a degree program to a greater extent than currently exists.

The accounts of compassion and caring appeared to the researcher to contain gendered undertones. Mary told a story of professional commitment to caring for students. Although Shaun mentioned caring for students, he spoke of colleagues who

only felt obliged to put the requirements of students above those of organisation and career as they neared the end of their careers. Otherwise, male accounts of caring and compassion tended to be constructed around the organisation and careers.

Obligation/Duty of Care to Organisation

James also spoke of caring and concern for others as a sign of commitment, saying “I think that one of the expressions of lack of commitment is lack of care, um, lack of showing adequate concern for colleagues and clients or students. I think if you are committed to something you show higher levels of caring...” James continued by explaining that he perceived caring to be the domain of both men and women, although the idea of a carer’s role, together with the relationship building role of women had been extended to education. He found the gendered nature of caring to be “... somewhat reasonable...” going on to say that “...because the girls do seem to exhibit a more caring attitude to the students that they do, are considered to be easier targets.” James also argued that commitment was expressed through showing adequate concern for colleagues and students. High levels of commitment were demonstrated through care taken in communicating. Committed individuals showed higher levels of caring, demonstrating a clear association between the two.

Jo also associated commitment with the theme of caring. Asked what she observed in other people that made her believe that they were committed, she said:

People who actually care. I think caring is important. They don’t come into work and do these long hours for nothing...they care about the curriculum, care about the students, we want to actually have a good graduate because we’re accountable...and if we don’t have *** out there then we are accountable. So we’re actually, we actually care about the type of graduate that is going to be out there [in the field of work]. That what as I see as caring about our end product which is [in the field of work].

Jo's focus was on commitment to caring at multiple levels. Commitment was initially demonstrated through caring begun at the interpersonal level, characterised by a focus on curriculum and students. Commitment through caring continued throughout the educational process, culminating in a graduate for whom staff felt *accountable*.

Pam also spoke of a female colleague who she described as having a high level of commitment to the people she served, which were mainly students. The colleague's commitment to students was evident to Pam and others through the high degree of care that she displayed in her dealings with others.

Mary told of a female role model who was "...so giving of herself and her time..." while maintaining a positive attitude and demeanour. Mary went on to describe her colleague in terms of care to others, encouragement and support. Mary also spoke about a male colleague who not only had a caring nature, but also coupled this with commitment to people and the organisation:

I felt every aspect of what he did reflected his whole persona of what he felt was his commitment to learning, his commitment to people, to the system, so there was this [pause] you know, you knew who he was, there wasn't like this fakeness in regard to it.

Mary had constructed caring and commitment in a way that was holistic and genuine.

Michael cited several examples of how academic colleagues had displayed care through commitment to students, colleagues and organisation. His story was about a colleague in an academic management role who showed his commitment to the university by "taking other junior researchers under his wing...and giving back to them some of the things he'd actually received from the school." Michael also spoke about a male colleague who had sufficient care for and commitment to students that he met a teaching commitment despite only returning from overseas travel at 3am that day.

Jillian also told of a female colleague who was highly committed to caring for students, which she displayed through the care and time taken in her dealings with post graduate students together with a general commitment to student learning. She went on to talk about a senior academic manager whose caring nature and commitment to the academic unit and university were evident in her dealings in representing the university, school or faculty "...in the way she always tries to find a way to do it. So she doesn't sort of shrug off that maybe responsibility, whereas I think people could say, it would be easy to say, you know I'm double booked I can't make that meeting or I can't attend that."

The notion of caring was also evident to the researcher during his interview with Shirley. While details of Shirley's commitment to work have been mentioned earlier in this chapter, it should be said that apart from regarding Shirley's attitude to work as obsessive, underlying this was a deep and heartfelt sense of wanting to care for people. Shirley demonstrated this through the range of voluntary activities, mainly as a service to others, which she undertook almost as a duty.

Pam then told of a female staff member who was a willing, helpful and obliging individual who often performed "heroic deeds" in the service of students. Pam spoke of her colleague's commitment as a feeling of obligation to students, to the extent that she would often work long hours to ensure that issues were minimised. The subtext from Pam's account was commitment through long hours of work and a presence in the workplace, a theme that was present in all of Pam's stories, including descriptions of her own work life.

Louise also spoke about commitment through a feeling of obligation, on this occasion focusing on a lack of commitment and presenting a counterexample. She

told of academic staff that "...will straight out refuse..." resulting in colleagues, usually female staff members, having to do the work even though it may not relate to them directly. As an example, Louise spoke of issues relating to a subject where a colleague had refused to attend to a subject outline, even though it was his subject to teach, as he was working on research. The lack of a sense of obligation was interpreted by Louise as a sign of low commitment; to colleagues, students and university. For Louise, the issue of some of her colleagues not having a sense of obligation was exacerbated by her being a fractional staff member who still "picked up" the work of recalcitrant, mostly male, colleagues.

Peter told of undertaking disproportionate service and teaching roles over a period of years. He claimed to have substantial involvement in the development of new programs and subjects across a range of undergraduate and post graduate offerings while still carrying out a full academic work load. When asked to expand on why he had undertaken additional work he said that he had done it through a sense of obligation to what he perceived he was expected to do, expressed as a measure of his commitment to his academic unit and to the university. Zane also told a similar story about the commitment of two female academic staff members who had "...taken on considerable administrative/managerial workloads when it wasn't their first love, not really what they wanted to do, to be good, to help the department, to help the university they've done it." He explained that in his view the sense of obligation shown by these women was probably "an over commitment" based on a sense of obligation, yet he regarded them "...as role models in commitment, in time and student orientation," adding "...perhaps putting too much in sometimes to their own

detriment.” Again the notion of gender commodification (Bruni et al., 2005), in relation to the perceived primary commitment to teaching of women, was evident.

Jane also spoke about her perception of how commitment through obligation was displayed. She saw colleagues showing commitment and obligation by spending long hours in the workplace. Jane qualified her views by adding that while she believed that the perspective about long hours of work was correct, people are often not what they appear to be.

Martha had a different perspective on obligation, telling of how she would “draw the box” around herself, forming an imaginary boundary between herself and the work environment. In this way she would “protect” herself from work overload, over commitment and excessive obligations. She said that her strategy was to herself “Don’t get emotionally engaged; don’t over engaged with the things going on external to you.” Martha’s interpretation of commitment through a focus on a sense of obligation was that people could easily become “overwhelmed” if they didn’t maintain a sense of perspective about their work. She continued:

Yes, you do sometimes think “I’m overwhelmed.” The rewards are about ensuring I do my teaching well and publishing, so let me draw the box and just do that. So I can actually understand the people who make the decision of “that’s enough.”

Martha concluded by saying that feeling obligated was sometimes tempered by the knowledge that one should focus on work issues that were the basis for promotion and tenure, and how she could understand colleagues who might think in that way.

Conclusion

This chapter has reported the emotional aspects of work commitment contained in the sub-core category entitled “Emotionalising Work Commitment”. The

ways in which participants in the research interpreted their commitment to work in terms of emotions, and the gendered nature of emotions, have been presented and discussed. The links between the gendered and emotionalised processes of work commitment have also been considered.

Commencing with the male norm of management and organisational life, with its focus on rational, non-emotional, and linear achievement of outcomes as the point of departure, this chapter has described and discussed how people actually *feel* about commitment. In expressing the organisational norm, men are expected to behave in a particular way, women in another. If men step outside the norm this will affect how superiors perceive their commitment, and act adversely on performance appraisal. For women, the expectation is that they will express emotions that adversely affect organisational outcomes.

What is clear is that work commitment is a gendered and emotionalised construct; one that is crucial to how people cope with their commitment in the workplace. Contributing to the purpose of the research: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* and the aim to re-conceptualise work commitment in the form of a theory of work commitment, this chapter has shown that gender and emotions are intertwining entities that are central to the interpretation of work commitment.

Emotions are a key part of organisational life. Understanding emotions, and the ways in which they intertwine with gender, is fundamental to understanding work commitment. When interviewing participants, the researcher noted that few men expressed their work and work commitment in terms of emotions, consistent with the male norm of organisational life discussed above. In contrast, most women in this study spoke of work, and their commitment to it, in ways that inevitably expressed

feelings and emotions, thus reinforcing the gendered and emotional nature of work commitment.

Gender has been described as an “ongoing enactment”, something that is practiced rather than existing as a static component of identity (Shields, 2000, p. 6). Thinking of gender as ongoing moves the debate from merely describing “differences” between men and women to encompassing when and how gender effects occur, giving consideration to context (Shields, 2000). Similar to gender, emotion can also be considered as a social process (Armon-Jones, 1991; Harre, 1986), suggesting that research should also focus on the context in which it occurs. The context of the study has provided a framework through which both gender and emotions can be studied. Context in this sense is used to describe the university setting in which the study is situated, along with the social context that provides the overall framework for studies of gender and emotions (Shields, 2000). Like the gendered aspects of university work commitment, discussed in the previous chapter, the sub-core category conceptualising emotions relates to a key element in the meaning of work commitment to academic staff. The research has shown that emotions experienced by men are few in number (e.g., James, Derek, Michael), and in the main tend to involve feelings about organisational issues, such as anger at perceived poor management and decision making. A small number of men (e.g., Peter, John) displayed feminine characteristics, such as a strong commitment to teaching or administrative work at the expense of research. consistent with Connell’s (1995) characterisation of feminised men. In contrast, all women interviewed expressed a range of feelings associated with their commitment to work, suggesting that for them commitment is a phenomenon with a large emotional component.

Several women spoke of themselves or other staff feeling intimidated with aspects of their work as a consequence of actual or perceived skill deficits. Terms used by one woman included expressions such as “feeling like a fraud” and of experiencing strong emotions “bordering on fear”. Feelings of inadequacy led to fear and apprehension, culminating in a lowering of commitment, mainly as a result of organisational expectations.

Love was another emotion expressed exclusively by women. Several staff members spoke of their love of particular aspects of work or of the organisation. While women spoke of commitment resulting from love, a contrasting story of commitment as a form of attachment was told by a male academic. For him, commitment was based on an exchange process; a duty resulting from the largesse of the university in offering employment, a similar construction to Allen and Meyer’s (1990) notion of normative commitment.

Anger or annoyance was an emotion that was also expressed by a number of staff members. Anger expressed by women mainly stemmed from the behaviours of male colleagues (e.g., not working with dickheads) and unreasonable expectations (e.g., workload) on the part of the organisation leading to reduced commitment. Juxtaposed was the male construction of anger and lowered commitment, resulting from perceived poor management and poor decision making. It was interesting to note that several men made the point that being angry about poor management and decision making was perceived as indicative of high levels of commitment; an interpretation based on commitment being associated with members expressing their anger loudly and frequently. Emotions experienced by women are different, and have different antecedents, to those experienced by men. Women’s emotions, intertwined

with gender, are frequently overlooked, important considerations in the construction of work commitment.

Apart from the emotions of fear, anger and love discussed above, emotional aspects of work commitment fell into four main areas: caring about others including students, colleagues and community; passion for work, linked with commitment; the emotional nature of commitment and dissonance; and excitement associated with work, dealing with people and commitment. The four areas represented a gendered view of commitment, being identified predominantly by women. One exception was a male staff member who, as discussed, displayed feminine characteristics in his account and interpretation of work and commitment.

Caring and concern for colleagues, students and community were emotions that were strongly associated with women. The caring nature of women was also reinforced by men. Where a male staff member showed care for colleagues, through mentoring junior researchers, these were exclusively *male* colleagues; a caring nature that was based on a gendered emotion.

Passion was an emotion exclusively displayed by women in this study. Several women linked passion with enthusiasm as antecedents of commitment. One woman suggested that commitment was grounded in passion; for her, commitment without passion was a veneer, often used by those who wished to be perceived as committed, but who just “played the system”. Many stories of passion were constructed around teaching, reinforcing the notion that teaching was gendered work predominantly undertaken by women academics. Commitment through passion was also gendered along similar lines. One woman told how men viewed passion, as expressed by women, as a weakness. She believed that men could not understand

how women could display an emotion such as passion and yet still function as thinking, rational human beings.

Several women told of the need to perform emotional work, some citing instances of dissonance that accompanied such work. Women spoke of being expected to appear confident and competent, while feeling overwhelmed by large classes and lack of experience in the areas they were expected to teach. One staff member spoke of decreased commitment and feeling “like a fraud”. Another spoke of diminished commitment due to emotional work being exacerbated by inappropriate teaching allocations.

Excitement was another emotion expressed mainly by women or male staff members regarded as feminised due to a primary focus on teaching. Women told of commitment experienced through enjoyment of work, leading to excitement and culminating in high levels of commitment. Commitment to the work itself was not compromised by low commitment to the organisation.

The next chapter discusses the last of the three sub-core categories that contribute to the grounded theory of academic work commitment. Chapter Seven is entitled “Achieving Work Commitment”. It reflects the enablers and barriers to commitment that contribute to the overall grounded theory of academic work commitment at the university in question.

Chapter 7

Achieving Work Commitment

Introduction

Previous chapters dealing with the sub-core categories “Gendering Work Commitment” and “Emotionalising Work Commitment” have considered how the work commitment of staff in a university context is gendered and emotionalised. Discussion of how work commitment is gendered and emotionalised has established clear links between the constructs. As discussed in the previous chapters, the role of gender and emotions in conceptualising work commitment has been inadequately addressed within previous work commitment research (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990; Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974). Previous research has tended to ignore, or to recognise and suppress, gender and to regard emotions in terms of a desire to internalise organisational values as one’s own.

Chapters five and six have addressed the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* The researcher would argue that the links between gender, emotions and work commitment have been clearly demonstrated in the context of the working lives of university academic staff. In addition to establishing the gendered and emotional nature of work commitment, the research also set out to reconceptualise work commitment, in a university context, by developing a grounded theory of work commitment.

In establishing that gender and emotions are integral parts of work commitment, the research has established other relationships that constitute the work commitment of academic staff. Some of the relationships fall outside the scope of this study (e.g., the commodification of commitment, where a value and ranking may be

ascribed to commitment) and these will be addressed in future research. Other relationships are central to the notion of work commitment in a university context, (e.g., teaching as a source of commitment), and are considered in this chapter. Some work, and attitudes to work, is considered as enablers of commitment. Other issues (e.g., managerialism, disengagement) are identified as barriers to commitment and are then discussed.

The composition of the sub-core category is shown in Table 5 below. This Table lists the categories that together make-up the sub-core category entitled “Achieving Work Commitment”. Categories are discussed in detail below.

Table 5. The Sub-Core Category of Achieving Work Commitment

Sub-core category	Categories
Achieving work commitment	Meaningful work New work challenges Work ethic Meaning of commitment to academics Teaching as a source of commitment Research as a source of commitment Recognising lack of commitment Managerialism Lack of appreciation Alienation

The chapter commences with the interpretations of academic staff of what they find meaningful in their working life. The researcher introduced the notion of meaningful work early in each interview as a means of focussing interviewees on

work and the workplace. Commitment from work challenges, together with interaction with people, is described and discussed. Building on the challenges and meaning of academic work, important sources of commitment (i.e., teaching and research) are discussed. Negative aspects or barriers to commitment are identified and discussed, together with the notion of disengagement which has been argued by Etzioni (1961) and Penley and Gould (1988) as engendering a strong negative commitment resulting from a perceived lack of alternatives. The core sub-category of “Achieving Work Commitment” is listed in Table 5, above.

Meaningful Work

Each interviewee was invited early in their interview to discuss what they found meaningful in their work life. The purpose of the question was to get the interviewee thinking and talking about things in their work life that were important to them. Not surprisingly, most academic staff members spoke about the core elements of their job, that is student learning (teaching) and research, with a greater emphasis on teaching.

John told of teaching students being meaningful to him in the sense that he was able to link his extensive work experience to what students were learning. Making a link between theory and practice enhanced the experience for students who appreciated that “...it’s not just up here in your head.” Achieving a satisfactory student experience was important for John, being a measure for him of an effective work outcome.

Peter told of the meaning that “...the teaching interface” held for him. He spoke of interest in having the opportunity to create, design and evaluate new programs, using words like “interesting” and “exploring” to describe the meaning that

teaching held for him. He also suggested that industry input was essential in order to ensure a good mix between theory and practical application.

For Richard, meaningful work involved interacting with students. He said, “Really, I do enjoy teaching, and a lot of why I do this job is the interaction with students. Learning from them is, you know, a pretty valuable asset to your life.” In the main Richard appeared to be a person who was self-fulfilled in his academic life, expressing this by the use of words like “enjoy”, “valuable” and “attraction” to describe his interaction with students. Fleur also enjoyed student interaction, saying, “...to see students actually go ‘wow’, hey this is really interesting, and you know...they’re sort of learning and they’re interested and we’re all having fun. I mean...to me, that’s what makes...”

Making a difference to student learning was a theme advanced by several staff members. Zoe stated that, for her, work was all about her ability to influence student learning, saying, “If I don’t think I’m making a difference that’s when I get jaded and cynical, and you know I feel like I’m in a rut. So that’s the thing I need to be feeling.” Jillian also expressed a desire to make a difference, although in her case she saw this as being achieved through “having a voice”, although in the final analysis she might not change things as completely as she would like. Jillian claimed that she “...seldom had a bad day,” which she attributed to being in control of her work. The theme of making a difference was also evident in Kathryn’s account of meaningful work. She told of “...getting a lot out of teaching” in terms of being able to maintain contact with students, and in some cases to have influenced the knowledge and outcomes that the students have attained. Louise also mentioned the importance of having the

opportunity to influence people's knowledge and ways of thinking, which she achieved through the use of critical methods of teaching.

Interest in students was a theme that was present in the accounts of several academics. Michael mentioned that he derived great pleasure from seeing students graduate, having prepared them in the best possible way for the challenges of work and industry. Ruth expressed similar sentiments, adding that helping committed students, both in their studies and in work placements, were highlights in her academic life.

Several academics also stated that research was an important aspect of their working lives. John found research to be meaningful because it enabled him to explore areas of interest to him, trying to find a niche, in order to research and publish. Sue commented that the most motivating aspect of her work life was the research component "...because you get to work on the sort of things that excite you, that you enjoy. It's productive, almost self-indulgent I suppose because you can do the aspects that you enjoy most."

Jane expressed the view that teaching was "...what we have to do, teaching it's OK," but for her research was the most important aspect. She expressed a frustration with the politics of university, and asserted that "...things are not always fair, but we have to put up with that," but she also had a desire not to change her life, a feeling of satisfaction with life as an academic. Jane's sense of satisfaction came from her love of research, which was evident in her comment that, "The research, I'm here for. I don't want to change my life."

Derek also spoke of research as the source of meaningful work, along with interaction with colleagues. Although Derek presented as a jaded staff member, one

who saw himself as a victim of incompetent university management, he was particularly enthusiastic about research. He stated that he would not have returned to university just for the teaching, it was the appeal of research along with access to facilities and colleagues. He concluded with a comment on his perspective about collegiality, saying “It *is* a big thing; unfortunately it’s been declining [pause], on the decline ever since I came back.”

Following on from a theme of “making a difference” through teaching, Louise also found research to be an aspect of work that was meaningful to her. Meaning was grounded in the choice of areas to research, together with the opportunity to influence policy through her research.

Meaningful work for academic staff was constructed around the teaching and research aspects were academic life. With the exception of Jo, who took the notion of caring beyond colleagues and students to encompass the community, none of the other participants in the study suggested that providing service, either to the university or the community, engendered any feelings of work that were perceived to be meaningful.

New Work Challenges

Staff spoke of the commitment associated with new challenges. Peter, who had many years of corporate business experience before becoming a full-time academic, spoke of taking up the challenge of an academic career in the later stages of his working life. He suggested that the challenges of the work itself, understanding how to teach and conduct research in particular, were major sources of commitment to him, in terms of to the university and to his career. Mary also spoke of being approached at a conference by an academic administrator who had offered Mary a

position at university. After due consideration, Mary had accepted the challenge that academic life offered, linking her commitment to both university and career to the challenging nature of her job. Mary articulated the challenges as being both intrinsic and extrinsic. The intrinsic challenges involved coming to terms with herself through introspection and self-awareness; both of which were sources of inspiration and commitment to her. The extrinsic challenges involved meeting the requirements of her academic unit in terms of teaching delivery, which she also had high commitment to meeting, but one sensed that it was more of an obligation than a journey of self-discovery.

The theme of commitment through challenge and obligation was continued by Shirley, who, in telling of high levels of commitment to students and the university said that she was driven by a determination "...that I don't let anybody else down." Finally, Martha told of being moved from a challenging work situation, where she "loved working" with a "great bunch of people" to a different situation that did not provide the same challenge. Consequently, her commitment to all aspects of work was diminished.

The stories of staff highlighted commitment engendered by challenging work, accompanied by a desire to perform work professionally and competently. The need to meet the expectations of students, colleagues and the university also engendered commitment.

Work Ethic

Work ethic involves the importance of work itself to the individual (Morrow, 1993). Pam clearly enjoyed the research aspects of her work and told of working up to twelve hours each day. Pam recognised that she was undertaking work primarily

for the university, though acknowledging that she was also making investments in her own career. The researcher interpreted Pam's commitment as being partly due to the importance that she associated with the work, but also a commitment based on instrumental factors, where work was carried out in the expectation that benefits would accrue at a future time. Sue also spoke of what she called a "...sort of indirect kind of commitment, though by committing yourself..." Like Pam, Sue was making the point that although one is apparently working for the university there are also investments accruing to the individual as a result of a strong work ethic. As well as speaking about herself and her commitment, Sue also gave an example of a female colleague who "...puts a lot of time and effort into all aspects of what they do as being an academic" and was perceived as having a strong work ethic and high commitment to the university as a result.

John also commented on his perception of the work ethic of colleagues, saying "I don't think I've seen any slackers around here..." espousing a positive view of the work ethic and commitment of colleagues. He went on to say that he believed he could "...make a contribution to the university and its operations" through his work activities.

Strong, positive attitudes towards work were also displayed by other staff. Shirley spoke of competing interests, some between work and home, and how her leisure time was compromised as a result. Martha also told a story about a highly regarded and committed colleague with a strong work ethic, who was committed to achieving positive outcomes for the university while being committed to dealing fairly with students and colleagues alike.

Meaning of Commitment to Academic Staff

Pam introduced the notion of engagement with other people as a sign of commitment. She espoused the view that academic staff should be actively seeking opportunities to engage with both students and other staff in order to help the university to "...go ahead", suggesting that the way forward was to "...try and engage people and to try and um generate that sense of commitment."

Martha continued with the theme of engaging people, speaking about students who were "...really interesting people" for whom engagement took place more as peers. Martha went on to talk about the individual and organisational benefits of a commitment to engage people, describing it as a situation where "...you're learning as much as you're often teaching, it's very engaging."

James questioned whether an organisation had the right to expect commitment from its staff unless commitment was reciprocated. James also suggested that workers could carry out work duties without necessarily feeling or expressing commitment, essentially an instrumental view of commitment. He then modified his position, saying that in many organisations, including universities, it was necessary to engage in displays of good corporate citizenship in order to "...get a good appraisal". James stated that organisations *could* make a link between organisational behaviours like good corporate citizenship and high commitment and that commitment was an important human factor that decision makers took into account when appraising workers. Suggesting that appraisal may be an informal process, and in contrast to his earlier assertion that commitment was instrumental, James said "I mean we're humans not machines, and we do judge that type of thing in a very human, emotional

level, and not in a pragmatic, mechanistic manner.” Later in the interview, James made a link between enthusiasm and commitment, describing the two as co-variables.

The meaning of commitment was a gendered construct. Women tended to focus on people, based on achieving ends through engagement with individuals. For men, commitment was at the organisational level.

Teaching as a Source of Commitment

Most staff interviewed in this study spoke of a commitment to teaching above any other academic work activity. Staff predominantly gave accounts of their own commitment, however, some staff also spoke of commitment to teaching that they observed in colleagues.

Peter spoke of having high commitment to teaching, describing it as one of the key parts of the academic job. James claimed that of all the things that he found enjoyable at university, he still maintained “...a very strong commitment to teaching.” James spoke of teaching in terms of value and improving outcomes. Commitment to influencing outcomes was also a theme in Louise’s account of her commitment to teaching. She spoke of teaching in terms of “...making a long-term difference to the path that they are taking” and of “...the opportunity to influence people’s knowledge and people’s way of thinking” through the application of critical thinking to the learning process. Ruth spoke of teaching in terms of “...being able to help students, who are really committed, want to excel...” deriving a clear sense of accomplishment from being able to make a difference to student learning outcomes.

Richard spoke of teaching in terms of enjoyment and two-way learning. He appeared to derive great satisfaction from his interaction with students, describing learning from students as “...a pretty valuable asset to your life.” He also commented

on the commitment of colleagues to teaching, saying “I do observe a fairly high level of commitment from my co-workers, particularly to the teaching...” Shaun also talked of the satisfaction he got from teaching, discussing it in terms of working really hard to make difficult concepts understandable and available to students, which he found “...very rewarding, but I also find it very tiring”.

Fleur spoke of her commitment to teaching in terms of engagement with students and generating interest. Her commitment was based around students expressing interest and enjoying the learning process. Describing positive student experiences as occasions when “...they’re interested and we’re all having fun...”

John was also committed to teaching, describing teaching as “...meaningful in the sense that you can use a lot of your experience and relate it to what they’re learning.” Jane’s interpretation of commitment to teaching, although perceived to be secondary to research, also had links to experience. Jane’s commitment to teaching was not based on enhancing student learning by linking theory with practice, rather, it was a self-serving commitment that functioned as a mean of enhancing her pool of knowledge by ensuring that she was kept “...on the edge of what is not my immediate research interest”.

Research as a Source of Commitment

In talking about sources of commitment, several staff members spoke about their commitment to research. John spoke of an expectation that staff would undertake research, teaching and service in the requisite proportions. He added that while teaching and service were necessary conditions for advancement in academic life, neither was sufficient. John said, “While it’s true we’re supposed to do all those things, what really counts is research and publications.” He went on to say that there

was a "...bit of tension there in the way they want you to address all these things, but are only going to promote you on that." John then spoke of people who "...attitudinally see research as the most important of the parameters" and the existence of a "mental hierarchy" that helped to guide people. Louise echoed John's comments, saying that in terms of job progression, research was always valued more highly by decision makers. Louise also expressed doubts about proposals to weight the elements of academic work more evenly.

Zoe also spoke of gaining recognition and rewards (promotion) by proving one's commitment through research and publications. She believed that the focus on research occurred at the expense of teaching, which she disagreed with, describing it as "extremely problematic." Sue took a different position to Zoe, acknowledging the primacy of research, but espousing a commitment to research as a means of being able to "...explore areas that are of interest to you..." Sue continued, expressing her commitment to research in terms of being able to "...get to work on the sort of things that excite you, that you enjoy. It's productive, almost self-indulgent I suppose, because you can do the aspects that you enjoy most." Although Sue went on to tell of teaching being motivating "at times", it was evident to the researcher that Sue derived her greatest commitment and motivation from research. Sue's primary focus on, and commitment to, research appeared to be contradictory, as she had also identified the need for female staff to undertake support work for so-called "phantom" staff, mostly male, who were often not available for the necessary, though not sufficient, academic work of teaching and service.

Jane also expressed a preference for research, although she did see value in teaching as an activity as it kept academic staff current in terms of knowledge in their

discipline. Kathryn displayed a high level of commitment to her research, stating that to her "...there's a real intellectual reward in the research...and I've been a researcher in the area that I am now for about five or six years... I'm one of the only people in this country that does this kind of research..." Kathryn derived an intellectual reward from her research, and her commitment to it was evident.

Finally, Derek said that it was research that underpinned his return to university after a period in the business world. He expressed a commitment to his research and to collegiality, which he stated he had missed in the business world.

Recognising Lack of Commitment

The interview process was also designed to gain insights into how academic staff perceived a lack of work commitment in colleagues. Many staff commented that colleagues were often not available, sometimes unwilling, to participate in activities that were not seen as enhancing their career prospects. Some aspects of recognising a lack of commitment have been mentioned elsewhere, such as in a previous chapter entitled "Gendering Work Commitment", and will not be discussed in detail in this section.

Recognising a lack of commitment, Pam suggested that some colleagues, mostly male, did not participate in all aspect of academic work, choosing instead to focus just on areas that they perceived as investments in their careers. Some of the examples of non-participation included minimal attention to teaching and students, along with non-participation in seminars, meetings and other extra curricula activities. Louise, Kathryn and Sue made similar comments in respect of predominantly male colleagues. Jillian also added that she found a lack of

commitment in staff who regularly failed to attend important events, giving an example:

...we've got a big insurgence of PhD students, especially overseas students, and so we have, you know, PhD confirmation seminars when I don't see, when I consistently don't see, people attending these seminars I think that that's a demonstration of a lack of commitment. And it's things like that, when I see people um not bothering to turn up to things that to me would be, should be important.

Jillian also spoke of attempts she had made to involve members of other academic units in university-wide issues, which had been rebuffed, suggesting a lack of commitment to corporate goals. Fleur also expressed feelings of lack of commitment towards academic staff who did not attend important seminars, particularly when the seminars were being presented by visiting international scholars.

John continued with the theme of minimal effort, adding that some colleagues just did "...what you have to do to hang in there." He gave examples of colleagues with a low commitment to research, some with no research output, a reluctance to undertake service to the university, and no interest in community issues. John was hopeful that "...the system will sort them out," as other staff members often had to compensate for colleagues who had no commitment to, and did not participate in, selected work activities. Peter also believed that there was a lack of commitment to academic work activities shown by some colleagues. He reasoned that, "The career path's more important than the profession or the institution. There's ways of manipulating the process so the career path is accelerated." Peter perceived that "spin" was the stock-in-trade of some academics, resulting in "...incongruence between what is said and done. People are objects that can be used in any way, shape or form for the progression of the individual."

James suggested that he had become jaded through lack of encouragement, saying, "...but I've found that my motivation to become involved in work related things, is actually on the decline..." Continuing, he said "I generally start off pretty enthusiastic about things, you know you have to hit me over the head with a baseball bat before I get the idea that people don't want me to be involved." He concluded, painting a gloomy picture of university academic life, suggesting that the university was not "...worthy of commitment" as it had been transformed into "...something that is basically dysfunctional..." and any feelings of optimism had now "...ebbed away..." and that the "...ebbing away had been quite dramatic..."

The darker side of human nature was the focus of Shaun's story, telling of a lack of commitment that was evident by "...working the system", and perpetrated by colleagues who were "...reasonable but not particularly able." Shaun gave examples of what he perceived to be lack of commitment where colleagues insisted on "secrecy" in running tutorials, always conducting them behind closed doors, along with organising student feedback so that it was not representative of what students really felt.

Colleagues "cutting corners" was an issue of non-commitment for Zoe, who spoke of a colleague who didn't read literature himself, instead reading literature reviews prepared by colleagues. Zoe believed that a measure of commitment was to actually read the primary source of literature, not use material that was a synthesis conducted by someone else. The example of lack of commitment provided by Zoe was evident in Ruth's account of colleagues who fail to use the ability that they have effectively. She spoke of having the opportunity in doing academic work to be self-directed in the management of time, work load, and research. Indicators of a lack of

commitment were staff who "...use these things inappropriately, like lack of time put into their position, the way they prepare their lectures and even the assessment levels." Ruth continued, giving a further example of lack of commitment:

I think you can primarily identify just in the ordinary everyday interaction with the individual, and they give this, well they don't always give; sometimes they actually verbally state their lack of regard for the institution, or their subjects and students. So it's not hard to identify.

She concluded by saying that the examples that she had given mostly involved male staff members, there being "...hardly any males [laughs] in the department who've got particular skills that I admire." Finally, Ruth confessed to experiencing a lack of commitment herself currently, caused by what she perceived to be poor management at departmental and faculty level.

Mary spoke of perceived low commitment in a colleague who "...definitely liked to use other people's stuff to get away with getting the job done." Speaking of other colleagues that she had observed "from a distance" Mary commented, "I've perceived their level of commitment is "...this is a job, I'm going to get paid. Hey, it's 9-5, I'm here, I'll do that then I'm gone. My commitment then is to my other part of life."

Lucy commented that lack of commitment was usually manifest in a lack of preparation. She gave an example of a male colleague, known as a strong researcher, who did not turn up for classes, and otherwise often was not prepared for teaching. Lucy interpreted lack of preparation as a sign of low commitment, associated with a perception that teaching was an "...extra-curricula activity" rather than a key part of core business.

Martha had concerns about the absence of male staff from day-to-day university life, predicting a future situation where major decisions at school level would be made without appropriate input from staff due to a lack of engagement in the process, referring to it as a “big divide.” In her view the same low levels of engagement and commitment of absent staff members also extended to their dealings with students and the university. Non-engagement and lack of commitment in relation to students was typified by low levels of care and service to students.

Finally, Jo expressed concerns about academic staff that took an expedient line with students; staff who might pass a student because it was an easier course of action than recording a fail. Apart from the dereliction of duty involved, Jo expressed concern about the impact on the public when university was allowing incompetent professionals into the workforce. For Jo, not making the correct decision about student grades was an issue of lack of commitment to university and students.

Managerialism

Peter spoke of commitment stemming from the opportunity and desire to be involved in organisational activities. In the past he had been able to involve himself in organisational activities, through being able to “...generate the actual implementations, the processes and the day-to-day running” and being able to “...create things that didn’t exist.” He found that he no longer had the opportunities to do this, although the desire to do so still existed. Peter believed that his changing relationship with the organisation was diminishing his commitment to the university. He explained that he was now less able to be involved in organisational processes due to what he described as “It’s become more managerial and less collegial,” suggesting that managerial control had replaced the traditional environment of collegiality in

which academic staff once operated. The perceived lack of control had caused Peter's commitment to the university to be reduced. He interpreted his reduced commitment to the university as being directly proportional, and a consequence of, the university "...managerially impinging..." on his commitment.

Other examples of inappropriate interventions and actions by university academic managers were cited. Michael spoke of his disappointment at finding out that having been head of an academic unit for a period of twelve years; the position had been offered to another staff member. The lack of collegiality in arriving at the decision, together with failing to communicate the decision to Michael in an appropriate manner, had caused a decline in his commitment. He spoke of being "...actually pissed off and about to resign in [month and year] when I found out overseas that the Head of School had been offered to someone else." Exacerbating the issue was the way in which Michael received the news, stating that he "...found out by email from somebody outside the university, and I hadn't even been told."

Managerialism, and a perceived lack of collegiality, were also evident in what Fleur had to say. Speaking about her frustration at having no input into decisions about what subjects she taught, what research students she supervised, and what service she performed, describing the situation as one where she was told "...this is what you're doing. So [pause] and it's a managerial thing, and you know [pause] ahhh [pause] I just don't get it." Fleur was so angry during the telling of her story that at times she was lost for words to describe her feelings. At another point in her interview she referred to the dictates of management, particularly in the area of teaching allocations, as "...pissing me off." Fleur concluded saying "I just don't get it and it makes me so unhappy. The ahhh [pause] the arbitrary allocation without

consulting, the lack of consultation gets me really angry.” Fleur’s commitment to the university was seriously affected by the perceived unfairness of a managerial approach, stating “...if you want to talk about commitment, um, I’m not committed to the organisation because this sort of thing goes on every single semester...rarely do you come across a good manager and that does [pause] that really does affect my commitment level; I don’t have a commitment level to the university”

Derek also expressed frustration with what he saw as ineffective management at the academic unit level, typified by poor decision making. Derek expressed frustration with decision making at faculty level, saying “...the poor decision making that I see within [his faculty]...you just think how could people be that poor at the job...um at certain levels within [his faculty].” He went on to cite examples of poor decisions in respect of changes postgraduate programs that had failed following structural change. His particular concern was that “...we had no choice in the matter, and yet those who forced it upon us are not going to pay any price whatsoever, whereas in a private organisation there’d be a few people get the boot.”

Derek also questioned the competence of his head of academic unit, who he said suffered from delusions of infallibility while providing no support for staff. He spoke of his academic manager as being “...just potentially...a threat and now everybody’s edgy all the time.” Derek continued, telling of “...the games that are played,” suggesting that his view of managerialism and ineffective management at departmental levels had diminished his commitment to his work, and to the university in particular.

Zane had a different perspective about university governance in the current environment. He agreed that the changes in the relationship between the university and its academic staff had been dramatic and widely felt, saying:

To an extent its managerialism gone mad but a university's a large, complex organisation um difficult to run it without managerialism because of the funding pressures um therefore we have to be more and more accountable and responsible and the days of the Oxford don turning up to have sherry with his tutorial group, whilst I'd love to revert to that model, it isn't there.

Zane did not see that there had been any diminution of commitment from academic staff, explaining by saying:

But we are being pushed, being pushed, being pushed and that's a change in accountability rather than commitment. I think commitment's always been there, but it's the accountability, the performance appraisal, these things are becoming the benchmarks we're measuring people against and that's been driven by the dollar.

Zane was arguing that government pressures were responsible for increased managerialism in universities; a point of view that possibly resulted from his position as a manager, and the tendency to take a different perspective due to one's position. The researcher's interpretation of the story was that Zane really believed that the commitment of academic staff was unaffected by managerialism, which the stories of other organisational members had shown to be a myopic perspective of the situation.

Lack of Appreciation

An issue that was raised by some staff members was a feeling that staff "at the chalkface" were often not accorded the recognition and appreciation that they deserved. In the context of working 12 hour days, and high commitment to both university and career, Pam disclosed that perhaps "...people don't appreciate the amount of effort I am putting in." Mary made the observation that people known to her were highly committed and made substantial contributions in time and effort, yet

experienced frustration when they perceived that their efforts were not acknowledged. Zoe continued with the theme of lack of appreciation, linking it to her own research, which she described as "...social science research, which isn't deemed as sexy by the government." Her argument continued along the lines that as the government controlled research funding, the university also pursued "grant style" research, rather than the personal interests of individuals. Zoe clearly felt that her efforts were not appreciated by the university, and this was reflected in her commitment to organisation and to career.

The theme of lack of appreciation was also expressed by Shaun, who described his contribution to university governance as having been on "...virtually every committee" yet had received no recognition for his contribution. Finally, James made the comment that from his observations women put in a lot more effort, which often went unrecognised. James also indicated that he viewed lack of recognition as a major cause of reduced commitment in the workplace.

Disengagement

Richard commented on colleagues who were "...just pushing the clock", suggesting that they may have disengaged from the organisation, particularly when "...decisions that come down from on high are fairly illogical." Disengagement from university work was also mentioned by Michael, occurring as a consequence of a silo mentality whereby corporate interests were not recognised at departmental level.

Zoe also appeared to be experiencing negative feelings towards university based on her perception of the value of her research, it not being based on the scientific paradigm (i.e., it is qualitative research). She said:

There is an expectation that we will do this research, but those of us who do social science research, which isn't deemed as sexy by the government, are feeling a bit well um that's not going to be seen as valued by the university because this agenda to be in the top ten means that all of us have to be ramping up the grant style research rather than the personal interest stuff. And that worries me. I would feel a lack of commitment if that happened, because at the moment my research agenda is based around my own passions.

Zoe had indicated that while her immediate supervisor supported her research endeavours, she doubted that many others in her faculty would do the same.

Derek also told a story of alienation, expressing frustration with decision making at departmental and faculty levels. Speaking of the disengagement of staff from day-to-day work activities at a particular university campus, he said:

Um, there is unfortunately, an attitude of the head of department that tends to be that the staff are wrong. If there's anything in question, it's why are you causing me problems, whereas [pause] so the staff don't at all feel, especially from [this campus] ...are not...don't at all feel supported by [head of department] at the moment. I mean basically [head of department] is just potentially [pause] a threat, and now everybody's edgy all the time.

Derek concluded by predicting that in the short term, staff would continue to leave the particular part of the university as long as the situation continued.

Finally, Fleur had raised an issue of work allocation, comprising teaching, supervision and service, which she perceived to be inequitable. She described it as a situation that "...pisses me off" to such an extent that she was working on her "exit strategy." Fleur remained committed to the university, manifest through commitment to continue organisational membership (Fisher, 1990; Penley & Gould, 1988), only to the extent that a more acceptable alternative had not yet arisen.

Conclusion

While the focus of this chapter was not particularly on the gendered or emotional aspects of commitment, both were evident in accounts of the commitment

of academic staff. The purpose of the research *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* has been informed by the sub-core category “Achieving Work Commitment”. A contribution has also been made to the aim of re-conceptualising work commitment in the form of a theory of work commitment. In particular, the intersection of the three sub-core categories, consistent with Strauss and Corbin’s (1990; 1998) research that sub-core categories are not mutually exclusive, suggests that gender, emotions and work commitment are inter-related concepts. Attempting to study commitment in isolation is likely to result in a poorly understood concept.

In discussing teaching, women mainly spoke of interesting work, wanting to help (i.e., caring), making a difference, interacting, enjoyment and the opportunity to influence thinking. Engagement with colleagues and students was also identified by women as an overt sign of commitment. Men tended to regard commitment to teaching as involving meeting standards through satisfactory outcomes, value and improving outcomes, and the notion of commitment through reciprocity.

In terms of research, women expressed commitment through the satisfaction obtained from research, intellectual reward, enjoyment, excitement, as productivity accompanied by self-indulgence, and the opportunity to influence policy. Women also recognised that research is more highly valued by decision makers and is really the primary academic work activity, often at the expense of teaching. For men, commitment involved the recognition that research is “what really counts”.

Expressions of commitment discussed above involved academic staff displaying positive commitment to teaching and research. Commitment associated with new work challenges and work ethic built on the enablers of commitment discussed above. The research also identified lack of commitment, along with barriers to commitment which are now discussed.

Lack of commitment, identified in academic colleagues, was a gendered construct. Women spoke of male colleagues whose focus was on career building at the expense of other academic work. Non-participation and non-involvement by male academic staff was the major cause of lack of commitment identified by other, mainly women, colleagues. Women also spoke of expediency, lack of preparation, lack of competence and the tendency to “cut corners”. Men predominantly spoke of lack of recognition, people “just hanging in there”, and working on career building at the expense of other academic activities.

Managerialism was a barrier to commitment identified mainly by men. Issues included poor decision making at departmental management level and poor communication of decisions by managers. Women also suggested reduced commitment due to a lack of input into departmental issues together with perceived poor management and decision making. Lack of appreciation was also identified as a barrier to commitment. Both men and women spoke of lack of appreciation as one of the main barriers to commitment.

The final category considered in this chapter was alienation, a negative form of commitment based on a perceived lack of alternatives (Etzioni, 1961), similar in nature to continuance commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990).

Alienation was mainly a male-oriented construct, with several male academics speaking of disengagement, lack of appreciation of corporate goals and frustration with decision making.

The next chapter discusses the core category and Basic Social Process (BSP) that together with the sub-core categories discussed in chapters five, six and seven constitute the grounded theory of work commitment. Chapter Eight is entitled “Creating Work Commitment”. The chapter accounts for the way in which professionals construct work commitment, by linking the core category with the three sub-core categories “Gendering Work Commitment”, “Emotionalising Work Commitment” and “Achieving Work Commitment”.

Chapter 8

Creating Work Commitment

Introduction

The previous chapters have described and discussed the three dimensions in the conceptualisation of work commitment identified in the context of the study. In addressing the purpose of the research through the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* it has been shown that gender and emotions play an important part in understanding work commitment. Gender, emotions and commitment are intertwined in a way that past research has failed to acknowledge or understand. The sub-core categories discussed in the past three chapters also contributed to the aim of the research, which was to reconceptualise work commitment, using grounded theory to generate a new theory. This chapter builds on the foundations laid by the sub-core categories by identifying a core category “Creating Work Commitment” that completes the grounded theory of work commitment.

The gendered and emotionalised nature of commitment has been presented in the accounts of staff, in terms of their work commitment. Discussion of the gendered, emotionalised and other dimensions of commitment has centred on the capacity to account for the variation in people’s work commitment in the context of the study. What linked the dimensions of work commitment into a grounded theory was the existence of a central core category, based on the investments that people make through organisational, professional and career commitment. The core category emerged from the data, and accounted for the work commitment of participants in the

study when viewed from their perspective (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Schreiber, 2001; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998).

The core category “Creating Work Commitment” (CWC) has provided new insights into the concept of work commitment, through the experiences of academic staff at an Australian university. Whereas previous studies of commitment have mostly ignored gender, and to a large extent emotions, from the theorising and conceptualisation of work commitment, this study has shown that these constructs are fundamental to understanding work commitment. The research has also shown that gender is constantly present in the ongoing interaction between staff and the constituents of academic work (i.e., teaching, research and service to the university).

The chapter begins with a discussion of the core category and Basic Social Process (BSP), showing how university academic staff achieve work commitment. Links with the sub-core categories, and between categories, are made in the context of explaining variation in the claimed behaviour of participants. Each of the conceptual elements of the study is reviewed. Linking each of the three sub-core categories into the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment is the core category or central concept, “Creating Work Commitment” (CWC) around which all other concepts revolve (Hutchinson, 1984).

The chapter continues by describing the three constituents of the core category “Creating Work Commitment”: organisational, professional and career commitment, which are presented through accounts of organisational members. Links to the sub-core categories of “Gendering Work Commitment”, “Emotionalising Work Commitment” and “Achieving Work Commitment” are discussed.

The chapter concludes by evaluating the proposed Grounded Theory of Work Commitment against the six criteria proposed by Strauss and Corbin (1998). The core category is also evaluated against the criteria for a BSP. The proposed Grounded Theory of Work Commitment meets the criteria as a core category and as a BSP.

A Substantive Grounded Theory of Work Commitment

As stated in chapter one, the aim of this research has been to discover the ways in which work commitment is gendered and emotionalised. The focus of the research, as expressed by the research question, is: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* The research question has been addressed through the sub-core categories “Gendering Work Commitment” and “Emotionalising Work Commitment” discussed in Chapters five and six.

Building on the findings resulting from addressing the research question, which are the gendered and emotionalised nature of commitment, the study also sought to develop a substantive theory of work commitment, in a university context, utilising a grounded theory approach. The grounded theory approach that has been used is based on the seminal work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) as adapted by Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990; 1998).

The theory generated by this research is a substantive theory, as opposed to a formal grounded theory. Consequently, it may not be generalisable beyond the context in which the study is based (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). As identified in Chapters one and two, previous research into work commitment has not brought the gendered and emotionalised nature of commitment into one study. This study has addressed the gap in the work commitment literature by examining the gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment, and reconceptualised it utilising a

grounded theory methodology. The main conceptual elements of the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment are shown at Table 6 below. The Table lists each of the elements of the grounded theory together with a description of each category.

Table 6. Main conceptual elements of the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment

Element	Categories
“Creating Work Commitment”	Core category and Basic Social Process
“Gendering Work Commitment”	Sub-core category
“Emotionalising Work Commitment”	Sub-core category
“Achieving Work Commitment”	Sub-core category

The work commitment of academic staff can be conceptualised as having three distinct inter-relating stages, each of which captures the gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment articulated by the theory. Each of the three stages has been discussed in detail in previous chapters. The main conceptual elements of the grounded theory are shown in Table 6, above.

Main Conceptual Elements of the Grounded Theory

There are four main conceptual elements to the proposed grounded theory, the core category and three sub-core categories. Each of the sub-core categories is processual in nature, and possesses its own lower-level categories. Process has been described by Strauss and Corbin (1998, p. 165) as “...a series of evolving sequences of action/interaction that occur over time and space, changing or sometimes remaining the same in response to the situation or context.” The lower-level categories associated with the core category are discussed later in this chapter. In terms of developing a grounded theory, which in addition to addressing the research

question this research set out to do, the processes involved in CWC are three separate stages that account for similarities and variations in the commitment of workers as they undertake academic work. These are the three sub-core categories of “Gendering Work Commitment”, “Emotionalising Work Commitment” and “Achieving Work Commitment” discussed below.

Gendering work commitment

Commitment to work can be conceptualised as an investment in one’s organisation, profession or career, or some combination of these. This research has confirmed that the research component of academic work was perceived to be more highly valued by decision makers than the other elements. Commitment to the different aspects of academic work was gendered, with men tending to invest in their careers at the expense of other work which then falls to colleagues, mainly women, to complete. Women have also had to balance the demands of home and work. Social processes associated with the gendering of academic work have been used to privilege men at the expense of women. The three components of CWC: organisational, professional and career commitment, were evident in the accounts of staff presented in Chapters five and six, and were themselves clearly gendered and emotionalised.

Emotionalising work commitment

The emotions that women displayed in providing work commitment were different to those displayed by men. The emotional nature of women’s commitment (e.g., passion, caring) was gendered, and the interaction between gender and emotions was clearly seen in the commitment displayed by women in undertaking academic work (e.g., a focus on teaching and service). The interplay between gender and

emotions was demonstrated throughout this sub-core category. Women knowingly continued to make investments in commitment to academic work which they knew was less highly regarded by decision makers. The researcher noted that even where women perceived that they had been adversely affected by gender bias, they still told positive stories of organisational experiences, confirming the research of Crompton and Harris (1998).

Previous studies of commitment have tended to address the issue of emotion by measurement, as discussed in Chapter two, mainly using positivistic methodologies that ignore commitment as experienced by persons in the workplace. This study has shown that emotion is an important dimension in the domain of work commitment, yet has been neglected in previous studies. The three components of CWC: organisational, professional and career commitment, were evident in the emotionalised accounts of staff presented in Chapter six, and were themselves clearly emotionalised and gendered.

Achieving work commitment

Having established the gendered and emotional nature of work commitment, other factors relating to work commitment in an academic context were considered. Once again, the intertwining of gender and emotions was seen in the accounts of academic staff. The differences in commitment to teaching and service displayed by women and men were once again evident. Women tended to embrace their work wholeheartedly, while men provided sufficient commitment to meet outcomes.

This sub-core category concluded with a discussion about creating enablers and barriers to commitment. The core category and BSP entitled “Creating Work Commitment” links the three sub-core categories by considering their impact on

organisational, professional and career commitment as experienced by people in the workplace, similar to the ways in which commitment had been categorised by Morrow (1983; 1993). The three components of CWC: organisational, professional and career commitment, were evident in the sub-core category “Achieving Work Commitment” through the accounts of staff presented in Chapter seven.

Creating Work Commitment – a Core Category and BSP

Creating Work Commitment (CWC) was the core category and BSP linking the three sub-core categories discussed above. CWC captured the foci of organisational, professional and career commitment presented in the three sub-core categories. The main elements of the core category were present in each of the sub-core categories, to the extent that each aspect of academic work (i.e., research, teaching and service) could be clearly identified with organisational, professional and career commitment in the context of each sub-core category. The core category became evident to the researcher soon after the development of the three sub-core categories. Each of the elements of the core category and BSP are now considered.

Commitment to the organisation

Academic staff provided a rich contrast in perceptions and interpretations of organisational commitment. Richard made a link between the university as a “good employer” that attracted “enthusiastic people” and as a consequence engendered commitment in its staff. However, in elaborating on how he experienced commitment to the university, he said “Well, I guess my first commitment is to my students and to my own ideas, you know. Universities are very nice, useful places that allow you to be like that, so yes. The way in which Richard had constructed commitment to the

university, made it dependent on commitment to students, a form of professional commitment, and to Richard's personal needs.

James also spoke about how he provided service to the university, despite sometimes not finding this to be particularly attractive. He gave an example of attending the university's open days as service that he disliked, yet still chose to do. He spoke of the pleasure that he derived from attending graduations and how he saw service as a measure of commitment to the university. James also observed that there were many members of academic staff who did little or no service, which for him was a demonstration of lack of commitment.

Louise spoke enthusiastically about commitment saying "... by and large it's a very committed selection of academics, people here I think are by and large doing..." and "...doing more than just the requirements, I mean, they're showing that they're internally committed to achieving," linking her observations about colleagues to their commitment to teaching and research. Asked to elaborate about commitment to the university, Louise, commented "It's not so much a commitment to...I don't think it's so much a commitment to the university as a whole, I think it's a commitment to whatever section I'm in...and so my commitment to [the university] is very much connected with how I perceive the School." Louise's observations about a level of commitment to her work unit, below that of the organisation, was also mirrored by other staff members. Martha described it as an inability to remember "...that you are a part of a bigger organisation. I think often in this, many of us live in our own little world." Failure to see the big picture was also mentioned by Mary, who said "In talking to people I can't say that I've noticed a commitment where people have said that they're doing something just because of the university."

An interesting distinction between commitment to one's job and commitment to the organisation was raised by Pam who said, "Yes, well I would think my answer would be that people are committed to their jobs and their careers." She continued, "...to the organisation I don't think there's that much necessarily in depth." She continued her explanation citing "...a weaker notion of commitment to the institution, because in our field there are so many kindred institutions that you can move around, especially if you are younger you can move around fairly readily. So I think there is a bit of conflict between commitment to the job, the career and the institution." Pam's account of commitment was interesting, and in some ways contradictory, as she had originally described her time at the university as "...a really great, positive experience the whole time."

Michael also distinguished commitment to organisation from commitment to the work itself, saying:

I don't think they have a commitment to the organisation as such. They might be very committed to their profession as a researcher, under a way of looking at research, and quite often those two, as an academic I don't think there's loyalty to the university, there's a loyalty to your research agenda, your CV and the next position that you may be looking for.

Michael continued with a story about how staff would tend to use up sick leave before they were allowed to accumulate it. Now, he reasoned, people come to work even when they are unwell "...because they feel committed to work". Michael concluded his account of instrumental commitment saying, "So I think there must be some commitment amongst us to actually get the work done."

Several staff members constructed commitment as an obligation that they felt towards the organisation, essentially normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990). Sue spoke of a commitment that she felt towards the university,

based on a perceived duty arising from the act of employment. Jillian also expressed similar sentiments, explaining her commitment to the university as reciprocal, based on the university "...being good to her." She explained that not many academics progressed at university in the way that she had and that she felt commitment because the university has supported her. She concluded by saying, "I've had opportunities to do other things but I've stayed here because I am committed to the organisation. I suppose you get commitment when your own personal ideas align with the organisations."

Sue raised the notion of self-motivation in connection with commitment. She interpreted commitment as being differently constructed in a university context, given the high levels of flexibility and autonomy that accompany academic work. Sue commented that at university "...we don't really have, other than the head of school, people standing over us you know 'for the good of [the university]' or this kind of thing." Therefore, for Sue, organisational commitment was internally generated by the member, i.e., was truly behavioural, rather than being organisationally driven. Louise spoke along similar lines, although her construction of commitment to the university was based on a notion of commitment by association. For Louise, commitment to the university arose from professional or career commitment, and was based on achievements in those domains. She said:

...and they're well respected and um, I think that's because of the quality of the work that they produce and so um, that to me indicates a commitment, or certainly a commitment to their profession and to their career but I guess it also is to the institution because they're committed to um, increasing the university's profile um, with their research.

Shaun's interpretation of commitment to the university was a dark and harrowing story of poor leadership, mediocre performance and declining levels of

commitment. In his view low organisational commitment was a function of poor leadership in past years. Consequently a culture of low commitment had evolved; one that continued through to the present time. Shaun spoke of declining levels of commitment to the university over a number of years. Blaming poor leadership in past years for the current situation, Shaun cited prominent academic leaders who had used the university "...as a stepping stone". He provided an example of his view on university leadership, saying:

I've got an old, you know an idea I have that most people can lead well when the circumstances are good, but you need special people when circumstances are ordinary, and we have poor circumstances and very ordinary leadership. Not a good combination. That's my view.

Shaun went on to say that as a result the university had not "...been particularly good at getting commitment, and most of the people I know talk about [the university] as a sort of a brand."

Poor management at academic element level was a theme in Fleur's account of commitment to the organisation. She told of issues with work allocation and lack of consultation. She said, "...if you want to talk about commitment, um, I'm not committed to the organisation because this sort of thing goes on every single semester. And, um, I'm going to um, you know, I'm basically um, looking at my exit strategies." Fleur continued:

...rarely do you come across a good manager and that does... that really does affect my commitment level, I don't have a commitment level to the organisation, I have a commitment level to the students, and to my research but to the organisation...no! why would I ?

Limited commitment was a theme also taken up by Jane, a long serving academic, who spoke of constant restructuring being a major barrier to commitment. Jane used several analogies to illustrate her point, "... you tread on it (a water bed)

and some parts go high and some parts go low. Things keep on changing. I believe it should be constant improvement, but I don't believe it should be constant restructuring. It is destabilising and much of it is done in vain.”

While Jane was commenting on commitment in the context of poorly designed and implemented change, an alternative view of change and commitment was proposed by Martha. She told of being aware of people who were strongly committed to the university, yet were upset because it was changing from its original form. However, the change that Martha was referring to was not the kind of poorly planned and implemented change the Jane referred to as occurring “...only so some people can write something in their CV”. Martha observed that some people were committed to established values, and that these people would resist change even if changes were warranted.

Several members of staff gave examples of how they interpreted commitment to the organisation, both in themselves and in others. Shirley spoke of commitment to the university being demonstrated in many small ways. For her, setting up programs that others might take over was an example of her commitment to the university. She also spoke of commitment in terms of finishing tasks that one undertakes. Ruth saw organisational commitment as representing enjoyment; with work, colleagues and students. Martha also believed that organisational commitment had relational aspects, with commitment to the organisation being dependent on commitment to colleagues and students. Michael expressed a more cynical point of view, stating that academic staff do not have high levels of organisational commitment, instead showing a commitment to research, research agenda and curriculum vitae. Michael's view was mirrored to an extent by Zane, who described the university as a “...delivery

mechanism to do what I'd like to do, so whether it's this university or another university they're not much different."

Finally, Martha suggested that commitment to the university involved

...just that everything they've got to do they do it. They do it in a timely way. They do it without complaining. They show a concern for the people in the different parts of their life. There is a concern with students. There is a concern with developing staff if it's someone in a more senior position. It's just that, they don't whinge, they don't backbite...

Jillian also focussed on the way in which committed staff carried out their work, interpreting commitment to the university as "...finding a way to do difficult things."

The accounts of women showed an intensity of commitment that was lacking in those of men. Enthusiasm, interest and a sense of duty were evident in the stories told by women, albeit in an overall climate of declining commitment. For men, explanations ranged from describing the organisation as a "delivery mechanism", to descriptions of low organisational commitment manifest by poor performance, self-interest and a focus on career building. The emotional nature of women's commitment to the organisation was different to that of men, indicating that emotions were more than just a desire to belong or take on organisational values as Meyer et al., (1990) and Porter et al., (1974) have argued.

Commitment to Profession

Commitment to profession evoked different meanings of the term "profession" to academic staff. Most staff interpreted their profession as being a teacher, researcher or academic. A smaller number of staff, mainly but not exclusively those in the "traditional" professions (e.g., accountants, engineers, lawyers), constructed their identities as members of the particular profession with which they were aligned. Several academics recognised that they had dual identities,

being “professionals” in the domains of academic work and the industry sector with which they were aligned.

Academic staff identifying themselves with recognised professional bodies, either through affiliations to professional bodies or by being qualified for work usually regarded as a profession, spoke of commitment to what was perceived to be their professional capacity. For example, Jo associated professional commitment with her chosen profession rather than with her work as an academic. Discussing this with her it was evident to the researcher that academic work was subordinate to what Jo regarded as her main profession.

Zane said that while he regarded himself as being committed to his profession he was not a member of a professional association and had no desire to be. His view was that membership of a professional association was not a necessary condition for commitment to the particular profession. A contrasting position was suggested by Sue, who was engaged in an occupation that was usually regarded as being a profession and was an active member of her professional association. Sue saw active participation in, and commitment to, the activities of the association as “...trying to contribute to the profession through broadening academic knowledge so that I can make an impact.” Zane spoke of having an “industry commitment”, suggesting that commitment to the industry in which one operated was a fundamental part of academic work. He believed that staff should “...have that external commitment to your professional organisations,” which he went on to say in his opinion was “...the life blood of the university continuing.” Martha also expressed a strong notion of the importance of professional identity, referring to it as “primacy” and a “core requirement.”

Jillian saw commitment to her profession as a process of “giving back” expressed by association membership, board of management membership, journal editorial boards and assessing grants. She also made a link between training students as “new professionals” and assisting the profession to develop and grow. Jane also saw her commitment to her profession as strong, expressed through active membership of an industry professional body. Talking about her commitment to the profession she described herself as “... very, very, passionate and very, very, strong about it.” Jane had been an executive member of her professional association at National level, and had won an award for her work. What made Jane’s story different from that of other women was that she was a highly successful female in what was traditionally a male domain.

Other academic staff members regarded elements of university work as their profession, with most staff associating the term “profession” with teaching. Peter associated professional activities with innovative teaching strategies, which he saw as strengths of the university. James argued that professional commitment was evident in the care, preparation and management of teaching, essentially a “professional” approach to the job. Mary also associated commitment to profession with teaching, making a link with improving the learning and teaching process, refining it, and getting better outcomes for students. She linked being a professional with identity construction, saying that many staff perceived teaching as just a job, when they should be thinking about it as a profession. Mary believed that staff needed to be aware, and show a commitment towards teaching, that there is “...a professional dialogue that goes with it as well as the professional actions, the professional dressing, and there’s the criticism about the way people dress, the way they talk.”

Lucy also made a link between work commitment and high levels of professionalism. Her construction of professionalism involved pride in work, self and organisation. For Lucy, measures of professionalism were receiving feedback, making improvements based on it and moving forward in one's chosen field. Lucy concluded saying, "If somebody is professional then they're showing commitment."

Zoe made a link between commitment to a profession and the three elements of academic work, saying, "I guess it's through my scholarly activities in terms of the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of research and through service." Fleur also perceived her profession as encompassing the main core of academic work, saying, "I would consider myself to be [pause] as I said from last year, when I suddenly changed my brain space, I consider myself to be an academic, not necessarily a teacher, or a researcher, but a sort of , like a combination of both." Although both Zoe and Fleur had worked in "professional" industries before commencing work at university, each now constructed a view of professional commitment based on their commitment to teaching and research. John told a similar story, in which he told of being "pretty committed" to the area in which he worked, although it wasn't a "recognised" profession as such. Reflecting on what he had said, John added, "Um [pause] I think I treat academia as a profession, I suppose." Finally, Louise, who had worked in a recognised profession before commencing work at university, interpreted the term "profession" as meaning academic profession, describing her commitment as "fairly strong".

Two members of academic staff identified themselves with commitment to a professional area of work and also to academic work as a profession. Michael spoke of having "two professions", one that involved a commitment to industry bodies, the

other to academic activities. Michael expressed a high commitment to both parts of his professional work life. Zane told a similar story, although in his case he was talking about colleagues who had "...stepped up to the plate and done a great job [pause], but also very highly committed to their professions and their academic profession, in their research, their working with peers and other institutions."

Professional commitment was shown to be a highly gendered and emotionalised construct. In the main, female staff constructed teaching as their "profession", discussing it in terms of passion and giving. Men also spoke of commitment to teaching as a profession, yet for them commitment emanated from different sources, such as good management and an association with the industry aligned with their university work. The highly gendered and emotionalised nature of professional commitment challenged the notion that emotions were merely a desire to belong or take on organisational values as suggested by Meyer et al., (1990) and Porter et al., (1974).

Commitment to Career

Commitment to career provided the most graphic differences in commitment between men and women. Career commitment has therefore been discussed in terms of men and women's commitment specifically.

Female academic staff

Self-improvement and acquiring knowledge were articulated by several female academics. Speaking about her sister who also was an academic, Mary characterised her as a "...career woman who is very committed to learning more" in order to improve her own understanding and to improve services to client groups. A similar theme of self-improvement was evident when Shirley spoke about her sister,

who like Mary's sister was also an academic, describing her as a career woman who was "...born to be in the university..." and who displayed high levels of commitment to her career. Ruth also saw developing skills and acquiring new knowledge, along with giving extra time and energy, and enjoying work, as signs of commitment. In addition, she indicated that meeting standards and always aiming to achieve the best outcome were indicators of commitment to career.

Depth of knowledge and the strength of one's network of people were also seen by Ruth to be a means of building a successful academic career. The confidence that accompanied extensive knowledge was also evident in the techniques and new approaches used in teaching, often engendering improved student responses and greater interaction. Ruth held academics with such qualities in high esteem, aspiring to be like them and actively "...seeking out people who can assist you in developing specific skills or exposing you to a knowledge bank that you haven't got."

Zoe described herself as "...very much a coal face, chalk face kind of person," for whom learning and doing things herself were important signs of commitment. In terms of building an academic career she believed that she was in error, strategically, by choosing to undertake qualitative research, which to her was more time consuming than quantitative research, and in an area [social science] that under the prevailing scientific paradigm was deemed to be "...not sexy". She continued, saying:

I believe that if we work in an institution like this we should have a commitment to learning and so for me in a higher education institution the whole focus should be about learning. So that should be a commitment and everything should be directed towards that.

Zoe observed that in addition to limited access to research funding, the opportunities to publish from her research were reduced due to the comparatively small number of journals that published qualitative research. She concluded by saying that her aim as a

career academic was to influence policy, influence work, "...make a difference," and obtain gratification from teaching.

Pam displayed a more pragmatic approach to her career, seeing it almost as a reciprocal arrangement with the university, saying "...you do sort of simultaneously work for yourself, for your own career advancement, and your career advancement seems to depend a lot on, is much more related to, the amount of effort that you put in." She expressed the view "...that although I really feel that I work hard for [the university] I feel that I work hard for myself because I will fairly directly reap the rewards of my hard work." Pam had earlier disclosed that she was not comfortable teaching subjects of which she had no real-world experience, therefore she perceived that career investments emanated from her research output only.

Helping others and trust were seen by some female academics as important work commitment issues. Martha spoke of helping colleagues as an indication of the commitment of academic staff, arguing that there was a relational aspect to commitment, giving as an example:

I mean if you're committed to your organisation, unless you're committed to the people around you there is some, what's the word I am looking for to say that comes with it, expectation that you know I'm there when that person can't be there to pick up. My colleague next door, his wife had a prem baby and he had to leave like that. Now the person's who's really committed in there says 'pass the honours student straight on to me, give me a mobile phone number,' that's somebody with commitment. So an uncommitted person would just say, 'well that's your problem'.

Jillian also suggested that commitment entailed a relational aspect, with trust as a key part of the relationship. Also, Jillian believed that commitment involved embracing organisational values, making the organisation's aspirations one's own,

and engaging the organisation, and the people working and studying within it, in a positive manner. To reinforce her point, Jillian gave an example of distrust and a lack of cooperation involving staff in different academic units of the university. She concluded by saying, “So, I guess the idea is if you feel you’re in a safe environment you’ll share, you know. I guess my ultimate thing is I don’t think we’re going to [achieve a particular strategic target] if we don’t start trusting each other in the bigger picture.”

Jane mentioned “...generosity of spirit” as a key ingredient of commitment, for example not stopping work at five o’clock, as she believed some academics did. She saw commitment as a relationship based on fairness in one’s dealings with colleagues and students. Jane also constructed academic staff commitment as something more than instrumental, or just an exchange process, saying “I don’t believe they are here just for the money, I don’t believe that. It is not my impression that anybody is here only for the money.” Jane expressed her commitment as constantly thinking about problematic issues facing students, and seeking constant improvement in terms of research.

Fleur also suggested a link between hard work and commitment, mentioning “working long hours” as a mark of her commitment. She emphasised that doing additional “little things”, such as using her own money to purchase plagiarism software and supplying additional student learning materials, were signs of her commitment to students. She was pleased when students commented about the extra effort she had made. Kathryn also expressed her commitment in terms of “...doing extra curricula work” that involved more than “...just ticking the box, or just turning

up.” Kathryn also saw commitment as making a contribution to the wider purpose of her academic unit.

Louise also spoke about working long hours as a sign of commitment to either career or organisation, suggesting that it might be both. She also saw quality of work as an indication of commitment, with repute and respect of peers as measures of this. She continued, saying:

I think that’s because of the quality of the work that they produce and so um, that to me indicates a commitment, or certainly a commitment to their profession and to their career but I guess it also is to the institution because they’re committed to um, increasing the university’s profile um, with their research...

She concluded with the observation that there was an element of self-interest in the actions of her peers as high ratings for either one’s academic unit or the university enhanced one’s academic profile. She described the relationship as “... a little bit of a give and take.”

The researcher interpreted the accounts of hard work and long hours as recognition by some women that career investments needed to follow the male notion of presenteeism in order for a person to be successful in the academy. While not all women expressed similar views it was evident that there was recognition by this group of women that unless similar tactics to those employed by men were used, career progress would be difficult. This mirrored the experiences of Franzway (2000) where women who failed to meet the male standard were perceived to have low levels of commitment.

A contrasting perspective of academic work commitment was provided by Sue, who spoke of some colleagues, mostly male, investing heavily in the research component of their work at the expense of teaching and service. Sue’s view of staff

who concentrated just on research was that they were committed to only part of their job, and that their commitment was shown by the contribution that such individuals made. She explained “I just get the feeling from observing an individual’s behaviour that they’re just committed to what they’re doing, or they’re committed to certain aspects but not everything.”

Jo also followed a similar line to that suggested by Sue. She argued that a gendered division of labour existed within academic work, with men pursuing grants and research as obvious investments in their careers, leaving women to carry out work that was perceived to be less valuable by decision makers. Jo contended that women were not so pragmatic, and “...because they love the students and because they love the interactions, they are more attracted to the teaching side...”

Male academic staff

John expressed his commitment as a reciprocal arrangement, characterised by loyalty and commitment towards the organisation on his part, and stable employment and a career path from the organisation in return. John spoke of his commitment being based on the university having employed him “...at a late stage in my career when probably a lot of other institutions wouldn’t, well certainly outside the educational sector. So they’ve demonstrated a commitment to me and I demonstrate a commitment to them.” When asked how he believed his commitment was demonstrated, John commented that it was through interest he took in teaching and the research undertaken by him. He stated that other organisational activities only indicated a generally positive approach towards work. John interpreted commitment as having a positive mental attitude to all aspects of work, demonstrated by achieving outcomes. John qualified his interpretation of academic work commitment by saying

that in practice there was tension between commitment to organisation, profession and career, due to a higher regard for research publications than for teaching or service. John's comment about tension related to the perception among staff that decision makers place greater value on research than on either teaching or service to the university. This caused tension for academic staff who realised that in career terms they should be investing more heavily in research, yet still were committed to meeting standards of excellence in teaching, and providing appropriate service.

Loyalty was also the main theme in Peter's story, which he expressed as "if I'm generally doing what I can do to my best ability, I'd expect the organisation to provide to the best of its ability; commitment back in." He continued, expanding on the theme of reciprocal loyalty:

I think in one way, by nature, I've always been committed [pause]. I tend to develop a sense of commitment and a sense of relationship to the environment that I'm in, because I figure if I'm loyal to that then it should be loyal to me.

Peter's account of commitment was similar to that of John, being based on reciprocal loyalty, effectively an exchange process between individual and organisation.

Michael's construction of commitment was based on setting achievable standards, meeting expectations, and having the motivation and dedication to achieve agreed outcomes. Several other male academic staff members also conceptualised commitment in similar terms to Michael. Understanding the job, working hard, and doing it well were espoused by Richard as important indicators of commitment. In the area of teaching, Richard believed in expending extra effort in order to meet the expectations of students. Peter also spoke of exceeding expectations as an important aspect of commitment.

Derek presented a different perspective from other male academics, saying that women were more interested in work activities and were usually better organised than their male colleagues being "...more interested in how things are going and their relationships within the department, and they are the one's who are concerned if things aren't working properly." Derek continued, saying that in his view a committed worker would be eager, conscientious, a good teacher, would enhance collegiality, and would contribute to the university's profile. When asked by the researcher whether he was describing a male or female colleague, Derek indicated that the person that he had in mind was a female. Continuing, he indicated that staff members who were experiencing frustration and alienation as a result of perceived poor management or ineffective decision making were really the most highly committed. Those who just accepted situations actually were *less* committed. Derek explained how he interpreted his colleagues' commitment saying:

...when things are going badly um, the frustration that people feel, they're the ones that are actually more committed. The ones that keep their heads down, never leave their room, are the ones who are just committed in their own career because they're basically, they're essentially just saying 'we're here, we do research, we do teaching, but this is just a temporary home for us [pause] we'll be here for a couple of years but we will go onto a better place'.

Derek then qualified his perceptions of academic staff commitment by elaborating on how academic colleagues carried on with work, despite a climate that engendered low commitment and low morale, saying:

...despite the negative atmosphere and the lack of morale within our department, you still try to do your best, and I think that's about the commitment and [pause] the [pause], but of course at some point you'll join the exodus of people from our department, and ah, probably end up in [another city].

The contrasting accounts of women and men regarding commitment to career supported the differences that the researcher had observed and interpreted throughout the research. Commitment constructed by women had an entirely different basis to that of men. Women's commitment was articulated using terms such as love of interaction, contributing, improving, holistic, helping, trusting, engaging and generosity of spirit. Juxtaposed, were men whose commitment was constructed around terms like reciprocity, loyalty in a normative sense, achieving outcomes, meeting standards, conscientiousness and doing one's best. Career commitment, closely followed by professional commitment, was the most gendered and emotionalised form of commitment in this study. The highly gender and emotionalised nature of career commitment challenged the notion that emotions were merely a desire to belong or take on organisational values as suggested by Meyer et al., (1990) and Porter et al., (1974).

The gendered nature of work commitment has been reinforced by the different ways in which women and men construct commitment. The meaning of commitment for academic staff, discussed in the previous chapter, clearly shows that for women academics commitment was based around engagement with individuals. For men, commitment occurred at the organisational level. Non-participation and non-involvement by men were identified by women as their main cause of lack of commitment. These accounts of commitment resonated with Marshall's (1984) research which has suggested that women deal with the outside world through interaction with people, while for men the relationship is instrumental, often through a process of exchange.

Marshall (1984, p. 63) has termed the different ways of dealing with the world “agency” and “communion” In describing agency she has suggested that men aim to manage tension by changing the environment in which it exists. Control is achieved by placing difficult situations “outside the self” (Marshall, 1984, p. 64). Agency is instrumental involving minimal contact with one’s external environment.

Marshall (1984, p. 65) has suggested that women deal with the world through communion, an approach based on relationships that involves “wholeness”. Communion tends to involve a focus on the self with “emotional tone” projected to the foreground. For women, relationships “between elements are more important than the elements themselves” (Marshall, 1984, p. 67).

The gendered nature of commitment, manifest through agency and communion (Marshall, 1984), was also evident in the development of the core category of the grounded theory of work commitment. Both Ruth and Martha suggested that work commitment was based on interactions with colleagues and students. Furthermore, the importance of the relational aspect to Martha was evident in her belief that organisational commitment was firstly dependent on commitment to colleagues and students. Finally, the link between the notion of communion and women’s commitment was articulated by the use of terms such as love of interaction, helping, trusting and generosity of spirit.

Evaluating “Creating Work Commitment” as a Core Category and BSP

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Strauss and Corbin (1998) have proposed criteria for evaluating the empirical grounding of a study. The core category “Creating Work Commitment” is now evaluated against the criteria:

Generation of concepts

Concepts and conceptual categories were developed from data collected for the research. The process of concept and category development is clearly articulated in Chapter four, based on open, axial and theoretic coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; 1998). Details of the grouping of categories, leading to the development of sub-core categories, are provided in tables at the commencement of Chapters five, six and seven.

Systematic linkage between concepts

Concepts presented in each sub-core category are linked by a theme common to the sub-core category. For example, in Chapter seven the enablers and barriers to commitment are discussed in terms of the linkage between concepts. Gendered (e.g., men's focus on careers often at the expense of women, balancing work and family life, women working in greedy institutions) and emotional aspects (e.g., women expressing commitment through caring, helping and enjoyment) are also major themes linking concepts.

Development and conceptual density of categories

Categories are tightly linked and conceptually dense; that is, they have many properties and dimensions (e.g., in the sub-core category Gendering Academic Work, the category *Commitment Through Exceeding Requirements* contains a rich and dense account of commitment expressed by nine academic staff members). All categories contain at least two concepts, while most contain several concepts.

Accommodation of variation

Variation has been accommodated in this research; much in answering the research question and generating the grounded theory. In particular, the grounded

theory of work commitment accounts for similarities and differences within and between sub-core categories and the core category. Additionally, other items of variation have been identified (e.g., the commodification of commitment), which will be addressed in future research.

Consideration of micro and macro conditions

Explanations of phenomena have been incorporated into the analysis and reconceptualisation of work commitment. Explanations include interpretation of interview data, observational data and the creativity of the researcher as part of the process of symbolic interactionism. Interpretations have been linked with literature wherever possible. Use of the conditional matrix has facilitated consideration of micro and macro factors.

Consideration of process

Actions/interactions over time have been considered. Process has been discussed above in the context of the sub-core and core categories. Each of the sub-core categories is processual in nature, and meets Strauss and Corbin's (1998, p. 165) definition of process, that is, each sub-core category consists of several stages through which it progresses.

Significance and extent of findings

The research provides significant findings in five main areas. Firstly, it suggests that the extensive work commitment literature is flawed by not considering gender as an important construct in the conceptualisation of work commitment. Gender is a key to the conceptualisation and theorisation of work commitment. Secondly, it suggests that attempts to understand affective commitment (i.e., through measuring emotional attachment to one's organisation) have not led to the emotional

and gendered nature of commitment being understood adequately. Emotions intertwine with gender and attempting to understand emotions by measurement alone is not sufficient. Thirdly, current research approaches in the domain of work commitment are flawed, being based on a dualistic ontology and positivistic epistemology. Current approaches have led to frequent measurement of a phenomenon that has not been understood by researchers and decision makers in organisations. The current research provides a balanced account of work commitment as experienced by academic workers themselves. Fourthly, the current view that career commitment is contained within professional commitment does not hold in the workplace studied. At the university in question there was a clear distinction between professional and career commitment. Surprisingly, the classification of commitment as organisational, professional and career by Morrow (1983; 1993) has been shown to be accurate, though serendipitous, given the complex gender and emotional relationships that were excluded by Morrow (1983; 1993) in her original research. Finally, the research provides a substantive grounded theory of the work commitment of academic staff at a particular university. As such, it provides a platform for further research into work commitment.

Does the theory stand the test of time

The grounded theory of work commitment comprises the core category “Creating Work Commitment” together with the sub-core categories “Gendering Work Commitment”, “Emotionalising Work Commitment” and “Achieving Work Commitment”. Whether the theory stands the test of time is difficult to evaluate at the present time. However, the researcher believes that the grounded theory generated by this research informs the ways in which work commitment is theorised and

conceptualised in a way that will be useful for future research. Having said this, the gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment suggested by this study may not be generalisable (i.e., it is a substantive not a formal theory), although it may be indicative of commitment in many workplaces.

Conclusion

In completing the aim of the research, that is reconceptualising work commitment through the generation of a new theory, it was evident from accounts provided by academic staff that commitment to the university (i.e., organisational commitment) was regarded as less important than professional or career commitment. Where the university was concerned, most staff members spoke of weak or non-existent commitment. Some staff expressed a commitment to a school or department, yet did not extend their commitment to the university. In terms of the service aspect of academic work most academics did not express a commitment to service. Most academics regarded service as a necessary but not sufficient condition for advancement. Links between service and commitment to organisation or department were weak. In the few instances where staff members did express positive organisational commitment, this was couched in terms of duty or reciprocity, mostly expressed in normative terms. An interesting interpretation of low organisational commitment was provided by Sue, who identified commitment as being member-based rather than organisation-based, a behavioural view of commitment.

In constructing professional commitment, academic staff espoused two main notions of commitment. The first notion espoused commitment to a profession (e.g. accountant, lawyer), or to a professional association (e.g. the Law Society). The second notion espoused commitment to aspects of academic work (e.g. teaching,

research). The researcher noted that while academic staff in the second group regarded teaching and research as work associated with their profession, service to the university or community were not linked to professional work. Staff interpreted professional commitment as being strong, both to a profession itself and to academic work. In terms of academic work, a greater number of staff members associated teaching with professional commitment than research. The gendering of professional commitment was evident to the researcher, with women predominantly associating commitment to teaching as professional commitment.

Career commitment for women was mainly constructed around learning (e.g. developing new skills and knowledge), helping (e.g. colleagues and students), giving (e.g. generosity of spirit), and working long hours. Some women expressed a gendered view of career commitment, arguing that male colleagues invested heavily in their careers at the expense of teaching and service. Women were not so pragmatic, being attracted to teaching by the interpersonal aspects of students and teaching. The researcher noted that while the gendered aspects of career commitment did not seem to be evident to men, reciprocity (i.e., an instrumental form of commitment) appeared to be a reason for male staff commitment.

Finally, the grounded theory “Creating Work Commitment” has been evaluated against the criteria suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998). Evaluation has shown that the grounded theory is robust, meeting all of the evaluation criteria.

In conclusion, the grounded theory of work commitment has provided a highly gendered and emotionalised account of commitment. The gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment is evident in accounts of organisational, professional and career commitment as experienced by organisational members.

Building careers, often at the expense of women, appeared to be the main reason underpinning the commitment of male staff members. Men showed career commitment by focussing on research, often at the expense of commitment to profession (e.g., teaching) and organisation (e.g., service to the university), which were minimised.

The final chapter discusses the implications and conclusions resulting from addressing the research question and from the grounded theory of work commitment constructed in the study. Implications for theory and practice are considered, together with limitations of the study and opportunities for further research.

Chapter 9

Implications and Conclusions

Introduction

This thesis has discussed how work commitment is a gendered and emotionalised construct. The study commenced with a review of the work commitment, gender and emotion literatures. The review established what gaps exist in understanding how these important concepts have been theorised and understood in relation to contemporary workplaces. The review has indicated that work commitment has been researched and conceptualised in ways that do not consider the importance and impact of gender and emotions. Given that work commitment has not been conceptualised and understood in a way that considers important issues such as gender and emotions, and the ways in which they are intertwined with commitment, a reconceptualisation of work commitment has been undertaken in order to address the question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?*

Most research into work commitment has been quantitative, with a focus on measurement of commitment to organisation, profession and career. In seeking to reconceptualise work commitment an interpretive approach, utilising Strauss' approach to grounded theory, has been taken. This is a novel approach in researching commitment, which allows phenomena to be understood through the ways in which workers themselves interpret commitment to their organisation, profession and career. The context for the study is academic staff in an Australian university.

Analysis of data collected from participant interviews shows that work commitment is a gendered construct, with the meaning of commitment being different for men and women. Women are forced to compete with the conflicting

demands of the greedy institutions of home and the workplace, a challenge that men mainly do not have to face. In the main men are focussed on building their careers, by concentrating their work efforts towards research, which is more highly valued by decision makers than teaching or service to the university. Men's focus on research is often at the expense of teaching and service, with the result that women are often left with a disproportionate amount of teaching. Emotions are central to the way in which commitment is constructed, not only in the way that they are displayed but also in the way emotions are considered to be indicators of work commitment. Women often display emotions like caring, excitement and passion in the construction of commitment. Juxtaposed is the male construction of commitment where few men express commitment through emotions, relying instead on presenteeism and meeting the standards of the norm of organisational man. These issues impact on organisational, professional and career commitment; issues which have not been considered adequately in previous research.

Reconceptualising work commitment, using a grounded theory approach, has shown that gender, emotions and other work-related issues form the main sub-core categories that underpin the core category and BSP that makes the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment. The Grounded Theory of Work Commitment explains how organisational, professional and career commitments are gendered and emotionalised constructs, and how gender and emotions are linked and intertwined, both with each other, and with the other categories making up the grounded theory.

What is evident in addressing the research question: *How is work commitment gendered and emotionalised?* is that organisational commitment is weak for women

and men, this being reflected at the organisational and departmental levels. In contrast to weak organisational commitment is a strong commitment to profession, which is clearly gendered, with women mainly constructing “profession” as a commitment to teaching. Career commitment is also gendered, with women mainly displaying commitment through the emotions of giving, caring and helping. For men, career commitment is mainly constructed through a focus on research, with a strong emphasis on reciprocity.

Conclusions about the Gendered Nature of Work Commitment

In addressing the first part of the research question, (i.e., the part relating to gender), the research has shown that gender plays an important part in the work commitment of academic staff, further suggesting that studies that have neglected the impact that gender has on work commitment are flawed

The large body of extant literature in the domain of work commitment (e.g., Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) has tended to disregard the impact of gender on the construct. Past research, involving many studies over a period of more than 30 years, has predominantly been conducted using positivistic approaches, with a focus on measurement rather than understanding. Consequently, the gendered and emotional aspects of work commitment have not been understood from the perspective of organisational members. In the limited studies that have considered the different ways in which women and men experience and display commitment (e.g., Franzway, 2000; Singh & Vinnicombe, 2000a, 2000b), research has not provided an integrated account of the impact of gender and emotions on work commitment.

Consistent with Bellas' (1999) research, the current study reveals a highly gendered workplace. It is an environment where the imposts of a greedy organisation, together with the difficulties that women face in balancing work and family, shape and modify the commitment of workers. Competing commitments result in some women not meeting the male notion of the ideal worker; also falling short of the notion of the ideal mother in trying to balance the competing requirements of work and family. In the context of the study, work is centred on three main processes of academic life; research, teaching and service. Staff should be competent in each of the three areas, with meritorious or outstanding performance being required for promotion to higher levels. Satisfactory achievement of the three main processes appears to be non-gendered. However, behind the façade of gender neutrality lies a gendered workplace where women are disadvantaged not only in the ways in which work is *carried out* but also in the ways that it is *assessed*. The commitment of staff to their work duties is also gendered for two main reasons. Firstly, the organisation, as a greedy institution (Coser, 1974; Franzway, 2000; 2001), holds unreasonable expectations of its staff through unrealistic workloads which impact on commitment, particularly that of women. Greedy institutions militate against the commitment of women, and some men, who have competing interests, such as family or carers, outside their scheduled or "normal" hours of work. Secondly, the commitment that some staff have to their own careers, irrespective of the impact this has on their peers, has gendered undertones.

The research finds that commitment to the elements of academic work is gendered, with tension between organisational, professional and career commitment, findings which are supported by Deem (2003) and Acker and Feuerwerker (1996).

Consistent with Deem's (2003) research, women perceived men as investing in their careers at the expense of teaching and service to the university, the latter being regarded as less important by decision makers. While men, sometimes through the careful selection of service roles, are able to escape the consequences of low organisational commitment, women are unable to do so. Women often do the unpopular, but essential tasks, that men choose not to do (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996) even though these tasks (e.g. pastoral care) may be perceived as less rewarding as career investments (Wyn, Acker, & Richards, 2000).

Conclusions about the Emotionalised Nature of Work Commitment

In further addressing the research question, the research has also constructed the emotional nature of work commitment as experienced by people in the workplace. In addressing the second part of the research question (i.e., the part relating to emotions) the research shows that emotions play an important part in the work commitment of workers. In this research it is shown that the emotions that women display are different from those of men, supporting Bellas' (1999) research that women are regarded as sensitive and emotional, while men are not. The importance of emotions is underlined by the construction of a sub-core category that deals with the emotionalised nature of commitment. Emotions, together with the gendered nature of much emotional work, call into doubt the ways in which emotions have been conceptualised in previous research within the domain of work commitment. As Brown (2002) suggested, in organisational research meaning matters as much as measurement and meaning is intertwined with emotion. Bringing gender and emotions together is a major innovation in the theorising and conceptualisation of work commitment.

The current research shows that emotions such as fear, inadequacy, love, caring and passion are emotions that are frequently expressed by women in conjunction with their work commitment at university. Juxtaposed are feelings such as anger and frustration experienced by men. The gendered nature of emotions was emphasised by the four main categories of emotions, experienced mainly by women: caring, passion, emotional work and excitement. Women tended to link strong emotions with a commitment to teaching (i.e., professional commitment) and to carrying out service roles (i.e., organisational commitment), work which men perceive as being of lower value and therefore more the domain of women.

The research also finds that commitment to the elements of academic work is emotionalised, with tension between organisational, professional and career commitment. As with the gendered aspects of commitment discussed above, women perceive men as investing in their careers at the expense of teaching and service to the university, the latter being regarded as less important work by decision makers. In the eyes of many women academics, men regard teaching and service, and the emotional work that is associated with them (e.g. high demands of students), as elements of academic work that are necessary but not sufficient work activities for career development.

Implications for Theory

In addressing the research question this research not only makes a significant contribution to the body of knowledge relating to the gendered and emotionalised aspects of work commitment, it also has implications for the wider body of knowledge about work commitment. Contributions to the wider body of knowledge of work commitment include (a) the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment; (b) the

use of grounded theory to construct a theory of work commitment; (c) the importance of gender in theorising and conceptualising work commitment; (d) the impact of emotions in accounting for affective commitment; (e) extending previous research by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000) into the different ways in which women conceptualise and display commitment; and (f) challenging the research of Cherniss and Kane (1987) and Von Glinow (1988) that career commitment should be used as a measure of commitment, rather than professional commitment. Contributions to the wider body of work commitment knowledge are discussed below.

The Grounded Theory of Work Commitment

The Grounded Theory of Work Commitment is a reconceptualisation of work commitment as constructed and interpreted by people in the workplace. The theory shows that gender, emotions, and enablers and barriers to commitment, act to form and modify the ultimate foci of the work commitment of people in the workplace. These foci are organisational, professional and career commitment.

The theory shows that investments in work commitment made by staff are gendered and emotion laden. Men tend to concentrate on career-building activities. In this research the focus is on research, at the expense of teaching and service to the university. Juxtaposed are women who are left to pick up the teaching and service work that men avoid. The perception of staff is that teaching and service are rated lower than research in the eyes of decision makers.

In addition to the gendered and emotional aspects of the theory, attention is given to issues identified by workers as enablers and barriers to work commitment. These are mostly gendered and emotionalised, and the effects of gender and emotions

on the ultimate foci of work commitment (i.e., organisation, profession and career) are evident throughout the theory.

The Grounded Theory of Work Commitment offers new and important insights into the phenomenon of work commitment. In doing so it challenges some of the long established tenets of commitment, such as its gender neutrality as argued in the meta-analyses of Cohen and Lowenberg (1990) and Mathieu and Zajac (1990). The theory also challenges the conceptualisation of emotions in previous research (Meyer et al., 1990; Porter et al., 1974) as being just the desire for organisational membership, or to take on organisational values. The grounded theory shows that emotions are an integral part of commitment and are closely entwined with gendered aspects of commitment.

Methodological implications

The research shows that work commitment is a gendered and emotionalised construct. Gender and emotions have an important influence on work commitment. Constructs such as women working in a greedy organisation, presenteeism, the need to balance work and family life, differing standards, and the ways in which commitment is appraised are important issues which in the main have not been considered in previous research. Similarly, previous research into work commitment has not considered emotions, other than in a cursory and crudely measured way. Emotions such as passion, enthusiasm, concern for others, and caring are important emotions that impact on work commitment. As previously discussed, most research into the phenomenon of work commitment has been quantitative, mainly attempting to draw meaning from a dualistic ontology and positivistic epistemology. Continued

use of quantitative approaches has prevented constructs like gender and emotions being understood through the experiences of people in the workplace.

Using a grounded theory approach to identify constructs like gender and emotions, then to build a theory based on the interpretations of people in the workplace, offers a novel and different way of conceptualising work commitment. The study confirms that if researchers wish to *understand* the attitudes of people in the workplace, this is best achieved through approaches such as grounded theory.

The importance of gender in theorising and conceptualising work commitment

The research has shown that gender is a fundamental construct in theorising and conceptualising work commitment. The ubiquitous nature of gender is evident in the Grounded Theory of Work Commitment and in addressing the research question. The importance of gender as a construct of work commitment suggests that previous research, which has been blind to, or suppressed, gender, is flawed.

The impact of emotions in accounting for affective work commitment

In the extensive work commitment literature, emotions have mainly been accounted for as a willingness a member to exert effort on his or her organisation's behalf (e.g., Meyer et al., 1990; Porter et al., 1974). This research shows that emotions affect commitment to a greater extent than previous research has suggested. Emotions are not just about taking on organisational values or desiring organisational membership, they are important factors in engendering commitment, and vice versa, often intertwined with gendered aspects of commitment.

Dealing with emotions, as important constructs in theorising and conceptualising work commitment, challenges the predominantly positivistic approaches of previous research (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990;

Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974). This research offers insights into the emotions of organisational members through the interpretations of the members themselves.

Extending previous research by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000)

Previous research by Singh and Vinnicombe (2000a) has shown that the meaning of commitment is different for women than for men. Women often use terms such as availability, involvement and concern for people. Men tend to use terms associated with task delivery, such as proactive, adding value and being ready for the challenge.

The research confirms that women and men experience different emotions which impact on work commitment. This research extends the range of emotions attributed to women and men in conceptualising and theorising commitment, identifying emotions such as passion, love and caring.

Building on Singh and Vinnicombe's (2000a) research, this research suggests that differences in the emotional aspects of commitment also exist depending on the focus of the emotion. For example, in this study when women expressed anger it was mainly directed at the behaviour of male colleagues. When men expressed anger, it was mainly directed at perceived poor management and decision making at the organisational level.

Career and professional commitment as distinct constructs

This research challenges the propositions of Cherniss and Kane (1987) and Von Glinow (1988) that career commitment should be used rather than professional commitment (i.e., career commitment effectively entails professional commitment). This research shows that in the work context studied, professional and career

commitment represent different concepts, and therefore should be conceptualised separately.

Implications for Practice

Currently business and management use and rely on a flawed way of understanding an important organisational construct. Continued use of dualistic and positivistic research distorts the real meaning of commitment to organisational members. Organisations and managers, using measures derived in the traditional way, will continue to make decisions that disadvantage a large proportion, sometimes the majority, of their workforce.

Recognising that gender and emotions are important and intertwining parts of work commitment will inform managerial decision making, particularly in the areas of promotion and performance appraisal. Understanding the gendered and emotionalised nature of commitment, along with the enablers and barriers to it, will assist in managing organisational, professional and career commitment more effectively. The Grounded Theory of Work Commitment links theory and application by providing an opportunity for organisations to reassess the ways in which they assess work commitment and the decisions that are based on current, flawed assessments of workers, particularly women.

The university, on which this study is based, frequently communicates accounts of high levels of organisational commitment from its members. It also espouses high regard for providing a work environment that facilitates achieving an effective work/life balance. The research suggests that organisational commitment is in fact low; far lower than either professional or career commitment. In terms of work/life balance, the perceptions of staff interviewed in this study suggest that the

environment espoused by the university, is not matched by what organisational members perceive in action.

The gendered nature of the workplace leads to inequities through the work undertaken mainly by women, when compared with that done by men. Women tend to care about, and undertake, teaching and service to a greater extent than men, even though women realise that this is often detrimental to their careers. Men tend to be more committed to building their careers through a focus on research at the expense of the other aspects of academic work. The imbalance should be recognised by organisational decision makers.

Limitations

This research has developed a substantive grounded theory of the gendered and emotionalised nature of work commitment in the context of an Australian university. By its nature, a substantive theory tends to have a local focus and therefore no claims about its generalisability may be made (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Outcomes that have a local focus and possibly limited generalisability are a feature of grounded theory research.

The context of the study also acts to limit the study. The university that is the subject of the study is going through significant changes due to reforms in the higher education sector. A wholly Australian focus also limits the study.

Within the university in the study there are differences between academic units that are not specifically identified in the research. The intra-university environment acts to limit the study.

Extant literature confirms the predominance of narrow methodological and theoretical perspectives relating to work commitment, and to gender and emotions in

the context of commitment. More work is needed to advance the understanding of work commitment as experienced and interpreted by people in the workplace.

Finally, in terms of autobiographical reflexivity, the researcher is a man studying the gendered and emotionalised aspects of work commitment of men and women. As a member of academic staff the researcher brings his own perspectives and approaches to the research.

The research generated large amounts of rich data, some of which were not used in this study as their links to the research question were deemed by the researcher to be peripheral. The researcher's interpretations of data influenced which data were included in the study.

Further Research

The research has identified several areas for further research. These include (a) further research to ascertain the generalisability of the findings of this research ; (b) research into the commodification of commitment (i.e., commitment has a value which may be traded); (c) research into the composition on power structures in universities; and (d) research into organisational citizenship behaviour.

Other opportunities include a study of work commitment in other contexts that have similar attributes. Contexts with similar attributes include the workplaces of professionals such as accountants and lawyers. Further studies may also be conducted using other qualitative methodologies (e.g., ethnography, hermeneutics) to explore further the ways in which people experience and interpret commitment in contemporary workplaces.

Cross national studies offer the opportunity for comparative studies of work commitment. Studies in cultures where the relationship between women and men is

different (e.g., Sweden) would inform the work commitment literature. Intra gender research, that is studies of work commitment within gender groups, also offers promise for future research.

Finally, future research could include policy implications resulting from a better understanding of work commitment, and its gendered and emotionalised nature. Studies could involve not just the university sector, but other professional sectors including the public sector.

The majority of the extant literature suggests that work commitment is a non-gendered and minimally emotionalised construct. This theory-building research has shown that work commitment is a more complex phenomenon than the literature has suggested, and provides a foundation for further research into the phenomenon.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), 139-158.
- Acker, J. (1992). Gendering organizational theory. In A. Mills & P. Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering organizational analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (1996). Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 26*(3), 401-422.
- Adams, J. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.
- Adams, J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 2*, 267-299.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1995). An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership and empowerment. *Women in Management Review, 10*(2), 3-8.
- Allen, F. (1990). *Academic women in Australian universities*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.
- Allport, C. (1996). Improving gender equity: Using industrial bargaining. *NTEU Frontline, Autumn*, 5-8.
- Allred, B., Snow, C., & Miles, R. (1996). Characteristics of managerial careers in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive, 10*, 17-27.
- Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. (1997). *Understanding gender and organizations*. London: Sage.

- Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology*. London: Sage.
- Angle, H., & Perry, J. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 1-14.
- Angle, H., & Perry, J. (1983). Individual and organizational differences. *Work and Occupations*, 10(2), 123-146.
- Aranya, N., Pollock, J., & Amernic, J. (1981). An examination of professional commitment in public accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 6, 271-280.
- Argyris, C. (1976). Leadership, learning and changing the status quo. *Organizational Dynamics*, 4(3), 29-43.
- Arminio, J., & Hultgren, F. (2002). Breaking out from the shadow: The question of criteria in qualitative research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(4), 446-460.
- Armon-Jones, C. (1991). *Varieties of affect*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Astin, H., & Snyder, M. (1982). A decade of response. *Change*, 14, 26-31.
- Babchuk, W. (1996). *Glaser or Strauss? Grounded theory and adult education*. Paper presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing and Community Education, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NA, 17-19 October, 1996.
- Bacchi, C. (1993). The brick wall: Why so few women become senior academics. *Australian Universities Review*, 36(1), 36-41.
- Bailey, P. (1996). Assuring quality in narrative analysis. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 18(2), 186-195.

- Bass, B. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries. *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.
- Baxter, L., & Hughes, C. (2004). Tongue sandwiches and bagel days: Sex, food and mind-body dualism. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(4), 363-380.
- Becker, H. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-40.
- Becker, P. (1993). Common pitfalls of published grounded theory research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 3(2), 254-260.
- Beechey, V., & Perkins, T. (1987). *A matter of hours: Women, part-time work and the labour market*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bellas, M. (1999). Emotional labor in academia: The case of professors. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561(1), 96-110.
- Bem, S. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Benoliel, J. (1996). Grounded theory and nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, 6(3), 406-428.
- Bettencourt, L., & Brown, S. (2003). Role stressors and customer-oriented boundary-spanning behaviors in service organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(4), 394-408.
- Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2003). Zealotry or nostalgic regret? Women leaders in technical and further education in Australia: Agents of change, entrepreneurial educators or corporate citizens. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(4), 478-503.

- Blaikie, N. (1993). *Approaches to social enquiry*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blau, G. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 58*, 277-288.
- Blau, G. (2001). On assessing the construct validity of two multidimensional constructs: Occupational commitment and occupational entrenchment. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*, 279-298.
- Blau, G., & Ryan, J. (1997). On measuring work ethic: A neglected work commitment facet. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 435-448.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism*. Los Angeles: Prentice-Hall.
- Boudens, C. (2005). The story of work: A narrative analysis of workplace emotion. *Organization Studies, 26*(9), 1285-1306.
- Bradley, H., Healy, G., & Mukherjee, N. (2004). Union influence on career development: Bringing in gender and ethnicity. *Career Development International, 9*(1), 74-88.
- Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (2002). Reflexive fathers: Negotiating parental leave and working life. *Gender, Work and Organization, 9*(2), 186-203.
- Brett, J., & Stroh, L. (1997). Jumping ship: Who benefits from an external labor market career strategy? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 331-341.
- Brewer, A. (2000). Work design for flexible work scheduling: Barriers and gender implications. *Gender, Work and Organization, 7*(1), 33-44.
- Brewis, J., & Linstead, S. (2004). Gender and management. In S. Linstead, L. Fulop & S. Lilley (Eds.), *Management and organization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Brown, R. (1976). Women as employees: Some comments on research in industrial sociology. In D. L. Barker & S. Allen (Eds.), *Dependence and exploitation in work and marriage*. Harlow: Longman.
- Brown, R. (2002). Emotion at work: Identifying the emotional climate of night nursing. *Journal of Management in Medicine*, 16(5), 327-344.
- Browning, L., Beyer, J., & Shetler, J. (1995). Building cooperation in a competitive industry: Sematech and the semiconductor industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 113-151.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. (2004). Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(4), 406-429.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. (2005). *Gender and entrepreneurship: An ethnographical approach*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bryant, A. (2002). Re-grounding grounded theory. *The Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application*, 4(1), 25-42.
- Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and quality in social research*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bryman, A., & Burgess, R. (2000). Reflections on qualitative data analysis. In A. Bryman & R. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Routledge.
- Bryson, C. (2004). What about the workers? The expansion of higher education and the transformation of academic work. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35(1), 38-57.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*. London: Heinmann.

- Burris, B. H. (1983). The human effects of underemployment. *Social Problems*, 31, 96-110.
- Burton, C. (1992). Merit and gender: Organizations and the mobilization of masculine bias. In A. Mills & P. Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering organizational analysis*. London: Sage.
- Calas, M., & Smircich, L. (1995). Dangerous liaisons: The "feminine-in-management" meets "globalization". In P. Frost, V. Mitchell & W. Nord (Eds.), *Managerial Reality*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Campbell, D., Gaertner, J., & Vecchio, R. (1983). Perceptions of promotion and tenure criteria: A survey of accounting educators. *Journal of accounting education*, 1, 83-92.
- Caplan, P. (1993). *Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide to surviving in the academic world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cappelli, P. (1999). *The new deal at work*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Carpenter, D. R. (1999). Grounded theory as method. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Qualitative research in nursing* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Carrington, R., Coelli, T., & Rao, D. (2005). The performance of Australian universities: Conceptual issues and preliminary results. *Economic Papers*, 24(2), 145-163.
- Cassell, C., & Symon, G. (1999). Qualitative research in work contexts. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in organizational research*. London: Sage.
- Castleman, T., & Allen, M. (1998). The 'pipeline fallacy' and gender inequity in higher education employment. *Policy, Organisation and Society*, 15, 23-44.

- Castleman, T., Allen, M., Bastalich, W., & Wright, P. (1995). *Limited access: Women's disadvantage in higher education employment*. South Melbourne: National Tertiary Education Union.
- Cetin, M. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction, occupational and organizational commitment of academics. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 8(1), 78-88.
- Charmaz, K. (1990). Discovering chronic illness: Using grounded theory. *Social Science and Medicine*, 30(11), 1161-1172.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Charon, J. (1998). *Symbolic interactionism: An introduction, an interpretation, an integration*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chenitz, W., & Swanson, J. (1986). Qualitative research using grounded theory. In W. C. Chenitz & J. M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Cherniss, C., & Kane, J. S. (1987). Public sector professionals, job characteristics, satisfaction, and aspirations for intrinsic fulfillment through work. *Human Relations*, 40, 125-136.
- Chilton, K., & Orlando, M. (1996). A new social contract for the American worker. *Business and Society Review*, 96, 23-27.
- Cohen, A., & Lowenberg, G. (1990). A re-examination of the side-bet theory as applied to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations*, 43(10), 1015-1050.

- Collins, G. (2005). The gendered nature of mergers. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(3), 270-290.
- Collinson, D., & Collinson, M. (1997). Delaying managers: Time-space surveillance and its gendered effects. *Organization*, 4(3), 375-407.
- Collinson, D., & Hearn, J. (1994). Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1(1), 2-22.
- Condor, S. (1991). Sexism in psychological research. *Feminism and Psychology*, 1(3), 430-434.
- Conley, H. (2005). Front line or all fronts? Women's trade union activism in retail services. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(5), 479-496.
- Conley, S., Muncey, D., & You, S. (2005). Standards-based evaluation and teacher career satisfaction: A structural equation modeling analysis. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 18(1), 39-65.
- Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Constanti, P., & Gibbs, P. (2005). Emotional labour and surplus value" The case of holiday 'reps'. *The Service Industries Journal*, 25(1), 103-116.
- Corbin, J. (1986a). Coding, writing memos, and diagramming. In W. C. Chenitz & J. M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory: Qualitative research in nursing*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Corbin, J. (1986b). Qualitative data analysis for grounded theory: Qualitative research in nursing. In W. C. Chenitz & J. M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Coser, L. (1974). *Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment*. New York: The Free Press.

- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Crompton, R., & Harris, F. (1998). Gender relations and employment: The impact of occupation. *Work, Employment and Society*, 12(2), 297-315.
- Crotty, M. J. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Cuba, R., Decenzo, D., & Anish, A. (1983). Management practices of successful female business owners. *Americal Journal of Small Business*, 8(2), 40-47.
- Cullen, D. (1994). Feminism, management and self-actualization. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 1(3), 123-137.
- Cullen, D. (1997). Maslow, monkeys and motivation theory. *Organization*, 4(3), 355-373.
- Currie, J., Harris, P., & Thiele, B. (2000). Sacrifices in greedy universities: Are they gendered. *Gender and Education*, 12(3), 269-291.
- Daly, M. (1984). *Pure lust: Elemental feminist philosophy*. London: The Women's Press.
- Davidson, M., & Cooper, C. (1992). *Shattering the glass ceiling: The woman manager*. London: Chapman.
- DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, 40(7), 445-470.

- Deem, R. (2003). Gender, organizational cultures and the practices of manager-academics in UK universities. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(2), 239-259.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000a). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000b). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dick, R. (2002). *Grounded theory: A thumbnail sketch*. Retrieved January 20, 2003, from <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/grounded.html>.
- Dickens, L. (1998). What HRM means for gender equality. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 8(1), 23-40.
- Diefendorff, J., Croyle, M., & Gosserand, R. (2005). The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(2), 339-357.
- Dockery, A., & Barns, A. (2005). Who'd be a nurse: Some evidence on career choice in Australia. *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, 31(4), 350-384.
- Doyle, C., & Hind, P. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout and job status in female academics. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 5(2), 67-82.
- Dwyer, P. D., Welker, R. B., & Friedberg, A. H. (2000). A research note concerning the dimensionality of the professional commitment scale. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 12, 279-296.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Lowe, A. (2002). *Management research: An introduction*. London: Sage.

- Elkjaer, B. (2004). Organizational learning: The third way. *Management Learning*, 35(4), 419-434.
- England, P., & Folbre, N. (1999). The cost of caring. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561(1), 39-51.
- Equal Opportunities Commission. (2002). Women and men in Britain: Management.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Eveline, J. (2004). *Ivory basement leadership: Power and invisibility in the changing university*. Crawley, WA: University of Western Australia Press.
- Fagerhaugh, S. (1986). Analyzing data for basic social processes. In W. C. Chenitz & J. M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory: Qualitative research in nursing*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27(78-95).
- Fineman, S. (2000a). Emotional arenas revisited. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Fineman, S. (2004). Getting the measure of emotion and the cautionary tale of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 57(6), 719-742.
- Fineman, S. (Ed.). (2000b). *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Fisher, R. J. (1990). *Organisational commitment as a multi-dimensional construct: An empirical analysis of the differences in commitment between workers in*

the public and private sectors of the bus industry. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wollongong, Australia,.

Fletcher, C. (2005). *Outre-manche/across the channel: Ongoing training and gender in Britain and France*. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(6), 572-590.

Foot, D. (1996). *Boom, bust and echo*. Toronto: McFarlane, Walters & Robs.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1976). *La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1998). *The will to knowledge: The history of sexuality Volume 1*. London: Penguin.

Franzway, S. (2000). *Women working in a greedy institution: Commitment and emotional labour in the union movement*. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 7(4), 258-268.

Franzway, S. (2001). *Sexual politics and greedy institutions*. Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press.

Freeborn, D. (2001). *Satisfaction, commitment and psychological well-being among HMO physicians*. *Western Journal of Medicine*, 174(1), 13-20.

French, M. (1993). *The women's room*. New York: Abacus.

Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). *Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.

- Fulop, L., & Linstead, S. (2004). Motivation and meaning. In S. Linstead, L. Fulop & S. Lilley (Eds.), *Management and organization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gale, F. (1997). Introduction. In F. Gale & B. Goldflam (Eds.), *Strategies to redress gender imbalance in numbers of senior academic women*. Nedlands: University of Western Australia.
- Garnsey, E., & Rees, B. (1996). Discourse and enactment: Gender inequality in text and context. *Human Relations*, 49(8), 1041-1064.
- Ginther, D. K., & Hayes, K. J. (1999). Gender differences in salary and promotion in the humanities. *American Economic Review*, 89(2), 397-402.
- Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence v forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. (1998). *Doing grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Glaser, D., & Frosh, S. (1994). *Child Sexual Abuse*. London: Macmillan.
- Godard, J. (2001). High performance and the transformation of work: The implications of alternative work practices for the experience and outcomes of work. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 54(4), 776-806.
- Gorden, R. (1975). *Interviewing strategy, techniques and tactics*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.

- Gottlieb, B. H., Kelloway, E. K., & Barnham, E. (1998). *Flexible work arrangements: Managing the work-family boundary*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goulding, C. (2002). *Grounded theory: A practical guide for management, business and market researchers*. London: Sage.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles-II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 444-480.
- Graddick, M. M., & Farr, J. L. (1983). Professionals in scientific disciplines: Sex-related differences in working life commitments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 641-646.
- Grimes, S. (1990). *Casual careers or career casualties? Equal opportunities in women's employment at the university*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.
- Guest, D. (1998). Beyond HRM: Commitment and the contract culture. In P. Sparrow & M. Marchington (Eds.), *Human resource management: The new agenda*. London: Pitman Publishing.
- Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role-explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 560-568.
- Halford, S., Savage, M., & Witz, A. (1997). *Gender, careers and organizations*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Hall, M., Smith, D., & Langfield-Smith, K. (2005). Accountants' commitment to their profession: Multiple dimensions of professional commitment and opportunities for future research. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 17, 89-110.

- Hall, R. H. (1968). Professionalization and bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 92-104.
- Hallam, J. (2002). Vocation to profession: Changing images of nursing in Britain. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(1), 35-48.
- Handy, C. (1994). *The age of paradox*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hansen, L. (2002). Rethinking the industrial relations tradition from a gender perspective: An invitation to integrate. *Employee Relations*, 24(2), 190-210.
- Harre, R. (1986). The social construction of emotions. In R. Harre (Ed.), *The social construction of emotions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harrison, D., Newman, D., & Roth, P. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 305-325.
- Healy, G. (1999). Structuring commitments in interrupted careers: Career breaks, commitment and the life cycle in teaching. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 6(4), 185-201.
- Hearn, J., Sheppard, D. L., Tancred-Sheriff, P., & Burrell, G. (Eds.). (1989). *The sexuality of organisation*. London: Sage.
- Hennon, C., & Hildebrand, B. (2005). Modernising to remain traditional: Farm families maintaining a valued lifestyle. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 36(3), 505-521.
- Hepburn, C. G., & Barling, J. (1996). Eldercare responsibilities, inter-role conflict, and employee absence: A daily study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 311-318.

- Hirschman, E. (1993). Ideology in consumer research 1980 and 1990: A Marxist and feminist critique. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(4), 537-555.
- Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1990). Ideology and emotion management: A perspective and path for future research. In T. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1997a). *The time bind, when work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Hochschild, A. (1997b). When work becomes home and home becomes work. *California Management Review*, 39(4), 79-97.
- Holloway, I., & Wheeler, S. (2002). *Qualitative research in nursing*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hornig, L. (1980). Untenured and tenuous: The status of women faculty. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 448, 115-125.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555-573.
- Hunter, J., Schmidt, F., & Jackson, G. (1982). *Meta-analysis: cumulating research findings across studies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hutchinson, S. (1984). Creating meaning: A grounded theory of NICU nurses. *Nursing Outlook*, 32(4), 86-90.

- Irving, P., & Coleman, D. (2003). The moderating effect of different forms of commitment on role ambiguity-job relation tensions. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 20*(2), 97-106.
- Isabella, L. (1990). Evolving interpretations as a change unfolds: How managers construe key organizational events. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 7-41.
- James, N. (1989). Emotional labour: Skill and work in the social regulation of emotions. *Sociological Review, 37*, 15-42.
- Jay, A. (1972). *Corporate man*. London: Cape.
- Jenkins, S. (2004). Restructuring flexibility: Case studies of part-time female workers in six workplaces. *Gender, Work and Organization, 11*(3), 306-333.
- Jogulu, U., & Wood, G. (2006). The role of leadership theory in raising the profile of women in management. *Equal Opportunities International, 25*(4), 236-250.
- Johnson, P., & Duberley, J. (2000). *Understanding management research: An introduction to epistemology*. London: Sage.
- Johnson, R. (1996). Antecedents and outcomes of corporate refocusing. *Journal of Management, 22*, 439-483.
- Joiner, T., & Bakalis, S. (2006). The antecedents of organizational commitment: The case of Australian casual academics. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(6), 439-452.
- Kandola, R., & Fullerton, J. (1998). *Managing the mosaic: Diversity in action*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 341-349.
- Kark, R., & Waismel-Manor, R. (2005). Organizational citizenship Behaviour: What's gender got to do with it? *Organization Articles, 12*(6), 889-917.
- Kazlauskaitė, R., Buciunienė, I., & Turrauskas, L. (2006). Building employee commitment in the hospitality industry. *Baltic Journal of Management, 1*(3), 300-314.
- Kidder, D. (2002). The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 28*(5), 629-648.
- King, N. (1999). The qualitative research interview. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in organizational research*. London: Sage.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (2002). Gender differences in managerial careers: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Business Ethics, 37*(1), 5-24.
- Knights, D., & Richards, W. (2000). *Sex discrimination in UK academia*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Toronto.
- Koch, J., & Steers, R. M. (1978). Job attachment, satisfaction and turnover among public sector employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 12*, 119-128.
- Kohn, M. M. (1971). Bureaucratic man: A portrait and an interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 36*(3), 461-474.
- Konrad, A. M., & Deckop, J. (2001). Human resource management trends in the USA: Challenges in the midst of prosperity. *International Journal of Manpower, 22*(2), 269-278.
- Kugelberg, C. (2006). Constructing the deviant other: Mothering and fathering at the workplace. *Gender, Work and Organization, 13*(2), 152-173.

- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- LaVan, H., & Banner, D. K. (1985). The perception of role conflict, role ambiguity and organizational commitment differences between sexes. *International Journal of Manpower*, 6(5), 32-36.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J. J., & Allen, N. J. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person and work related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799-811.
- Leidner, R. (1991). Serving hamburgers and selling insurance: Gender, work and identity in interactive service jobs. *Gender and Society*, 5, 154-177.
- Lennie, I. (2000). Embodying management. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and organization*. London: Sage.
- Leonard, D., & McAdam, R. (2002). The strategic placement of TQM in the organisation: A grounded study. *Managing Service Quality*, 12(1), 43-53.
- Leong, L., Huang, S., & Hsu, J. (2003). An empirical study on professional commitment, organizational commitment and job involvement in Canadian accounting firms. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 2(2), 360-371.
- Lewin, M. (1984). Psychology measures femininity and masculinity, 2. In M.Lewin (Ed.), *In the shadow of the past: Psychology portraits of the sexes*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Liccione, W. (2005). Balanced management: A key component of managerial effectiveness. *Performance Improvement*, 44(2), 32-39.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1989). Ethics: The failure of positivist science. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12(3), 221-240.

- Linstead, S. (2000). Comment: Gender blindness or suppression? A comment on Fiona Wilson's research note. *Organization Studies*, 21(1), 297-303.
- Locke, K. (2001). *Grounded theory in management research*. London: Sage.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 24-33.
- Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Mahaffy, K., & Caffrey, E. (2003). Are requests for teaching credentials customary: A content analysis of the 1999 Employment Bulletin. *Teaching Sociology*, 31, 203-211.
- Marshall, J. (1984). *Women managers: Travellers in a male world*. Chichester, NY: Wiley.
- Martin, P. (1996). Gendering and evaluating dynamics: Men, masculinities and managements. In D. Collinson & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as managers, managers as men*. London: Sage.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- May, K. (1994). Abstract knowing: The case for magic in the method. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mayo, E. (1960). *The human problems of an industrial civilisation*. New York: Viking Press.

- McCann, T. V., & Clark, E. (2003a). Grounded theory in nursing research: Part 1 - methodology. *Nurse Researcher*, *11*(2), 7-18.
- McCann, T. V., & Clark, E. (2003b). Grounded theory in nursing research: Part 2 - critique. *Nurse Researcher*, *11*(2), 19-28.
- McCann, T. V., & Clark, E. (2003c). Grounded theory in nursing research: Part 3 - Application. *Nurse Researcher*, *11*(2), 29-39.
- McDowell, J. M., Singell, L. D., & Ziliak, J. P. (1999). Cracks in the glass ceiling: Gender and promotion in the economics profession. *American Economic Review*, *89*(2), 372-396.
- McGinnis, S. K., & Morrow, P. C. (1990). Job attitudes between full and part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *36*, 82-96.
- McKie, L., Bowlby, S., & Gregory, S. (2001). Gender, caring and employment in Britain. *Journal of Social Policy*, *30*, 233-269.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. New York: Humanities Press.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*(6), 710-721.

- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(4), 538-551.
- Michie, S., & West, M. (2004). Managing people and performance: An evidence based framework applied to health service organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 5-6*(2), 91-111.
- Milliken, P. J., & Schreiber, R. S. (2001). Can you "do" grounded theory without symbolic interactionism? In R. S. Schreiber & P. N. Stern (Eds.), *Using grounded theory in nursing*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1997). *In-depth interviewing: Principles, techniques, analysis*. South Melbourne: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Miree, C. E., & Frieze, I. H. (1999). Children and careers: A longitudinal study of the impact of young children on critical career outcomes of MBAs. *Sex Roles, 41*, 787-808.
- Mishler, E. (2000). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. In B. Brizuela, J. Stewart, R. Carrillo & J. Berger (Eds.), *Acts of inquiry in qualitative research*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Morgan, D. H. J. (1981). Men, masculinity and the process of sociological enquiry. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge.
- Morris, J. H., & Koch, J. L. (1979). Impacts of role perceptions, organizational commitment, job involvement and psychosomatic illness among three vocational groupings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 88-101.

- Morris, J. H., & Sherman, J. D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 512-526.
- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
- Morrow, P. C. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment*. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Strategies for sampling. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Qualitative nursing research: A contemporary dialogue*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Morse, J. M. (1994a). Designing qualitative research. In Y. Lincoln & N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative inquiry*. Menlo Park, CA: Sage.
- Morse, J. M. (1994b). Emerging from the data: The cognitive process of analysis in qualitative inquiry. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 3-5.
- Morse, J. M. (2001). Situating grounded theory within qualitative inquiry. In R. S. Schreiber & P. N. Stern (Eds.), *Using grounded theory in nursing*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Moss, P., & Deven, F. (1999). Parental leave in context. In P. Moss & F. Deven (Eds.), *Parental leave: Progress or pitfall? Research and policy issues in Europe*. The Hague: NIDI Publications.
- Mowday, R. (1983). Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R. Steers & L. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 142*, 224-247.
- Muir, K. (1994). *Strength in numbers: Increasing women's representation in unions*. Adelaide: Centre for Labour Studies.
- Neider, L. (1987). A preliminary investigation of female entrepreneurs in Florida. *Journal of Small Business Management, 25*(3), 22-29.
- Nelson, M., Englar-Carlson, M., Tierney, S., & Hau, J. (2006). Class jumping into academia: Multiple identities for counseling academics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 1-14.
- Newton, T., & Findlay, P. (1996). Playing God? The performance of appraisal. *Human Resource Management Journal, 6*(3), 42-58.
- Ngo, H. (1998). Employment practices and organizational commitment: Differential effects for men and women? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 6*(3), 251-267.
- Oakley, A. (2001). Foreword. In A. Brooks & A. Mackinnon (Eds.), *Gender and the restructured university*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 27*(4/2), 321-334.
- Olsson, S., & Walker, R. (2004). Two wo-men and the boys: Patterns of identification and differentiation in senior women executives' representation of career identity. *Women in Management Review, 19*(5/6), 244-251.
- Park, S. (1996). Research, teaching and service: Why shouldn't women's work count. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(1), 46-84.

- Parker, G. (1990). *With due care and attention: A review of research on informal care*. London: Family Policy Studies Centre.
- Parry, K. (1998). Grounded theory and social process: A new direction for leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 85-105.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newberry Park: Sage.
- 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.
- Perrons, D. (2003). The new economy and work-life balance: Conceptual explorations and a case study of new media. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(1), 65-93.
- Pettinger, L. (2005). Gendered work meets gendered goods: Selling and service in clothing retail. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(5), 460-478.
- Pointer, G. (1991). *Women and the academic profession: Questions of equality and opportunity*. Working paper in women's studies, Number 1. Kingswood, New South Wales: Women's Research Centre, University of Western Sydney.
- 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*, 5, 603-609.
- Probert, B. (2005). I just couldn't fit it in: Gender and unequal outcomes in academic careers. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 12(1), 51-72.
- Probert, B., Ewer, P., & Whiting, K. (1998). *Gender pay equity in Australian higher education*. Melbourne: National Tertiary Education Union.

- Raddon, A. (2001). *Conflict and contradiction in the discourses of the "proper" mother and the "proper" academic: Reflections on the experiences of an academic mother*. Paper presented at the Rethinking Gender Work and Organization Conference, Keele University, 27-29 June 2001.
- Rasmussen, B. (2004). Between endless needs and limited resources: The gendered construction of a greedy organization. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(5), 506-525.
- Rees, B., & Garnsey, E. (2003). Analysing competence: Gender and identity at work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(5), 551-578.
- Reynolds, L. (1992). Translate fury into action. *Management Review*, 81(3), 36-38.
- Rimmer, R. J., & Rimmer, S. (1994). *More brilliant careers: The effect of career breaks on women's employment*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Ritzer, G., & Trice, H. M. (1969). An empirical study of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. *Social Forces*, 47, 475-479.
- Robrecht, L. (1995). Grounded theory: Evolving methods. *Qualitative Health Research*, 5(2), 169-177.
- Rosenau, P. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences: Insights, inroads and intrusions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosener, J. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, November-December, 119-125.
- Rowley, J. (2004). Partnering paradigms: Knowledge management and relationship marketing. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 104(1/2), 149-157.
- Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., & King, S. N. (2002). Benefits of multiple roles for managerial women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 369-386.

- Runte, M., & Mills, A. J. (2004). Paying the toll: A feminist post-structural critique of the discourse bridging work and family. *Culture and Organization, 10*(3), 237-249.
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2002). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ryan, J. (2002). Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(1), 123-132.
- Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B. M. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior*. Chicago: St Clair Press.
- Sandberg, J. (2000). Understanding human competence at work: An interpretive approach. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(1), 9-25.
- Sandelands, L. (1988). The concept of work feeling. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 18*, 437-457.
- Sandelands, L., & Boudens, C. (2000). Feeling at work. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Sanders, T. (2005). It's just acting: Sex workers' strategies for capitalizing on sexuality. *Gender, Work and Organization, 12*(4), 319-342.

- Sass, J. (2000). Emotional labour as cultural performance: The communication of caregiving in a nonprofit nursing home. *Western Journal of Communication*, 64(3), 330-358.
- Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. (1973). *Field research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schneer, J. A., & Reitman, F. (1995). The impact of gender as managerial careers unfold. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 209-315.
- Schreiber, R. S. (2001). The "how to" of grounded theory: Avoiding the pitfalls. In R. S. Schreiber & P. N. Stern (Eds.), *Using grounded theory in nursing*. New York: Springer.
- Schweingruber, D., & Berns, N. (2005). Shaping the selves of young salespeople through emotion management. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 34(6), 679-706.
- Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1977). *The hidden injuries of class*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sharpe, R. (2000). As leaders, women rule. *Business Week*(November), 74-84.
- Shepherd, J., & Mathews, B. (2000). Employee commitment: Academic vs practitioner perspectives. *Employee Relations*, 22(6), 555-575.
- Sheridan, A. (2004). Chronic presenteeism: The multiple dimensions to men's absence from part-time work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(2), 207-225.
- Shields, S. (2000). Thinking about gender, thinking about theory: Gender and emotional experience. In A. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.
- Simpson, P., & Stroh, L. (2004). Gender differences: Emotional expression and feelings of personal inauthenticity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 715-721.
- Singh, V., Kumra, S., & Vinnicombe, S. (2002). Gender and impression management: Playing the promotion game. *Journal of Business Ethics, 37*(1), 77-90.
- Singh, V., & Vinnicombe, S. (2000a). Gendered meanings of commitment from high technology engineering managers in the United Kingdom and Sweden. *Gender, Work and Organization, 7*(1), 1-19.
- Singh, V., & Vinnicombe, S. (2000b). What does "commitment" really mean? Views of UK and Swedish engineering managers. *Personnel Review, 29*(2), 228-254.
- Steinpreis, R. E., Anders, K. A., & Rizke, D. (1999). The impact of gender on the review of the curricula vitae of job applicants and tenure candidates: A national empirical study. *Sex Roles, 4*(7/8), 509-528.
- Stern, P. N. (1980). Grounded theory methodology: Its uses and procedures. *Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 12*(1), 20-23.
- Stern, P. N. (1994). Eroding grounded theory. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical Issues in qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stone, K. (2001). The new psychological contract: Implications of the changing workplace for labor and employment law. *UCLA Law Review, 48*(3), 519-530.
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2000). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Streubert, H. J., & Carpenter, D. R. (1999). *Qualitative research in nursing: Advancing the humanistic imperative*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Stroh, L. K., Brett, J. M., & Reilly, A. H. (1992). All the right stuff: A comparison of female and male managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 251-260.
- Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 633-642.
- Sutton, R. (1987). The process of organizational death: Disbanding and reconnecting. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 542-569.
- Swanson, J. M. (1986a). Analyzing data for categories and description. In W. C. Chenitz & J. M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Swanson, J. M. (1986b). The formal qualitative interview for grounded theory. In W. C. Chenitz & J. M. Swanson (Eds.), *From practice to grounded theory*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Thomas, R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review*(March-April), 107-117.

- Thomas, R. (1996). *All talk and no action? The failure of academic appraisal in the gendered academy*. Paper presented at the WHEN Conference, University of Central Lancashire.
- Thompson, P., & McHugh, D. (1990). *Work organisations: A critical introduction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Todd, P., & Bird, D. (2000). Gender and promotion in academia. *Equal Opportunities International*, 19(8), 1-16.
- Trinidad, C., & Normore, A. (2005). Leadership and gender: A dangerous liaison. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 27(7/8), 574-571.
- Truman, C. (1992). Demographic change and "new opportunities" for women: The case of employer's career break schemes. In S. Arber & N. Gilbert (Eds.), *Women and working lives, divisions and changes*. Houndsmill: Macmillan.
- Tyler, M., & Taylor, S. (1998). The exchange of aesthetics: Women's work and 'The Gift'. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 5(3), 165-171.
- Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Von Glinow, M. A. (1988). *The new professionals*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Wahn, J. C. (1998). Sex differences in the continuance component of organizational commitment. *Group and Organizational Management*, 23(3), 256-267.
- Wajcman, J. (2000). Feminism facing industrial relations in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38(2), 183-201.
- Wallace, J. (1995). Organizational and professional commitment in professional and nonprofessional organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 228-255.

- Wallendorf, M., & Brucks, M. (1993). Introspection in consumer research: Implementations and implications. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 719-722.
- Waterman, R., Waterman, J., & Collard, B. (1994). Towards a career-resilient workforce. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(4), 87-96.
- Weedon, C. (1999). *Feminism, theory and the politics of difference*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wharton, A. (1993). The affective consequences of service work, managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations*, 20(2), 205-232.
- Whitt, E. (1991). Artful science: A primer on qualitative research methods. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 406-415.
- Whyte, W. M. (1956). *The organisation man*. New York: Schuster & Schuster.
- Wilkinson, A. (1998). Empowerment theory and practice. *Personnel Review*, 27(1), 40-55.
- Williams, C. (1995). *Still a man's world: Men who do women's work*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Williams, C. (2003). Sky service: The demands of emotional labour in the airline industry. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(5), 513-550.
- Williams, J. (2001). *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willmott, H. (1995). Managing the academics: Commodification and control in the development of university education in the UK. *Human Relations*, 48(9), 993-1028.

- Wilson, B., & Byrne, E. (Eds.). (1987). *Women in the university: A policy report*. St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
- Wilson, F. (1996). Research note: Organizational theory: Blind and deaf to gender? *Organization Studies*, 17(5), 825-842.
- Wilson, F., & Nutley, S. (2003). A critical look at staff appraisal: The case of women in Scottish universities. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(3), 301-319.
- Wilson, H. S., & Hutchinson, S. A. (1996). Methodological mistakes in grounded theory. *Nursing Research*, 45(2), 122-124.
- Wirshbo, E. (1990). Can emotions be determined from words? A consideration of recent military usage. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 33, 287-295.
- Witz, A., & Savage, M. (1992). The gender of organizations. In M. Savage & A. Witz (Eds.), *Gender and bureaucracy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wolff, J. (1977). Women in organizations. In S. Clegg & D. Dunkerley (Eds.), *Critical issues in organizations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Wouters, C. (1989). The sociology of emotions and flight attendants: Hochschild's managed heart. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 6(1), 95-124.
- Wright, M., Assar, N., Kain, E., Kramer, L., Howery, C., McKinney, K., et al. (2004). Greedy institutions: The importance of institutional context for teaching in higher education. *Teaching Sociology*, 32, 144-159.
- Wyn, J., Acker, S., & Richards, E. (2000). Making a difference: Women in management in Australian and Canadian faculties of Education. *Gender and Education*, 12(4), 435-444.

APPENDIX “A”

Meyer and Allen’s (1997) Affective, Continuance and Normative
Commitment Scales*Affective Commitment Scale Items*

- 1 I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.
- 2 I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
- 3 I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
- 4 I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. (R)
- 5 I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. (R)
- 6 I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. (R)
- 7 This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.
- 8 I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Continuance Commitment Scale Items

- 1 I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up. (R)
- 2 It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
- 3 Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.

- 4 It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization in the near future. (R)
- 5 Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
- 6 I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
- 7 One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives
- 8 One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.
- 9 If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.

Normative Commitment Scale

- 1 I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)
- 2 Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
- 3 I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
- 4 This organization deserves my loyalty
- 5 I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
- 6 I owe a great deal to my organization

(R) Indicates a reversed-keyed item.

APPENDIX "B"

Academic Levels

Sessional	Teaching staff employed on a semester basis
Level A	Associate Lecturer
Level B	Lecturer
Level C	Senior Lecturer
Level D	Associate Professor
Level E	Professor

APPENDIX “C”

Interview Guide: Initial Interviews

Length of time in your present position? (Prompt: What was your previous position? How long have you been in your present position?).

What do you find meaningful in your work life? (Prompt: Can you give me an example of this or tell a story about it?)

Are there other aspects of your work that increase your desire to be involved with organisational activities?

What do other people in your workplace do that leads you to believe that they are committed to the organisation?

What do other people in your workplace do that leads you to believe that they do not wish to be involved with organisational activities?

How would you describe your commitment to your profession? To the organisation. (Prompt: If someone says they are highly committed what does that mean?)

Describe a role model, without giving his or her name. How do you know whether that person is committed? How do you rate this person's commitment to their profession compared with their commitment to other aspects of work?

Is the role model that you have identified male or female? Can you think of a role model of the opposite sex to the first one given? How would you know whether that person is committed? How do you rate this person's commitment to their profession compared with their commitment to other aspects of work?

Describe someone with low commitment. How do you know that this person has low commitment?

Tell me more about your views on commitment? (Prompt: what is it? How is it recognised? What is the target? Does it fluctuate?)

What about commitment in academia? (Prompt: Occupation? Anything else?)

How and when is commitment appraised? (Prompt: Experiences? Forms? Systems?)

Is this different for women and men? (Prompt: If so, how?)

In relation to teaching, how important is it that we link theory and practice?

Do you think that overall academics are successful in achieving this link?
(How? Why?)

Do you have any strategies that you use to link theory and practice? (Prompt:
What are these?)

Do you think that we are successful in our attempts to do this? (Prompt: Why?
How?)

Is there anything else that you would like to discuss or add to what you have
said?

Can I contact you to follow-up if I have questions after I examine my notes
from your interview?

APPENDIX “D”

Memo for Interview 1

Interview conducted at a “neutral” location, as requested by the interviewee. Interviewee made good eye contact during interview. Communicated effectively, using frequent examples to illustrate points. She presented as a hard-working, research oriented academic who found teaching to be challenging, particularly when required to teach in areas in which she had little or no experience. Talking about teaching she used terms like “fraud” to describe her feelings about the role that she was forced to enact, obviously a painful experience. Interviewee was relaxed and appeared comfortable throughout the interview. She used expressions like “love” and “a really great, positive experience” to describe her feelings towards the university. Responses were spontaneous.

Interviewee spoke warmly about mentors, both male, but criticised them for excessive work hours. Male academic focus on careers evident. In other colleagues, non-participation and lack of engagement were signs of low commitment.

Theme of the interview was of a hard working female academic with a strong emotional attachment to the university, tempered by resentment towards some aspects of teaching (signs of emotional labour). Clear signs of a strong career focus.

APPENDIX “E”

Data Analysis Database

Microsoft Access

File Edit View Insert Format Records Tools Window Help Adobe PDF

Type a question for help

Interview Schedule : Table

Interviews : Table

Copy of Categories_15May06 : Table

ID	Category	Concepts	Description	Memo
1	Long serving	Microsoft Word Document	Long service at Griffith or other university	Microsoft Word Document
2	Choice	Microsoft Word Document	Choosing work or location	Microsoft Word Document
3	Emotional attachment to Griffith	Microsoft Word Document	Emotional attachment to Griffith	Microsoft Word Document
4	Work experience	Microsoft Word Document	Feelings about working at Griffith - commitment to organisation	Microsoft Word Document
5	Difficult to leave	Microsoft Word Document	Ease or difficulty of leaving Griffith	Microsoft Word Document
6	Career difference	Microsoft Word Document	Differences between an academic career and others	Microsoft Word Document
7	Self and career	Microsoft Word Document	How people feel about themselves and their careers	Microsoft Word Document
8	Rewards for work	Microsoft Word Document	Work ethic, perceived value and rewards for work	Microsoft Word Document
9	Presenteeism	Microsoft Word Document	Being present at work	Microsoft Word Document
10	Lack of appreciation	Microsoft Word Document	Lack of appreciation by others for work done	Microsoft Word Document
11	Concern for health	Microsoft Word Document	Work related health issues	Microsoft Word Document
12	Passion	Microsoft Word Document	Driven by or feelings of passion	Microsoft Word Document
13	Obsessive involvement	Microsoft Word Document	Obsession and drive to be involved/over commitment	Microsoft Word Document
14	Addictive involvement/obligation	Microsoft Word Document	Involvement in events almost as an obligation or addiction	Microsoft Word Document
15	Concern for others (Nurturing)	Microsoft Word Document	Concerns and feelings for other people	Microsoft Word Document
16	Career based	Microsoft Word Document	Commitment to career	Microsoft Word Document
17	Multiple masters	Microsoft Word Document	Being asked or expected to serve more than one master	Microsoft Word Document
18	Exploitive role model	Microsoft Word Document	Sees the job through to the point of being exploited	Microsoft Word Document
19	Caring selfless role	Microsoft Word Document	Commitment to the people that the person serves	Microsoft Word Document
20	Non-participation	Microsoft Word Document	Characteristics of low commitment	Microsoft Word Document
21	Commodification	Microsoft Word Document	Work conceptualised in terms of tangible outputs or commodities	Microsoft Word Document
22	Age, family or lifestyle	Microsoft Word Document	Commitment affected by age, family or lifestyle	Microsoft Word Document
23	Engaging people	Microsoft Word Document	Importance of engaging people	Microsoft Word Document
24	Misgivings	Microsoft Word Document	Feelings of fear or inadequacy of what is expected	Microsoft Word Document
25	New challenge	Microsoft Word Document	Desire to take up new challenge	Microsoft Word Document
26	Emotional labour	Microsoft Word Document	Feelings of discomfort about what one is asked to do	Microsoft Word Document
27	Meaningful work	Microsoft Word Document	What you find meaningful in your work life	Microsoft Word Document
28	Lack of opportunities	Microsoft Word Document	Feeling that one could contribute more if the opportunities were there	Microsoft Word Document

Records: 14 of 67

Datasheet View

APPENDIX “F”

Interview Guide: Interview 5 Onwards

Length of time in your present position? (Prompt: What was your previous position? How long have you been in your present position?).

What do you find meaningful in your work life? (Prompt: Can you give me an example of this or tell a story about it?)

Are there other aspects of your work that increase your desire to be involved with organisational activities?

What do other people in your workplace do that leads you to believe that they are committed to the organisation?

What do other people in your workplace do that leads you to believe that they do not wish to be involved with organisational activities?

How would you describe your commitment to your profession? To the organisation. (Prompt: If someone says they are highly committed what does that mean?)

Describe a role model, without giving his or her name. How do you know whether that person is committed? How do you rate this person's commitment to their profession compared with their commitment to other aspects of work?

Is the role model that you have identified male or female? Can you think of a role model of the opposite sex to the first one given? How would you know whether that person is committed? How do you rate this person's commitment to their profession compared with their commitment to other aspects of work?

Describe someone with low commitment. How do you know that this person has low commitment?

Tell me more about your views on commitment? (Prompt: what is it? How is it recognised? What is the target? Does it fluctuate?)

What about commitment in academia? (Prompt: Occupation? Anything else?)

Some people have said that students expect a female academic to be more understanding or accommodating in terms of issues that students may have? What are your views on that?

How and when is commitment appraised? (Prompt: Experiences? Forms? Systems?)

Is this different for women and men? (Prompt: If so, how?)

Is there anything else that you would like to discuss or add to what you have said?

Can I contact you to follow-up if I have questions after I examine my notes from your interview?

APPENDIX “G”

Interview Guide: Interview 10 Onwards

Length of time in your present position? (Prompt: What was your previous position? How long have you been in your present position?).

What do you find meaningful in your work life? (Prompt: Can you give me an example of this or tell a story about it?)

Are there other aspects of your work that increase your desire to be involved with organisational activities?

What do other people in your workplace do that leads you to believe that they are committed to the organisation?

What do other people in your workplace do that leads you to believe that they do not wish to be involved with organisational activities?

How would you describe your commitment to your profession? To the organisation. (Prompt: If someone says they are highly committed what does that mean?)

What about commitment to your Department or School?

Do you belong to a research centre? Commitment to this?

Describe a role model, without giving his or her name. How do you know whether that person is committed? How do you rate this person's commitment to their profession compared with their commitment to other aspects of work?

Is the role model that you have identified male or female? Can you think of a role model of the opposite sex to the first one given? How would you know whether that person is committed? How do you rate this person's commitment to their profession compared with their commitment to other aspects of work?

Describe someone with low commitment. How do you know that this person has low commitment?

Tell me more about your views on commitment? (Prompt: what is it? How is it recognised? What is the target? Does it fluctuate?)

What about commitment in academia? (Prompt: Occupation? Anything else?)

Some people have said that students expect a female academic to be more understanding or accommodating in terms of issues that students may have? What are your views on that?

How and when is commitment appraised? (Prompt: Experiences? Forms? Systems?)

Is this different for women and men? (Prompt: If so, how?)

Is there anything else that you would like to discuss or add to what you have said?

Can I contact you to follow-up if I have questions after I examine my notes from your interview