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Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the factors that affect burnout of faculty, which we refer to as “academic fatigue”, in the context of the business professors in the highly competitive and globalized market of the United Arab Emirates, which, unlike the United States, does not offer tenure to professors. It is the first paper to addresses an increasingly important area in the higher education sector in the UAE where increasing competition between institutions, the financial pressure on universities, and government funding cuts are having a knockdown effect on all parts of the higher education supply chain, including faculty. Data was collected from business faculty in a major UAE public university using a quantitative survey that designed based on Maslach Burnout Inventory MBI Educators Survey (MBI-ES). We find that while purely aspects of financial compensation (including satisfaction with pay, pay for performance sensitivity, and merit pay allocation) are not significantly related to faculty burnout, faculty satisfaction with the research and teaching workload reduces burnout significantly. Our results do not support the academic capitalism paradigm in a strict financial sense, but rather in a holistic sense that incorporates non-financial compensation.
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1. Introduction

Stress in the modern workplace is not new to academic literature. Bob Losyk (2005, p.1) rightly described 21st century’s workplaces as “raising a baby who demands everything at this very moment”. We no longer able to leave work after leaving our workplace, as technology is keeping us connected not only with the things we love but also with the things that may -through mismanagement of our work-life balance- contribute to our stress and discontent. Work is one of the major sources of anxiety and stress (Carranza, 1973; Harris, 1973; Kumari and Mishra, 2009; Choudhury, 2012; APA Center for Organisational Studies, 2013), understandably, the modern workplace is fast-based and demanding, and employers care less about our life-work balance. Possibly, this is a feature of service-based economies, rather than a bug.

Researchers relate workplace stress to many factors. For example, Choudhury (2012) contributes it to office politics, your hateful boss, not being promoted when you deserve to, work load, task unclarity, feeling trapped in a job you don’t feel passionately about, and the constant fear of losing your position or status. The American Psychological Association (n.d) added other, primarily system-wide stressors, such as economic upheaval, downsizing, layoffs, merger, bankruptcies, and workplace related factors such as CCTV at the workplace, shrinking healthcare and retirement benefits, and long working hours. Khan and Khurshid (2017) divided the sources of workplace stress into work domain and non-work domain; work domain includes overload, relationship between employee and employers, lack of job autonomy, excessive work hours, and lack of organizational support, whereas non-work domains include poor quality of work and family life and lack of family and social support. Perry-Jenkins et al. (2000) also argued that workplace stressors are caused by the non-standard work hours required in many professional environments, the pace of labour, and continuous pressure from employers seeking higher quality and more efficiency.

The APA Centre for Organisational Studies (2013) found that more than one-third of working Americans experiencing chronic work-related stress. Stress level differs from one country to another and from one workplace to another. Based on a poll conducted by a UK based mental health charity, Mind (2016) found that nine in ten practice nurses, GPs working for UK National Health Services, and other primary care workers find their work life stressful. In the UAE, according to Watson (2012) 42% of employees felt extreme pressure because of their work, only 45% of them feel that the levels of stress at work are manageable, and it seems that the source of their stress is related fears regarding future finances. Furthermore, a Bayt.com (2013) poll found that 49% of employees in the UAE feel that they are either under stress or under severe stress. A quarter of surveyed employees work long hours, citing job requirements and the need to be ahead of their projects as the main reasons.

Almost 40 years ago, Johnson and Sarason (1979) found that stress could meaningfully contribute to sudden cardiac death, pregnancy complications, tuberculosis, and diabetes. This has not changed since then, as many studies Harvard Health Publications (2015) found that stressful jobs could potentially increase the risk of a stroke (Andre Picard Public Health Reporter, 2007; Nakao, 2010; LeWine, 2012; Harvard Health Publications, 2015).

As for stress among various professions, many studies were conducted on the stress in healthcare profession (Littlejohn, 2012; Howlett et al., 201; Mind, 2016). People working in the clerical profession also reported high level of stress caused by the increasingly blurred boundaries between family and work (Wells et al., 2012; Hall 1997; Meek et al. 2003; Weaver et al. 1997). Many other studies examined teachers and found that it is also a high stress profession (Chaplain 2008; Kyriacou 2001; Yorimitsu, 2014). Stress and burnout studies on university lecturers, however, were limited, according to Watts et al. (2011). But other studies explored stress level for academics and found that working in higher education is no longer a low-stress zone, relating this ever increasing pressure to raise the lecturers’ workload requirements, pressure to publish, and the mounting pressure to seek acquire research funding (Winefield et al. 2003; Court and Kiman 2008).
High levels of stress result in burnout. Schwarzer and Hallum (2008, p. 154) define burnout as “a chronic state of exhaustion due to long-term interpersonal stress within human service professions”. Leiter and Maslach (1998, p. 347) see burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced accomplishment which is a special risk for individuals who work with other people in some capacity”. Employees’ burnout effect can extend and cause damages not only organisations and employees, but also have far-reaching consequences to family units and also the larger society. Burnout is proved to weaken professional functioning as well as health (Maslach and Jackson 1993; Guglielmi and Tatrow 1998). Burnout in academia occurs when faculty undergo workplace stress for long periods while experiencing emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminishing personal accomplishment (Maslach, 2003). Singh, Mishra, and Kim (1988) found that more fatigued academics exhibit lower motivation to do research, or in other words, burnout reduces academic productivity in ways that harms the value of human capital of the faculty and the reputational capital of the institution.

This paper aims to investigate the factors that affect burnout of faculty, which we refer to as “academic fatigue”, in the context of the business professors in the United Arab Emirates. It is the first paper to address an increasingly important area in the higher education sector in the UAE where increasing competition between institutions, the financial pressure on universities, and government funding cuts are having a knockdown effect on all parts of the higher education supply chain, including faculty.

The United Arab Emirates is a natural laboratory to examine the phenomenon of academic fatigue, as it is unique in several ways. First, tenure protection does not exist in the UAE. Rather, faculty contracts are renewed on a rolling, three to five year basis. Secondly, UAE faculty are employed solely for the benefit of the UAE leadership, and if they want to retain their visa status rather than returning to their home countries, they must meet specific performance objectives in terms of teaching and research established by their employers. Third, like the US, the faculty in the UAE is highly diverse and relatively high pay and the UAE attracts a highly qualified global workforce; only 10% of Emirati residents are Emirati citizens. As a talent centre reliant on time varying public revenues, faculty in the UAE face intense competition for employment opportunities. We also examine business faculty specifically, because the academic market is increasingly competitive in terms of demand for AACSB accreditation. As of date, seven United Arab Emirates business schools have obtained AACSB accreditation, the first of which was the United Arab Emirates University (UAEU) in 2001. Six of the seven only received accreditation in the past decade with three since 2015 and a number are currently under AACSB review. Therefore, the demands to publish are more intense than they were in the past, with course-load requirements remaining high relative to comparable American institutions, and this lends itself to an increasing risk of academic fatigue for UAE faculty.

Our results are also informative for western academic institutions. There is substantial debate over eliminating tenure in the United States and Europe, and given demographic factors and budgetary problems confronting the West, it is anticipated that faculty will be asked to do more with less in the future. By uncovering the factors that impact academic fatigue, we hope to identify strategies to improve working conditions and faculty productivity which can then be implemented worldwide.

The following section will review the literature to explore the factors that cause faculty burnout and describe the theoretical framework, then based on our review hypotheses will be developed. Further sections will discuss our data collection method, analyses, discussion conclusions and finally we will offer some recommendations to interested parties including executives and policy makers in the higher education sector.

2. Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Higher Education Environment in the UAE
The higher education landscape in the UAE is increasingly competitive. There are currently 67 public, government-funded and private higher education institutions competing to attract talented students, staff and highly qualified faculty, many of them are non-Emiratis (Commission for Academic Accreditation CAA, 2018). The oldest is the United Arab Emirates University and the largest out of all is the Higher Colleges of Technology with total number of 23000 students studying at 16 campuses and doing various undergraduate degrees such as engineering, media and business (HCT Fact Book, 2018). According to Statista (2018) the total number of higher education students in the UAE is around 140000 (see figure 1) and this number grew at a rate of 9.1% annually from 2009 to 2014 (Alpen Capital, 2016).

To compete in such climate, universities need to develop competitive advantages and strive to create expand their market share and such race for success. This race is pound to impact faculty members working for these institutions and cause burnout. This impact could manifest itself in increased teaching load, quality of students and inadequate access to resources both financial such as research funding and non-financial resources such as human capital investment (Bakker et al., 2003).

Figure 1. Number of university students in the United Arab Emirates in 2015/2016

2.2. Theoretical framework

Academic Capitalism

In contemporary years, much attention has been paid to the idea of academic capitalism. Slaughter and Rhoades have theorized colleges and universities as shifting “from a public good knowledge/learning regime to an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime” (Slaughter and Rhoades 2004, 28; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2011). That is, universities have moved from forming principle of knowledge acquisition as an aspiration and public good to a viewpoint that the pursuit of learning must produce commodities and offer latent sources of revenue (Slaughter and Rhoades 2004, 30).
Academic capitalism, one manifestation of the effect of neoliberal ideology in higher education institutions, is defined as “...institutional and professorial or market like behaviors to secure extra moneys” (Slaughter and Leslie 1997, 8). Academic Capitalism is a framework to delineate the activities evolving as a result of entrepreneurial and commercialized educational politics in universities owing to global economic forces (Collyer 2015, Marshall 2016; Kauppinen, 2012; Jessop, 2017). Moreover, it affirms all the values, aspects and artifacts influencing the way academia works, researches and governs (Collyer 2015, Marshall 2016; Cantwell and Kauppinen, 2014). Slaughter and Leslie (2001) see academic capitalism as a phenomenon that may offer a new theoretical base for elucidating the irregular moves toward the market by public research universities.

In sum, academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie 1997, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004) is a valuable framework for scrutinizing higher education privatization as it arose from an analysis of neoliberal influences on universities from the early 1980s forward.

Academic Capitalism in MENA Region

Academic capitalism emboldens market-like behavior, with business schools as typical example of this approach. State funded higher education in the MENA nations is defied by a shortage of financial resources, underprepared students entering the system and challenging employment situations for graduates (Jaramillo and Melonio 2011). One weakness of the academic capitalist/learning system model may be its presumption that universities have embraced neoliberal thought and practices. In precise, while some Middle Eastern countries, particularly the Gulf States, are comparatively well assimilated into the international economy, most others are not—whether due to prevalent poverty, political segregation or conditions of perpetual clash.

Half a century ago, the Arab Gulf states were a long way behind other Arab countries in development terms. But the start of oil revenues during the 1950s and 1960s that twisted many of these states into distributive economies also brought the necessity for local higher education sectors to supply both infrastructural and emblematic support. Across the region today, conventional systems of governance sit side by side with substantial expenditure on higher education, facilitate internationalisation, free-market economies and massive numbers of highly educated and literate women. The main higher education plan is growth, in order to meet workforce needs, indigenize the careers and meet the request for higher education. This has been talked about through a spread of university ‘start-ups’ and ‘branch campuses’. These have started through personal networking with private foreign providers, who are supported by local business and receive government licences.

Nonetheless, events have happened in the field of higher education that cannot be fully explained by the concept of academic capitalism. One of these instances is the 21st-century educational gold rush in Dubai that was led by foreign business schools (see Alajoutsijärvi, Juusola, & Lamberg, 2013). This effort was not about the transformation of significant research universities; rather, it affords an example of how higher education markets create opportunities for business schools that these schools have not adored in their home countries. For instance, a few years ago, Dubai became a very good example of a free educational market. The first university in Dubai opened in the 1990s. Before that time, students seeking a university-level education had to go to the close Emirate of Abu Dhabi or had to enroll in a university abroad. Though, by the mid-2000s, Dubai had created a global educational center and a regional financial center that produced a huge need for business education programs. The request for business education was mainly filled by escalating private for-profit institutions, which usually used foreign education models, and by bringing in foreign business schools. Importing foreign education models has never been a problem in Dubai, which lacks a local academic heritage for its universities because of its substantial poverty and underdevelopment before oil was discovered there.
Burnout

It is now clear that employee, and faculty burnout in particular, has many causes. These causes seem in many aspects interrelated, for example, job insecurity and pay scale can be related to nationality. Research requirements and the ability to publish is also related to the available funding and also motivation which is in turn related to fairness of pay and level of workload.

The term burnout is used when people are not happy about what they have been doing. It is recognized that many have been affected by so called burnout effect which means the state of physical and emotional exhaustion resultant from conditions of work (Freudenberger, 1974). Burnout term was coined by Herbert Freudenberger in 1974 to describe a special kind of job distress (Freudenberger, 1974). Job burnout is a negative emotional reaction to job, generated through long attendance in high stress workplaces (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Maslach, & Jackson, 1986).

According to Maslach (2003), burnout is the physical, mental and emotional exhaustion subsequent from long-lasting job attrition. Burnout appears in three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal achievement (Maslach, 1982). The first, emotional exhaustion is described by feelings of frustration, rage, sadness and disappointment. The second dimension, depersonalization means a dehumanized and impersonal view of others and dealing with them like ordinary things rather than people. It is a pessimistic and distant attitude towards one’s work and the people one works with, demonstrating the interpersonal context in which burnout occurs. Depersonalization which splits workers from others and causes cynicism to colleagues, customers and organization. This dimension of the job burnout is predominant among those staff who frequently communicate to other persons (for instance teachers, students, customers, patients) to do their jobs. The last dimension, reduced personal achievement denotes to a loss of self-efficacy on the job and the tendency to assess oneself negatively (Maslach, 1982, 2003).

The review suggested many theories that can explain stress and burnout. The Existential Theory by (Frankl 1976) states that individuals need to believe that their lives has meaning and the activities they do is worthy. According to existential theory. In fact, Frankl (1976, p. 154) believes that ‘the striving to find meaning in life is a primary motivational force in man’. Frankl (1967) also thinks that the absence of objectives and ideals from individuals’ life might be cause for distress. Based on this theory, we can related burnout to the loss of meaning of life, the worthless activities individuals may perform, and we can compact burnout by providing faculty with activities and work environment that can enforce these aspects.

Burnout can also be explained by Karasek’s (1979) job stress Demand-Control theory argues that in workplaces that give individuals a high level of control or autonomy should not be stressful, even if the work itself is demanding, this point of view sees this can of job as active jobs but not stressful. This theory sees stressful jobs as the jobs that have low level of control and high level of demands i.e. high workload. For faculty, this seems good approach to compact burnout as faculty traditionally enjoy reasonable level of control over their daily work routine, this study sheds light on this aspect of the UAE faculty level of control in their workplace.

Other theories that can explain faculty burnout phenomena is Martens et al. (1990) Multidimensional Theory of Anxiety. This theory argues that employees’ job performance can be predicted by three separate psychological factors namely cognitive state anxiety i.e. the mental manifestations of anxiety, state self-confidence i.e. the conviction of certainty individuals have at a particular moment about their ability to succeed, and the physical symptoms of anxiety. Based on this approach, we can predict burnout by assessing theses three elements on the targeted population and if we can predict it then we can mitigate its consequences.
In summary, burnout is an essential variable not only because that it is an index to show individuals' weak enactment in workplace but also because that it effects on individual's attitudes, their physical and mental health and lastly on their behavior (Cordes, & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Lee, & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach, 2003; Maslach, & Goldberg, 1998).

Antecedents of Faculty Burnout

A number of studies examine the factors that impact academic fatigue, albeit none of the United Arab Emirates or business faculty specifically. Lackritz (2004) finds that burnout is approximately half that estimated in the general workforce and that could be due to employees’ fair of exposing their point of view. The literature review suggests a number of causes for academic burnout, these include academic institutions’ research requirements and the support available to do so, fairness of pay, course-load, administrative workload, student evaluations, passport strength, management practices and finally job insecurity.

We divide our hypotheses into four categories related to (1) market based incentives, (2) student interactions, (3) academic organization and evaluation procedures, and (4) perceptions of the external market for the human capital of faculty members.

Our first set of hypotheses relates to the role of market based compensation incentives in reducing faculty burnout. The educational administration literature on “academic capitalism” argues that faculty act as self-interested economic agents within an economic system generating market based intangible assets such as knowledge (Slaughter and Rhodes, 2004). Within this paradigm, individuals respond to incentive based compensation such as salary and merit pay increases. Because the business school curriculum is based on economic paradigms such as pay for performance, business school faculty may be uniquely incented by properly designed compensation contracts. Business school faculty in particular may be responsive to incentive compensation contracts, which have the scope to reduce burnout of business school faculty.

2.2.1 Pay for Performance

There is an ample literature regarding importance of pay and its positive impact on employees’ performance. Literature suggests that fairness of compensation is a dynamic element of employees’ motivation that they receive against their organizational input (Nix & Wolfe, 2016; Novac & Bratanov, 2014). While other numerous studies used various research tools in different applications such as (Mohsin, Rasheed, & Saidur, 2018) and (Mohsin, Zhou, Iqbal, & Shah, 2018). Findings suggested that the feeling of being treated fairly in their work environment show more motivation than others (Colquitt et al., 2001; Van Knippenberg et al., 2007; Van Knippenberg and De Cremer 2008; Hartmann and Slapničar, 2012). Wang et al. (2017, p. 359) studied salary discrimination based on nationality and they argues that “salary discrimination occurs in an organization when persons A and B exhibit the same performance, but person A salary is lower than person B's because of discrimination based on factors unrelated to performance”. Similar study also carried out on NBA players by Naito and Takagi (2017) and found that white players are being paid around 20% more compared to coloured players. Such unfair pay structure behaviour is bound to impact on employees moral and performance.

Paying fairly is also discussed extensively in the organizational justice literature (Konovsky 2000; Wade, O’Reilly and Pollock 2006, Kim et al., 2010). Paying fairly has a positive impact on employees’ motivation. According to Adams (1963), employees at a particular firm may assess their remuneration fairness based on what others who do the same work in the firm get- Disruptive Justice. However, the latter raises concerns about privacy as the level of earning individuals make is a private matter based on Data Protection Act 1998 in the UK for example. Marisa Beid in an interview published in a widely circulated UAE’s newspaper Emirates247 (2011) said: “I am the most qualified person in my team and one of the most productive workers, but what I get is the least”. Marisa’s point of view may be also
explain another disadvantage of Adams (1963) theory of Disruptive Justice, would Marisa feel that way if she hadn't found out about her other colleagues’ pay?

Thibaut and Walker (1975) Procedural Justice, however, argues that employees will assess the fairness of their pay if it was based on a pay system that is structured and can be trusted. Procedural Justice also raises questions about the transparency of the pay system and its design and structure.

In the UAE higher institution environment, faculty pay in most cases is a matter of negotiations, many universities adopt a pay scale system where a faculty post salary ranges from a minimum value to a maximum value that post holder can receive. This system opens a window for negotiation, therefore, some faculty members would receive higher remuneration than others who do the same work.

According to a report for Tong (2010) published by Zayed University, Western expatriates are the highest paid in the UAE, followed by Emirates and the lowest paid were Asians from India, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Philippines. Pay inequality is not unique to the UAE, as it seems to be a systematic process in Asia too. Joseph C. Geck, the former CEO of Global Intercultural Communication quoted in Kim (2010) saying: “Treating everybody (in Asia) the same would be as foolish as speaking Japanese to a Korean and expecting to be successful”. This situation can result in pay inequality that can potentially impact on faculty motivation, causes stress and ultimately burnout.

In this section, we expect a relationship between academic fatigue and fairness of pay.

**H1:** Academic fatigue is negatively correlated with perceived fairness of pay

### 2.2.2 Workload: Course-load & Administrative Workload

In almost all of the scholarly work we reviewed, workload has always been reported as cause for faculty fatigue. Many studies found high workload to be positively correlated with burnout (Fernet, Guay, and Senécal 2004; Barkhuizen, and Tytherleigh 2008; Zhong et al. 2009; Navarro et al. 2010). This was the case for other professions including nurses, doctors and social workers (Lazarus; 1993; Bakker et al., 2006; Chen and Chen, 2018). Job stress and faculty workload are becoming an emergent concern contributing to burnout from job dissatisfaction (Davidson, 2009). Stress, produced by work factors, refers to the contents of work itself and the tasks carried out in the work settings (Nguyen & Ermasova, 2018).

There is a considerable evidence of the positive relationship between overload and burnout (e.g., Abbas & Roger, 2013; De Beer, Pienaar, & Rothmann, 2016). Though, some studies have not found this relation. For instance, Chennoufi, Ellouze, Cherif, Mersni, and M'rad (2012), in a study with teachers of public secondary schools, found that 75.2% of the sample stated overload as a factor of occupational stress, but there was no important association between work overload and the burnout syndrome.

As for the UAE, the workload on faculty in many institutions is higher. This is because many of these institutions have gone through or currently preparing to follow the process of national and/or international accreditation taking for example AACSB accreditation process which requires faculty continuous involvement that is in addition to their course-load and many other administrative duties such as filing online database (eCAF folders), students advising, meetings and so on.

**H3:** academic fatigue is positively correlated with Workload: Course-load & Administrative Workload.

### Support and Resources for Research

Winefield et al. (2003) explored the pressure faculty face to publish in order to stay updated in their fields. Keeping a faculty job or securing new one depends largely on the faculty's ability to produce intellectual work. The following conversation in the great comic novel The British Museum is Falling Down is a true testament to how academia looks like now “I really will need a job next academic year. A job? A university post, is it that you want, Appleby?. Then I have only one word of advice to you... Publish! Publish or perish! That’s how it is in the academic world these days” (Lodge, 1989, p. 76). In
management disciplines, the pressure on academics to publish create is well acknowledged (Baruch and Hall, 2004).

In the UAE, the central government is pushing universities to provide a world-class teaching quality (Chapman et al., 2014) and one way to enhance teaching is by improving faculty knowledge and exposure through publishing. The market has also an undeniable role to play in this matter; students and their parents naturally would attempt to join a university that is known for its teaching quality and faculty research activities improve the educational experience of students (Thomas and Harris, 2000). Furthermore, competition is fierce among providers, universities proud themselves by having highly renowned faculty and in academic field faculty publications plays a major role, after all having a renowned faculty is a competitive advantage universities strive to acquire. International accreditation bodies also require faculty to be not only lecturers but also active researchers and this is the case for AACSB.

From a psychological perspective, threat response is also relevant in determining cognitive state. For instance, Craighead and Nemeroff (2004) describe an “aversive cognitive component” of the states of mind of individuals in highly stressful environments who wait in anticipation of a negative experience such as surgery. If evaluation processes are not perceived as fair or transparent, a threat response may be triggered ahead of student evaluations and annual faculty reviews.

2.2.3 Evaluation Quality

Performance appraisal is an organised formal interaction an employee and his/her and line manager that usually takes the form of a periodic interview and survey in which the employee job performance of the employee is reviewed and discussed (Moorhead and Griffin, 1992; Sabeen and Mohboob, 2008).

Employees appraisal process is a tool successful organisations use to enhance effectiveness and employees performance and satisfaction (Harrington and Lee, 2015; Esu & Inyang, 2009; Roberts, 2003). It is a central part of the HRM system (Longenecker & Goff, 1992). Satisfaction in the Workplace is necessary for enhancing performance (Suliman, 2007). Appraisal system involves two parties, Ratees and Raters. Giles et al. (1997) argues that one of the major factors that drives the success or failure of any appraisal system is the ratees reaction to the appraisal system, i.e. their perceived assessment of its fairness. This is because such systems not only include systematic or structure factors such as the appraisal design, outcome of the process, its dates or reporting lines but also psychological elements between raters and ratees that may also impact on the evaluation process. Preceived unfairness of the appraisal process can cause negative expectations; according Martens et al. (1990) negative expectations may cause mental anxiety.

In a country like the UAE where expats who come from different cultural, religious backgrounds make up to 80% of the country’s population, the challenges Ratees and Raters face while carrying out the review process becomes clear. Some might say that a rigid annual review process can overcome such differences; however, the human element in the review process can’t be ignored.

In this section, we anticipate that academic fatigue is also related to Employees appraisal process.

H3: academic fatigue is negatively correlated with perceived fairness of annual review processes

2.2.4 Job Insecurity

Lackritz, 2004 and Winefield et al. (2003) explored many of the stressors faculty, including job insecurity. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984 p. 438) defined job insecurity as a "perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation". The decline in funding for universities is one of the causes for layoffs and hence the feeling of insecurity (Kerlin & Dunlap, 1993). This job insecurity is also seen in public and private universities (Adkins, 2001) as many of these institutions no longer offer tenure contracts (Bess, 1998).
Adkins (2001) investigated five antecedents of job insecurity, including Tenure status, information, Tolerance for ambiguity, job satisfaction and thoughts of leaving the organization. Adkins (2001) found information, tolerance for ambiguity and tenure status to be significant predictors of job insecurity. Furthermore, job insecurity was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and the thoughts of leaving the organization.

As discussed earlier, there are no tenured-faculty in the UAE, expats work here based on employment contract approved by the Ministry of Labour. They also go through annual review every year that set to determine the likeliness of the renewal of their contracts. Hence, it is reasonable to expect that such reviews can put pressure on faculty as it has the potential to threaten their job security in the absence of a tenure system that gives job security to tenured faculty in many countries including the USA, Canada and many European countries.

Tenure system offers job security (Adkins, 2001) and is important for academics because it enhances innovation and creative problem solving among academics according to Neumann Jr (2017). However, other studies even questioned its fairness and suggested that tenure system is no longer suitable for the 21st century job market as it may cause complacency among faculty (Kaplan, 2010, Lawrence et al., 2014) and this might explain why in the USA tenured faculty count for only around 30% of the total faculty population while the adjuncts population is growing (Bernstein and Kezar, 2018). In the UK, tenure system scapped more than 30 years ago (Kaplan, 2010).

Based on our review, in this research, we hypothesize that the feeling of job insecurity leads to academic fatigue.

### 2.2.6 Passport Strength

Recent literature is starting to address the influence of nationality on pay scale and the benefit certain nationalities may secure compared to other nationalities (Silva at al., 2018; Naito and Takagi, 2017; Wang et al., 2017; Tong, 2010). Sliva et al. (2018) argues that your nationality may play part in the likelihood of you escaping from a low salary situation. Nationality-based pay is common practice in many countries; Wang (2017) studied pay discrimination based on nationality in the South Korean baseball and found that these baseball organisations practiced salary discrimination by paying foreign players considerably more salaries than local South Korean players and that is despite the similar performance records between the local and foreign players. Based on The GCC 2016 Salary Survey, conducted by Gulf Business all (Pressreader.com, 2016), expats holders of developed, mainly Western countries passports are being paid 28.9% salaries more Asian expats and 4.6 than Arab expats across the GCC region in which the UAE is part of.

However, our review suggests that very little attention was paid to explore the relationship between nationality and workplace stress and burnout. Out of the few studies, one conducted in Korea by Eunha (2007) and found that Korean psychotherapists suffered higher levels of workplace stress than their American counterparts. However, the most interesting study was conducted in Saudi Arabia by Ben-Bakr et al (1995) and found that Westerners expats exhibited the lowest levels of stress compared to Saudi employees who exhibited the highest levels of stress, followed by Arab expats then Asians.

The above suggests a number of facts; firstly, some passports are more influential than others on job market, secondly, holders of certain passports are more employable than others, thirdly, as a result holders such passport might suffer less stress related to job hunting or security than others and if they do, their remuneration package may still compensate for the stress they might endure at the workplace.

In the UAE, expats are temporary workers; there are no naturalization route for expats. If you hold a Western passport, you are more likely to be employed than others, even than UAE nationals as suggested by a report in the Khaleej Times (2018) a widely circulated newspaper. Furthermore, since
expats are temporary workers on a temporary resident visa, once their contract runs out they are required to leave the country unless they secure another employment, hence, expats going back to stable countries economically and politically would naturally be less stressed than expats whom contracts ran out and they need to go back to Yemen, Syria, Afghanistan or other countries that are less privileged politically and economically.

Based on the above, we expect that the passport a particular faculty hold would impact on her/his level of academic fatigue.

H4: Academic fatigue is positively correlated with perceived job insecurity

2.2.7 Other Antecedents

Our review also suggested other factors that may play part in faculty fatigue, for example, large class size is known to decrease learners’ achievement, lower their attendance and obstructs class engagement (Fassinger, 1995; Arias and Walker, 2004; Beattie and Thiele, 2016; Yamamori et al., 2017). Hence, class size can add pressure on faculty members as it can negatively affect their student evaluation scores.

Gender also known to have an effect on burnout levels; according to Steel (1988) and Doyle and Hind (1998) female lecturers feel more work stress than men. Similar results were reported by Tumkaya (2006) who found that female professors felt more severe emotional fatigue than male professors did. In the UAE, like many Muslim, Arab countries, the society is dominated by men and female faculty do not enjoy all the freedoms a male faculty have and this includes traveling for conferences or for professional development purposes. In this social structure, it would be hard not to assume the stress female faculty endure while presuming an academic career despite many government initiatives aimed at given women more role to play in the society.

Rank is thought to impact on the level of burnout faculty face, Gmelch, et al. (1986) found that higher faculty ranks experience less stress than their lower rank colleagues do. Tumkaya (2006) also found that those higher ranked professors experienced a lesser amount emotional exhaustion compared to other lower academic ranks. For example, full professors have a higher level of productivity and satisfaction than lower academic ranks and have a positive correlation with productivity and satisfaction Holden and Black (1996).

As for age, Boran Toker (2011) found in his study on Turkish academics that age was significantly related to job burnout, in fact his study found that age groups, 21-30 years have significantly higher mean levels of depersonalization than older age groups and that the older you get the more personal accomplishment satisfaction you feel. Russell et al. (1987) and Jackson (1993) argued that teachers’ age, was one of the predictive of burnout. Furthermore, younger staff found to be more vulnerable to emotional exhaustion (Watts and Robertson, 2011). On the contrary, Dillon and Tanner (1995) and Friedman and Farber (1992) also reported no significant relationship between burnout and age for faculty.

3. Methodology

A quantitative survey was designed based on Maslach Burnout Inventory MBI Educators Survey (MBI-ES). According to mindgarden.com which is a resource for psychological assessments The MBI-ES is a version of the original MBI for use with educators, including teachers, administrators, other staff members, and volunteers working in any educational setting.

The objective of this research is firstly to review the literature on such an important area of stress and burnout especially in the higher education sector, which is no longer immune from this syndrome. Another objective of this study was to explore the potential factors that cause faculty burnout in the
UAE. A related objective was to describe the theoretical framework we extracted from the literature review, then based on our review hypotheses will be developed. The main objective of this study is to investigate the factors that determine business faculty burnout in the UAE.

Data were collected from business faculty in a major UAE public university. A survey was sent by email to all business faculty totalling 191 according to 2018 HR headcount and 76 completed responses were returned, amounting to 40% response rate.

Appendix 1 provides variable definitions.

We then coded the survey results into excel and analysed the data in SPSS v.25. We used a multivariate regression framework in order to test our hypotheses as follows:

Dependent variable: Emotional Exhaustion /depersonalization (Burnout)

Independent variables: perception of requirements versus resource support, perceived fairness of pay, course-load, service requirements, student evaluations, passport strength, perceived management practices, perceived insecurity

Controls and expected coefficient sign: Age or time since PhD (-), public status (-), gender=female (+), department (?), marital status or dependents (+)

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics for the sample.

Table 2 provides bivariate correlations between model variables.

We observe that in a univariate framework, both measures of burnout are significantly and negatively related to perceived fairness of pay and satisfaction with pay for performance, indicating that higher satisfaction with compensation structure leads to lower levels of faculty burnout. Similarly, satisfaction with how merit pay is allocated is significantly and negatively related with both proxies for burnout. Further, satisfaction with the research and teaching workload is negatively and
significantly related to burnout. We also observe that satisfaction with teaching evaluations is negatively and significantly related to emotional burnout, but not with depersonalization. However, satisfaction with the research evaluation process is significantly and negatively related to both forms of burnout. In terms of job security, passport strength does not appear to be significantly related to academic burnout in the UAE. The reported level of job security does, however significantly lower both forms of burnout. Taken together, these results indicate that in the absence of tenure, as is the case in the UAE, faculty is responsive to institutional level incentives, such as compensation policy, workload requirements, fair evaluation processes, and a sense of job security. Our results are also broadly consistent with the academic capitalism perspective.

Next, we investigate the determinants of faculty burnout in a multivariate framework. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3.

In Models 1, 3, and 5, the emotional burnout measure is used as the dependent variable. Models 2, 4, and 6 provide the regression results using depersonalization as a measure of burnout.

Models 1 and 2 indicate that, controlling for satisfaction with workload, satisfaction with the evaluation process, perception of job security, age, gender, and rank, compensation, as proxied by perception of fairness of the compensation package (PAYFAIR) is not significantly related to academic burnout. Further, Models 3 and 4 indicate that satisfaction with the relationship between pay and performance (PAYPERFORM) is not significantly related to either aspect of faculty burnout. Models 5 and 6 further illustrate that satisfaction with merit pay (MERIT) is not a significant determinant of faculty burnout. These findings are inconsistent with hypothesis 1 as well as the academic capitalism/market based incentives paradigm.

In all six models, satisfaction with both teaching and research workloads (WORK_TEACH AND WORK_RESEARCH) were significantly and negatively related to emotional burnout (p value < 0.05), although research workload was not significantly related to depersonalization. These results are partially consistent with hypothesis 2. Furthermore, satisfaction with evaluation processes does not appear to be a significant determinant of faculty burnout (EVAL_TEACH and EVAL_RESEARCH; p value > 0.10). Passport strength is not significantly related to either emotional burnout or depersonalization; however, the strength of the perception of job security (SECURE) is significantly and negatively related to both measures of faculty burnout. This finding is consistent with hypothesis 4.

Regarding control variables, age is significantly and negatively related to burnout, indicating that faculty closer to retirement exhibit lower academic stress. Gender, rank, and number of dependents were not significantly related to burnout. All models are significant at the 5% level as indicated by the F-statistic (p value < 0.05). The models explained between 35.6% and 39.5% of the variation in faculty burnout as indicated by the Adjusted R-square.

Discussion and Conclusions

The academic environment in the United Arab Emirates is increasingly competitive, attracting a global pool of talent to its universities given its relatively high compensation package and tax status. Many schools are pursuing AACSB accreditation, and correspondingly, restructuring their workload expectations towards higher research expectations. The academic capitalism perspective relates universities to business enterprises and implies that faculty and staff will respond to market based incentive schemes.

Academic capitalism has pervaded business schools, but the discussion of this phenomenon has not yielded unanimous conclusions. Some authors who have studied the potential reforms propose new paths for business schools that have strayed from their mission. These authors note the dangers of academic capitalism but see the potential to reverse the change (see, e.g., Khurana, 2007; Taylor, 2010). Others acknowledge and criticize the problem but seem skeptical about the potential for
effective reform, suggesting that at best, we can hope to impede its growth (see, e.g., Giroux, 2002; Tuchman, 2009). In conclusion, academic capitalism is a theory that assists to explain how institutions of higher education move along the continuum with neoliberalism on one extreme and a public good philosophy on the other, it is a valuable framework for scrutinizing higher education privatization as it got up from an analysis of neoliberal influences on universities from the early 1980s forward (Slaughter and Leslie 1997, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004). Our results provide interesting insights into business faculty at one UAE institution undergoing substantial transformation from a predominantly teaching orientation to more of a research focus.

The present study was conducted to scrutinize the factors that affect burnout of faculty “academic fatigue” and to addresses an increasingly important area in the higher education sector in the UAE. The results are informative for academic institutions as it investigated the factors that impact academic fatigue in order to identify strategies to improve working conditions and faculty productivity which can then be employed worldwide.

Our finding indicate that academic faculty burnout (both emotional burnout and depersonalization) is not significantly related to satisfaction with financial compensation (either through salary or the structure of compensation) provides interesting implications for universities seeking to retain productive faculty. From a purely financial perspective, this result is counter to the academic capitalism paradigm, which is more consistent with the literature on employee financial compensation and incentives driving performance.

However, from a more holistic perspective, academic capitalism does not preclude implementing non-financial performance schemes into the overall compensation structure. Compensation is one component of the work environment, but providing a satisfactory workload and the feeling of inclusion related to the perception of job security appear to be more relevant for reducing both emotional burnout and the reported experience of dehumanization for business faculty. Specifically, improving the workload related to teaching, through efforts at reducing the number of new preparations or possibly even permitting course credit hour buyouts could yield improvements in workplace satisfaction without negatively impacting budgets. Research workload satisfaction does not appear to incrementally reduce the sense of depersonalization, but it is significantly correlated with emotional burnout.

**Recommendation**

Academic capitalism positively influences the anticipatory socialization to the academic profession by promoting a culture that preserves the traditional academic values and that recognizes the advantages of industrial partnerships at the same time. This research intended to provide university policymakers in MENA region and specifically in the UAE with a better understanding of the potential changes within their institutions that may ascend from policies and practices that support academic capitalism. This study intended to help government officials make more informed policy by increasing their awareness of the potential consequences of academic capitalism. The main contribution of the present study lies in the fact that it supports the concept that burnout can certainly be conceptualized as a developmental process. The present study was conducted to scrutinize the factors that affect burnout of faculty “academic fatigue” and to addresses an increasingly important area in the higher education sector in the UAE. The results are informative for academic institutions and uncovered the factors that impact academic fatigue in order to identify strategies to improve working conditions and faculty productivity which can then be employed worldwide. It is very important for higher education professionals to be aware that academic faculty burnout is not expressively interconnected to satisfaction with financial compensation and this gives significant implications to decision makers at the universities especially those who are looking for retaining productive faculty.

It is very important for higher education policy makers to be aware that providing a satisfactory workload and the feeling of inclusion are related to the perception of job security which
helps to reduce both emotional burnout and the reported experience of dehumanization for business faculty.
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Appendix 1

Variable Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>BURN_EMOT</td>
<td>Ordinal, scaled (0 lowest, 30 highest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>BURN_DEPER</td>
<td>Ordinal, scaled (0 lowest, 6 highest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Test Variables</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Satisfaction</td>
<td>PAYFAIR</td>
<td>Dichotomous, 1=high, 0=low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay tied to performance</td>
<td>PAYPERFORM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate merit pay</td>
<td>MERIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with teaching load</td>
<td>WORK_TEACH</td>
<td>Dichotomous, 1=high, 0=low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Review Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with research</td>
<td>EVAL_TEACH</td>
<td>Dichotomous, 1=high, 0=low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluations</td>
<td>EVAL_RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport strength</td>
<td>PASSPORT</td>
<td>Dichotomous, 1=high, 0=low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Security</td>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>Dichotomous, 1=high, 0=low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Control Variables</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Categorical, 20-40 = 1; 40-60 = 2; above 60=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Dichotomous, Male =1 and female = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>DEPENDENT</td>
<td>Ordinal, number of dependents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>Categorical (1 = assistant, 2 = associate, 3 = professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>Dichotomous, 1=high, 0=low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D1: Finance = 1, 0 otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D2: Marketing = 1, 0 otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D3: Management = 1, 0 otherwise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This appendix provides information regarding model variables.

Table 1
Sample Descriptive Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURN_EMOT</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURN_DEPER</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Independent Compensation Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAYFAIR</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYPERFORM</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIT</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK_TEACH</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_RESEARCH</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAL_TEACH</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL_RESEARCH</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSPORT</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPENDENTS</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table provides means, medians, and standard deviations for model variables; variable definitions are provided in Appendix 1.
### Table 2

**Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BURN_EMOT</th>
<th>BURN_DEPER</th>
<th>PAYFAIR</th>
<th>PAYPERFOR</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>WORK_TEACH</th>
<th>WORK_RESEARCH</th>
<th>EVAL_TEACH</th>
<th>EVAL_RESEARCH</th>
<th>PASSPORT</th>
<th>SECURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURN_EMOT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURN_DEPER</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYFAIR</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYPERFORM</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIT</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_TEACH</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
<td>-0.56***</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_RESEARCH</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL_TEACH</td>
<td>-0.36***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL_RESEARCH</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSPORT</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>-0.52***</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table provides bivariate correlations between dependent and test variables and corresponding test statistics. All variables are defined in Appendix 1. *, **, *** denotes significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.
Table 3
Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BURN_EMO</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>(6.27)**</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BURN_DEPE</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>(7.21)**</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BURN_EMO</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>(7.76)**</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BURN_DEPE</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>(7.19)**</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BURN_EMO</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>(8.87)**</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BURN_DEPE</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>(7.20)**</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H1: Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAYFAIR</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.39</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.45)</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.54)</td>
<td>(-0.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYPERFORM</td>
<td>-3.81</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.27)</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2: Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK_TEACH</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.31)</td>
<td>(-3.52)**</td>
<td>(-2.36)**</td>
<td>(-3.79)**</td>
<td>(-2.34)**</td>
<td>(-3.75)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK_RESEARC</td>
<td>-5.89</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-5.38</td>
<td>-5.83</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.14)**</td>
<td>(-0.58)</td>
<td>(-2.02)**</td>
<td>(-2.7)***</td>
<td>(-0.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3: Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAL_TEACH</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.51)</td>
<td>(-0.07)</td>
<td>(-0.50)</td>
<td>(-0.03)</td>
<td>(-0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL_RESEARC</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H4: Job Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSPORT</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.05)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(-0.17)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURE</td>
<td>-7.66</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>-7.17</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.64)**</td>
<td>(-2.06)**</td>
<td>(-1.89)**</td>
<td>(-2.13)**</td>
<td>(-2.51)**</td>
<td>(-2.06)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-3.80</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.44)**</td>
<td>(-2.47)**</td>
<td>(-2.56)**</td>
<td>(-2.44)**</td>
<td>(-2.54)**</td>
<td>(-2.47)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table provides the results of our multiple regression analysis testing our four hypotheses. T-statistics are shown in parentheses. All variables are defined in Appendix 1. Variance inflation factors are all less than 2. *, **, *** denotes significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.