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Abstract

Localization is a longstanding and worldwide issue and strategies for localization are being implemented in a complex environment of globalization and economic reform. Even though localization is a key issue, there are relatively few scholarly studies in the literature on this subject. Furthermore, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) government initiative ‘Emiratization’ is yet to realize the goal of increasing the productive employment of Emiratis in the labor market. However, localization practices are mostly seen as having a negligible impact. For example, Emiratization until today has had limited success, with only about 1% of Emiratis working in the private sector. Besides the turnover rate among Emiratis is high in general. This research intends to go beyond the current research by establishing a comprehensive understanding of localization, adding to the research literature, which has emphasized recruitment, with a focus on retention as a key aspect of localization. Retention is a significant aspect of localization as retaining local employees is seen as critical to its success. This research focuses on organizational commitment and turnover intention as variables representing local employee’s retention.

The objective of this study is to develop a theoretical model of local employee’s retention as an important aspect of localization and to test relationships between four aspects of organizational socialization and two types of stereotypes, and organizational commitment and turnover intention. This research aims to explore the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention of local employees. The theoretical insights on localization and retention, and then a discussion of the relationships between organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention are presented. This research further
investigates the organizational socialization constructs. The conceptual framework is further discussed with regards to the different outcomes related to organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention.

The empirical data for this research were collected and analyzed using survey responses from 431 employees in 9 organizations from both the public and private sectors in the UAE. The outcome of structural equation modeling offered mixed results; the statistical analysis indicated that organizational socialization and stereotypes contribute to organizational commitment and turnover intention. In addition to the direct influence of stereotypes on both organizational commitment and turnover intention, results also revealed that the future prospects serves as a mediator in the relationship between stereotypes and both organizational commitment and turnover intention. In terms of the antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intention, the findings suggest that future prospects can be the key in increasing local Emiratis retention and thus successful localization. Additionally, empirical evidence from this research confirmed the influence of stereotypes on the organizational socialization constructs.

The findings provide some insights into the study of localization especially with respect to retention. This research expands the conceptualization of localization to consider retention as a key aspect along with recruitment. It also furthers theoretical research on localization effects as this is the first study to investigate localization through the lens of organizational socialization.

**Keywords:** Localization, Emiratisation, retention, organizational socialization, stereotypes, organisational commitment, turnover intention.
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**GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Analysis for Moment Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>Average Variance Extracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>Beta Causal Path or Standardized Path Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Correspondence Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBSEM</td>
<td>Covariance-based Structural Equation Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Confirmatory Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Expectation-Maximization Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f^2 )</td>
<td>Effect Size Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>Gulf Cooperation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOF</td>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Internal Consistency or Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISREL</td>
<td>Statistical Package for CBSEM Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS</td>
<td>Latent Variable Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Multiple Correspondence Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Maximum Likelihood Estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVA</td>
<td>Missing Value Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS</td>
<td>Partial Least Squares Path Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q² Test</td>
<td>Stone–Geisser Predictive Relevance Test of Model for estimated PLS path model evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>A measure of the proportion of variability explained in dependent variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Reliability Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.e.</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Structural Equation Modeling (incorporating PLS and CBSEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SmartPLS</td>
<td>Partial Least Squares Statistical Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>Standardized Root Mean Square Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>Studentised t-statistic for significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANMIA</td>
<td>National Human Resource Development and Employment Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 : INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Research

Localization is policies adopted by countries to substitute non-national employees with locals (Al-Enezi 2002, Kapiszewski 2000). Localization worldwide is not a new phenomenon and has been the subject of research in the management and marketing literature (Al-Najjar 1983, Assael 2004, Daher & Al-Salem 1985). Further, localization strategies are being implemented worldwide in the complex environment of globalization (AL-Dosary 2004, Looney 2004, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Organizations’ success depends on having a talented and stable workforce, with organizations who value their workforce being more profitable than others (Pfeffer & Veiga 1999). In order to achieve this strategic imperative, they need to acquire and retain the best employees (Bauer, Talya & Erdogan 2014).

Localization has traditionally referred to recruitment and filling jobs with locals and not necessarily employee integration and retention. Extant literature in the field of organizational behavior studies has focused on the significance of employee retention (Deckop et al. 2006, Moncarz, Zhao & Kay 2009). Given the growth of new managerial methods to address retention and labor market dynamism, it is not surprising that turnover remains a vibrant area for study (Holtom et al. 2008). This research studies local employee’s organizational commitment and turnover intention, as variables reflecting job retention. Previous studies suggest that organizational commitment positively affects employees’ organizational behaviors, such as job performance and intention to leave (Holtom et al. 2008). Retaining committed employees in today’s competitive environment is considered to be challenging for organizations.
This research is motivated by the need to address how organizational socialization and stereotypes can impact organizational commitment and turnover within the frame of localization/Emiratization. This study utilizes an organizational socialization model developed by Taormina (1997, 2004) that consists of four key constructs; training (by which a person attains relevant job skills), understanding (which helps employees possess a functional level of organizational understanding), co-worker support (by which employees attain supportive social interactions with fellow co-workers) and future prospects (which are the perceptions about employees prospects for a rewarding career in their organization). Grounded in this organizational socialization model, the study develops a theoretical model of employee retention as an important aspect of localization and tests relationships between four organizational socialization constructs and two types of stereotypes with an employee organizational commitment and turnover intention.

In addition, the literature highlights differences between the private and public sectors in the UAE with respect to various aspects, such as human resources (HR) practices and the presence of stereotypes (al-Suwaidi 2011, Godwin 2006, Mellahi 2007b). Al-Ali (2008a) suggests that the private sector provides better training and career opportunities for employees than does the public sector, so we can expect different socialization processes between the two sectors. Furthermore, Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) argue that the presence of stereotypes used to be stronger in the private sector compared to the public sector, as stereotypes often initially start from within the private sector. Hence it is expected that there should be different results between the public and private sectors with respect to the study’s main constructs; organizational socialization and stereotypes and their effects on organizational commitment and turnover intention.
This study offers an extended view of the ‘localization literature’ and furthers theoretical research on localization influences. The results will help to explain the complex relationship between organizational socialization, stereotypes and their impact on organizational commitment and turnover intention. It is anticipated that this will result in a better understanding of how these constructs contribute to employee retention, as a key aspect of localization. The results will also enrich knowledge on localization in general and Emiratization in particular, as workplace localization has previously been studied with a key focus on employee recruitment, but not retention. Additionally, the findings of this research are expected to make important contributions to the fields of organizational socialization by examining the influence of organizational socialization on commitment and turnover intention. The impact of localization factors is also elucidated by examining the role of stereotypes in the research model.

1.2 Research Gaps

This research addresses the gap in the localization literature in terms of local employee’s retention by examining the effects of organizational socialization and stereotypes on both organizational commitment and turnover intention as variables reflecting retention. A review of the extant literature on localization, retention, organizational socialization and stereotypes identified the following research gaps. First, the literature suggests an overall scarcity of research on localization strategies and a lack of systematic discussion of the factors impacting on localization and how it should be managed (Wong & Law 1999), in addition to the underrepresentation of scholarly studies on localization programs in GCC countries (Forstenlechner 2010, Mellahi 2007b, Metcalfe 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Localization initiatives are
generally perceived as having only had a negligible impact in this region (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2010, 2011).

Localization traditionally refers to recruitment and finding job opportunities for the local population (Al-Enezi 2002, Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011) and not necessarily on local employee’s integration and retention. The research to date in this area has not recognized the limitations of emphasizing only one major aspect of localization, namely recruitment (e.g. Al-Ali 2008a, Metcalfe 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). This study goes beyond the narrow understanding of localization, allowing researchers to take retention into consideration as an important aspect of localization. Recruitment and retention are suggested as potential antecedents to localization and the full scale of localization consists of recruitment and retention (Forstenlechner 2010, Selmer 2004b). Retention is identified as a key aspect of effective localization programs, and Selmer (2004b) argues that retention is a core contributor to localization success. Localization does not appear to have been conceptually or empirically tested in the context of retention.

Second, scholars have tried to resolve the issue of retention by investigating factors impacting employees’ turnover intention and commitment (Holtom et al. 2008) and one of the most established models which predicts retention is the organizational socialization model. Organizational socialization is defined as ‘the process by which an employee acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role’ (Van Maanen & Schein 1979, p. 211). It is the practice by which employees move from being organizational outsiders to insiders as they adjust to their new role (Bauer, Talya & Erdogan 2014). Organizational socialization literature is a body of literature that has examined employee retention and commitment substantively
Localization literature has not considered the significance of organizational socialization efforts. Viewing localization as fundamentally recruitment and filling of quotas without consideration to the local employee’s integration into the organization and their retention can have unfavorable effects in the long run, including high turnover among the local employees. There is a considerable body of research related antecedents to organizational commitment and turnover intention (e.g. Cohen, A 2003, Ferris & Aranya 1983, Mathieu & Zajac 1990, O’Reilly & Caldwell 1980, Randall, D 1990, Stumpf & Hartman 1984). However, this research is mainly concerned with organizational socialization.

Research on organizational socialization justifies the significance of organizational socialization to localization. It has established a strong relationship between the socialization process and increased organizational commitment (Chao et al. 1994, Taormina 1997) which is associated with lower turnover intention; it is argued that unsuccessful socialization leads to turnover (Fisher 1986). This suggests that organizational socialization affects localization in terms of retention of local employees in the workplace. However, organizational socialization is overlooked in the context of local employees’ commitment and turnover intention.

Third, stereotypes have always been associated with localization as research reveals that negative stereotypes about local employees and how localization is perceived can affect the success of localization initiatives (Al-Ali 2008a, Forstenlechner 2010). The literature suggests that factors such as stereotypes represent a challenge to local employee’s competitiveness in the local labor market (Al-Ali 2008a). Negative stereotypes affect local employee’s motivational levels and thus their engagement at
work. This in turn is likely to affect their willingness to stay in the job. Negative stereotypes are one of the significant reasons for high turnover.

A review of the extant literature suggests that there is a gap in research as there are no studies yet that have connected stereotypes to antecedent variables including those representing organizational socialization. There is conceptual and empirical merit to examining stereotypes as the construct may impact outcome variables including organizational commitment (Riaz, Anjum & Anwar 2016) and turnover intention (Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry 2013, Wang & Shultz 2010). Besides negative stereotypes is one of the main reasons for high turnover rates among local employees (von Hippel et al. 2011).

Furthermore, this study proposes that the organizational socialization constructs are related to each other. However, to date, from the review of the extant literature it seems there is no published research that has studied the relationships between these organizational socialization constructs namely training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects. Researchers argue that offering employees with training and development advances their skills and capabilities (Harel & Tzafrir 1999, McEvoy 1997) and this provides employees with a better understanding of their jobs and the organization. Furthermore, the support that employees receive from their fellow co-workers enables them to gain an understanding of their job and organization. Moreover, when employees have a better understanding of their jobs and organization, their chances of career progression and promotion, and securing a rewarding career in their organization, increase. This research looks to explore the four constructs of organizational socialization in terms of their potential relationships to each other.
Many researchers argue that localization in the UAE has made virtually no progress, with a very limited number of local employees working in the UAE labor market in both the public and private sectors (Al-Ali 2008b, Forstenlechner et al. 2012). Therefore, there is a need to better understand why there has been little progress and how this situation can be changed. The importance of the expanding role that organizational socialization and stereotypes play on organizational commitment and turnover intention in both the public and private sectors of the UAE labor market can be demonstrated by highlighting the differences between both sectors with regards to the different socialization strategies and the strength of stereotypes. There is evidence from the literature suggesting differences in many practices concerning localization between public and private sectors, such as training and future career opportunities. In addition, negative stereotypes about local employees are stronger in the private sector than in the public sector (Al-Ali 2008b, Forstenlechner et al. 2012). Thus, this research looks to investigate the difference between public and private sectors with respect to the constructs being investigated, namely organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention.

In summary based on the review of the literature, current research is limited in terms of identifying the factors influencing localization, especially related to workplace retention. In an effort to identify the factors that affect local employee’s retention in the labor market, this study considers stereotypes and organizational socialization constructs in the retention aspect of localization. Thus, overall, this research seeks to address this gap in the literature by examining the role played by organizational socialization in retaining local employees in the workplace and the role stereotyping plays with respect to this.
The details of these gaps are presented in chapter 3, Literature review and chapter 4 Conceptualization.

1.3 Objective of the Study

This study investigates the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention by local employees. Specifically, the four constructs of organizational socialization and two types of stereotypes are explored with respect to their relationship with organizational commitment and turnover intention to tackle the issue of employee retention in a localization context. This study also seeks to explore whether the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention differ for public or private sector organizations. This study also looks to explore the four constructs of organizational socialization in terms of their potential relationships to each other. This study aims to provide recommendations for strategies for enhancing the success of Emiratization in the UAE labor market.

1.4 Research Question

This study aims to answer the following question:

- What is the influence of stereotypes and organizational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intentions in the context of localization?
Sub questions:

- What is the influence of stereotypes about local employees on their organizational commitment and turnover intentions?
- What is the influence of organizational socialization on local employee’s organizational commitment and turnover intentions within the context of localization?
- Does the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention differ for public and private local employees?
- What is the role that stereotypes play in the proposed relationship between organizational socialization and organizational commitment and turnover intention among local employees?
- What is the relationship between the four organizational socialization constructs?

1.5 Definitions of the Terms

In the context of this study,

*Localization* refers to policies adopted by countries to substitute non-national workforce with locals (Al-Enezi 2002, Kapiszewski 2000).

*Emiratization* is defined as an initiative by the UAE government to employ Emiratis in an efficient and meaningful manner in the labor market (Al-Ali 2008a, Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010).
Stereotypes are defined as beliefs and perceptions about the characteristics, attributes and behaviors of members of certain groups (Hilton & Hipple 1996).

Organizational socialization is “the process by which a person secures relevant job skills, acquires a functional level of organizational understanding, attains supportive social interactions with co-workers, and generally accepts the established ways of a particular organization” (Taormina 1997, p. 29).

Organizational commitment is defined as “an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in his/her organization” (Meyer & Allen 1997).

Turnover intention refers to employees’ perceived likelihood of leaving their organization (Mobley 1977).

1.6 Contribution of the Research

This research offers important theoretical and practical contributions on localization, specifically Emiratization, that can add knowledge to this field of research.

Theoretical/Conceptual Contributions

In terms of theoretical and scholarly contributions, an extended and refined conceptualization of localization is presented. This research expands the conceptualization of localization to consider retention as a key aspect along with recruitment. Forstenlechner (2010) suggests that the full scale of localization consists of recruitment and retention and Selmer (2004b) identified selection, recruitment and retention of appropriate local employees as core contributors to localization success. Localization traditionally referred to the recruitment and provision of jobs to local employees (Al-Enezi 2002, Kapiszewski 2000, Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011)
and not necessarily employee integration and retention; but there is a conceptual justification for expanding it to these two dimensions. Localization has not been conceptually articulated or empirically tested in the context of retention. This research pays attention to this under-researched component of localization and the results will enrich knowledge on localization in general and Emiratization in particular, as it explores localization with a key focus on retention.

Furthermore, to the author’s knowledge, this research is one of the first studies to conduct a detailed comparison between the public and private sectors with respect to the effect of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention. The literature suggests that these two sectors differ and investigating the effect of the study’s key variables can provide a detailed explanation of their effects.

The current research expands localization literature by conceptualizing it within the frame of organizational socialization. This research offers an extended view of ‘localization literature’ and to the author’s knowledge it is considered among the first research studies of its kind to investigate localization in the context of organizational socialization.

This research furthers theoretical research on localization influences as this is the first reported study to examine localization in general and Emiratization specifically through the lens of organizational socialization. While the direct relationship of organizational socialization (as a whole) on outcomes such as turnover intention and organizational commitment is well established in the literature, there is merit in testing the relationship between organizational socialization constructs as this can help to provide a better understanding of these constructs and how they influence each other. This will help
researchers and practitioners to understand which organizational socialization constructs are more critical to successful socialization practice.

This appears to be the first study to test direct relationships between the four constructs of organizational socialization, and this is one of the major contributions of the research. The relationships between individual socialization constructs have not been empirically examined. This study also provides an order for these constructs occurrence.

By applying the organizational socialization model within the unique context of localization, this study identifies stereotypes as an important construct impacting the retention aspect of localization. The study proposes a comprehensive model that integrates constructs of organizational socialization and stereotypes with organizational commitment and turnover intentions as representing the retention dimension of localization. To date, localization has not been understood by examining the patterns of relationships between these constructs.

Furthermore, most of the research on organizational socialization, commitment and turnover intention has been undertaken within a Western context (e.g. Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005, Gao 2011) with a few studies in an Asian context (Salavati et al. 2011). Thus, there is a need to extend the research beyond the western context. This is particularly important because this research aims to investigate the relationships between these constructs in the context of localization. This study is motivated by a lack of research in this field in relation to localization, especially in the GCC region. This might result in different implications regarding relationships between organizational socialization, commitment and turnover intention. Hence, it is anticipated to make important contributions to the body of knowledge on these organizational aspects in UAE.
Practical Contributions

In terms of practical contribution, the study investigates a national dilemma, localization in UAE, an issue that is rarely considered in international academic circles. This may be a result of the low percentage of Emiratis in the UAE population, and their high levels of unemployment. With more than 5 million expatriates being employed in the UAE labor market, Emiratis contribute 27 percent of employees in the public sector and 1.3 percent in the private sector, yet they have a relatively high unemployment rate (Al-Ali 2008b, Forstenlechner et al. 2012). Research is now starting to emerge in UAE and other GCC countries as they deal with similar employment and labor dilemmas (Al-Ali 2008a, Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). The findings of this study make an initial contribution to the question concerning the factors that have to be taken into consideration when implementing future Emiratization programs. The potential contribution of this research goes beyond the UAE as the GCC countries face comparable issues within an arguably similar context in terms of culture, demographic factors and economy.

The research will help practitioners understand organizational socialization and stereotypes and their influence on commitment and turnover intention within the context of localization. Recognizing the role of organizational socialization could assist managers to determine where to direct efforts in helping to develop employees’ commitment and as a result decrease their turnover. Given the necessity for organizations to understand the effect of organizational socialization on individual-related constructs in today’s competitive marketplace, the research will assist organizations from both public and private sectors to evaluate and establish the suitable
organisational socialization strategies and organizational practices that result in the highest levels of employee retention specifically within the context of localization.

Concern about the current saturated, and therefore limited, employment opportunities in the public sector and high unemployment among the most critical resource, Emirati labor, is a major issue for the country's socio-economic development (Ryan, Tipu & Zeffane 2011). The findings from this study will contribute new insights, and enrich the existing literature on Emiratization. Furthermore, this study enhances our understanding of the effect of stereotypes on Emiratization, a key aspect of the overall issue.

1.7 Organization of Chapters

This thesis consists of eight chapters. It covers first, the literature on localization with a particular focus on Emiratization in the UAE and the terms of this study. Second, existing theory is reviewed and research methodology is explained. The data analysis results of the research and finally the interpretation and discussion of results were presented. Next the conclusion and implications of the research and further research will be provided. The structure of the chapters is as follows:

Chapter One: Introduction

This chapter provides the background to the study and sets grounds on reason the research was conducted. This is followed by the discussion of the objectives of this research and explanation of the research question. Furthermore, this chapter discusses the objective of the research and its significance.
Chapter Two: Establishing the Context

This chapter is concerned with establishing the context of the research by providing background information about the UAE. Characteristics of the country, its demographics, history and economy are then discussed. A description of the workforce in the UAE is offered to give an understanding of the issues that UAE locals face and the environmental context of the research.

Chapter Three: Literature Review

In this chapter, a review of the literature is undertaken in order to establish the theoretical background. This chapter reviews the results in the existing literature, and shows their relevance to the objectives of this study. It reviews relevant literature including recent research on localization in general and Emiratization in particular, organizational socialization, stereotypes, employee commitment and turnover and how they relate to localization.

Chapter Four: Conceptualization and Hypotheses Development

This chapter presents a theoretical framework for the study based on the literature on organizational socialization, stereotypes and their relationships with turnover intention and organizational commitment. It also presents the conceptual rationale for the development of hypotheses testing the proposed relationships between the constructs included in the framework.

Chapter Five: Research Methodology and the Quantitative Study

This chapter describes the research design, approach, strategy, methodology and techniques used in conducting this research. It also describes the methodology selected,
the research process followed and its justification. A quantitative approach was used for this study. A description of the data collection method, sampling method, reliability and validity testing are also presented.

Chapter Six: **Data Analysis and Results**

This chapter discusses the data analysis and results the hypotheses testing. The statistical techniques used for testing each hypothesis are discussed, and then the results are reported. This chapter offers the findings of the research from the analysis of the data.

Chapter Seven: **Discussion of Results**

This chapter provides a detailed discussion of the study’s key findings and links these to prior research in the literature. Additionally, this chapter discusses the results to explain the significance and contribution of the findings.

Chapter Eight: **Conclusion, Implications and Recommendations**

This chapter presents the conclusions of the overall findings and contributions of the research. The limitations, implications and recommendations are presented along with directions for future research.

**1.8 Chapter Summary**

This chapter has set out the foundation for the study. It presented an introduction to the research topic addressing the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention in the context of localization. It described the purpose of the study and briefly presented the significance and the outline
of the study. The research gaps and questions were discussed, as well as definitions of the terms presented.

In order to provide context to the issue of localization in the UAE labor market, the journey into this much-debated topic begins with a brief overview of the context of UAE presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 2 : UAE – ESTABLISHING THE CONTEXT

2.1 Focus

In this chapter, the UAE labor market, along with its suitability for adopting the government’s Emiratization policy, is assessed. The chapter will review background information about the UAE, in order to establish the context for this study; this begins with a brief historical, economic and demographic overview of the country.

2.2 History and culture

The UAE is a constitutional federation of seven emirates with a political system based on sheikdoms and it is located on the eastern side of the Arabian Peninsula (Al-Oraimi 2004). Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan Al Nahyan, the former ruler of the Emirate of Abu Dhabi took the initiative of calling for a federation of the seven Emirates (eGovernment 2012). The other emirates (Dubai, Sharjah, Ajman, Ras Al Khaimah, Umm Al Quwain and Fujairah) believed that it was in their interest to unite as a single state and on the 2nd December, 1971 the UAE was formally announced as a sovereign entity (al-Suwaidi 2011). Sheikh Zayed was selected as President and Sheikh Rashid bin Saeed Al Maktoum, as the Vice President of the country (eGovernment 2012). Each emirate has a local government involving various government departments and retaining significant financial autonomy (Abubakr 2006, p. 60).

Since the foundation of the UAE in 1971, the seven Emirates have forged a distinctive national identity through the alliance of federal status and enjoy a significant amount of political stability. This federation constitutes the most unique Arab unity in present history (al-Suwaidi 2011, eGovernment 2012).
The culture of the UAE is derived from national, regional, social and organizational cultures. The regional culture includes three factors: religion, language, and history and is considered the main influential layer of culture in the country (Abubakr 2006, Christie 2010). The cultural behaviors of an Arab country are associated with Islam and the norms of Arabic communities (Bjerke & Al-Meer 1993). Besides, the work values in the UAE are considerably different from those in western countries as they are greatly affected by national culture (Steers, Sánchez-Runde & Nardon 2010).

2.3 Demographics

The UAE has one of the most diverse populations in the Middle East. During the past few years, the population of the country has increased rapidly from nearly four million in 2005 to about eight million by 2010 (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2011). Current estimates put the population at 7.3 million (Marchon & Toledo 2014). Of those, only 950,000 (11 percent) are UAE locals with the remaining 89 percent classified as expatriates. Additionally, since the late 1980s, people from all across South Asia have settled in the UAE (Abdulla, Djebarni & Mellahi 2011). Economic opportunities in the country have led to higher living standards than almost anywhere else in the Middle East. The population is characterized by a skewed sex distribution where the number of males is double that of females. This gender imbalance is considered among the highest in any country in the world (al-Suwaidi 2011).

2.4 Economy

Recently the UAE won the bid to host the World Expo 2020 in Dubai. The UAE is one of the most developed economies in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). The UAE is considered a high growth economy that rapidly diversified into areas of
banking, finance, tourism, logistics and manufacturing (Jabeen, Cherian & Pech 2012). Additionally it has attracted many international organizations that are interested in the UAE because of its well-developed infrastructure, flexible investment laws, and the availability of highly skilled expatriate professionals (al-Suwaidi 2011, Jabeen, Cherian & Pech 2012). Recently, the UAE ranked 27th in the Global Competitiveness Index, 32nd in human development and is the only Arab economy categorized as ‘innovation-driven’ (al-Suwaidi 2011). The GDP per capita is currently 16th in the world and 3rd in the Middle East. There are several inconsistent estimates related to the actual growth rate of the country’s GDP but the average quarterly GDP growth for the last decade was 6.19 percent (al-Suwaidi 2011, eGovernment 2012).

Flexible economic policies and development schemes have allowed the UAE to reach a prominent status in the international economy (al-Suwaidi 2011, Elamin 2011). Indeed, the UAE economy is considered one of the fastest growing economies in the Middle East (Shallal 2011). While petroleum and natural gas exports still play a dominant role in the economy, diversification initiatives are assured to transform the country into a regional and international leader in important fields including technology, renewable energy, tourism and financial services (al-Suwaidi 2011).

In terms of economic reform, according to al-Suwaidi (2011) the country has initiated several strategies, at both the federal and local levels, to maintain a competitive edge in the world economy. With respect to the federal level, the country is pursuing the “2021 Vision,” which aims to accomplish major landmarks by the time of the golden anniversary of Federation. On the local level, recent developments in two major emirates, Abu Dhabi and Dubai, highlighted the continuing changes in the country’s economy. For example, Abu Dhabi is investing greatly in renewable energy through
Masdar, Mubadala and IRENA. On the other hand, Dubai has been the role model to other nations seeking rapid growth and modernization. For example, the Emirates Group, a successful Dubai government-owned company achieved a gross income of $15.6 billion in 2010-2011 (al-Suwaidi 2011).

The financial crisis of 2009 initially had a negative impact on the country as a whole, and Dubai particularly, because of the real-estate sector and its debt problems where the GDP growth rate had fallen from 6.5 percent to 3.2 percent in 2007. However, recent experience has proven the flexibility of the UAE economy, as it was able to achieve a faster recovery than expected. According to the International Monetary Fund, the GDP growth rate had improved in 2010, and was expected to grow by 3.3 percent (al-Suwaidi 2011).

Economic growth has been fostered by a relatively liberal business environment with minimal barriers to trade. Additionally, the introduction of free zones has reduced some of the restraints on foreign ownership of companies and requirements for branches of foreign firms to employee UAE agents (eGovernment 2012). This policy encourages expatriates to look for work opportunities in the UAE rather than other Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) or MENA countries.

2.5 Present Day UAE

Success in politics has been accompanied by successes on economic and social fronts. In 2006, a major step towards democracy was made by enhancing civilians’ participation in government through the introduction of indirect elections to the parliament, the Federal National Council (FNC) (al-Suwaidi 2011). The decree stated that out of the 40-member chamber, twenty deputies would be elected and the other
twenty would be appointed by the rulers. While the 2006 FNC elections only had an electoral college of 6,689 (2011), the 2011 elections had about 130,000 participants and in 2019, FNC elections will be open to all UAE locals (al-Suwaidi 2011). There were nine female members in the 2006 FNC, or 22 percent which is one of the highest ratios of women in the world. In the 2011 elections there were seven (or 17 percent) (al-Suwaidi 2011). The function of the FNC is to look into executive decisions and make recommendations related to the social issues concerning UAE citizens such as demographic imbalance; education and health systems; Emiratization and rights of women (al-Suwaidi 2011).

The UAE government has shown considerable recent interest in improving both education and research. Recent enterprises established include the Centre of Excellence for Applied Research and Training (CERT) Research Centers and the Masdar Institute of Science and Technology. This shows the UAE government is interested in developing the abilities of its citizens so that they can attain the skills and competencies required for joining the workforce, especially the private sector (al-Suwaidi 2011, eGovernment 2012). Another example is the UAE’s recent contract signed with South Korea to develop nuclear power stations which mainly focuses on the engagement and training of local employees at all stages of the project (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2010).

2.6 History of Expatriates Flows to UAE

The adoption of a market economy has encouraged foreign workers from all over the world to move to the UAE. According to Ramaswani (1968), a capital-rich nation is usually employs two approaches; either to send some of its capital out of the country, believing profits are higher there, or attract expatriates to work in the home country
believing it could be achieved at a lower foreign wage rate. He further claims labor migration is preferable for growing a nation’s real national income. The UAE has followed the second strategy by allowing a large influx of foreign workers to significantly increase the country’s real national income over the past three decades (Al-Ali 2008b, Elamin 2011).

After the discovery of oil in UAE in 1960 the country witnessed dramatic progress (Al-Ali 2008a). During this economic development, the millions of jobs created were not filled with Emiratis but with foreign workers due to a structural preference for cheap, imported labor and the shortage of a local workforce (Davidson 2009). In order to facilitate infrastructure development, undertake major projects and support the development and growth of local businesses, organizations have been allowed to freely hire expatriates with limited intervention from government. By the year 2006, expatriates constituted 91 percent of the total labor market, predominantly in the private sector (Tanmia 2006). The expatriate workforce in UAE is the highest percentage of any GCC country. The present majority of foreign workers can be viewed as a direct consequence of ambitious plans to convert the nation into an economic leader in the region (Mohamed 2002). These initiatives were necessary because the local workforce was not only lacking in the needed skills and experience, but was also too small to physically staff the infrastructure needed. Al-Ali (2008a) claims that this percentage of unemployment is expected to increase significantly in the next few years without government involvement.

2.7 UAE Labor Market

In order to investigate obstacles to perceived employability of Emiratis, it’s important to realize some facts about the labor market in the UAE. Firstly, even though there are not
any formal figures because of the transience of labor, the UAE labor market consists of a vast majority of expatriate workers (Elamin 2011, Jabeen, Cherian & Pech 2012) and it is generally assumed that expatriates comprise approximately 95.8 percent of the labor market in the UAE (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2011). In the past, the migrant laborers who used to come to the UAE to work and save before going back home were temporary workers. Nevertheless, this situation has changed over time as a new migrant workforce is increasing or replacing those leaving the UAE, making labor migration permanent. Secondly, foreign employees hold jobs that local Emiratis would not accept. Moreover, they are doing jobs that require experience that the local Emiratis do not possess. Thirdly, foreign employees accept adjustments and variation in working conditions more willingly than UAE locals. Lastly, foreign workers are always available and in infinite supply. This is due to the better wages and working conditions offered for those workers than in their country of origin (al-Suwaidi 2011, eGovernment 2012).

Unemployment in UAE

Despite the fact that unemployment among Emiratis in the early phases of the country’s growth was not a concern, the increase in human capital amongst the locals did not keep pace with the growing demands of the rapidly developing economy. Marchon and Toledo (2014) suggested that to address this, the UAE government implemented a flexible immigration policy that permitted organizations in the private sector to attract required skilled labors. They further added that this flexible immigration policy also permitted firms to employ service and manual laborers for the unskilled occupations that the recently enriched locals were reluctant to take. This resulted in a private sector that is currently composed almost completely of non-national labor.
Although labor migration into the country has certainly conveyed great benefits, the rapid increase in the non-national employment has been associated with high and increasing unemployment among Emiratis. In 2011, The National newspaper presented a comprehensive study indicating a 13% unemployment rate among UAE locals at the federal government level. The study also cautions that the government sector is already saturated and that it recruits too many Emiratis in management positions.

Emiratis comprise 27 percent of employees in the public sector and 1.3 percent in the private sector, however they have a relatively high unemployment rate (Al-Ali 2008b, Forstenlechner et al. 2012). Moreover, Emirati job seekers are a very small proportion of the UAE labor market, but large numbers remain unemployed (Al-Ali 2008b). Unemployment rates among Emiratis increased from 8.6 percent in 2001 to more than 12 percent and this percentage is expected to rise during the next decade (Forstenlechner et al. 2012). This latest labor market reality obligates the government to facilitate an increase in Emiratis’ employment in the private sector (Al-Ali 2008a).

While relevant tables showing the progression of labor market indicators over a period of time would be very valuable to understand trends, there is very few formal published data available about UAE labor market which makes a trend analysis difficult. Further there is no publically available data accessible to researchers with regards to the labor force for public and private sector which makes it difficult to make a comparison between the two.

In the next chapter, localization, Emiratization in practice and different issues related to localization implementation are discussed in detail.
Chapter 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Focus

In this chapter, a review of the literature is undertaken in order to establish the theoretical background and status of the literature relevant to the study. This review of the literature will cover latest research on localization generally and Emiratization particularly, organizational socialization, stereotypes, employee commitment and turnover and how they relate to localization. This chapter aims to investigate how localization looks in practice, assessing labor market’s suitability for adopting and implementing localization. While frequently mentioned in the popular press within the UAE, Emiratization as a subject has not received enough attention from researchers given its importance for the UAE, and its likely relevance to other Middle Eastern countries facing similar issues with regard to their localization efforts.

3.2 Theory and Relevant Literature

The review of the literature is divided into three main sections. First, there is a discussion of the localization literature, identifying core concepts and key initiatives related to it, as well as the key argument about its nature with a focus on Emiratization in UAE. This part of the chapter will address the background of localization policy and adoption in other countries with a discussion of the global nature of this subject and particular focus on Emiratization as an example of localization. This will be followed by a discussion of the practice of Emiratization in the local labor market within the UAE, with specific reference to the obstacles and challenges that Emiratis face in finding suitable jobs, including negative stereotypes acting as a key obstacle. Second, a conceptual discussion of productive employment as a key characteristic of localization
highlights the relationship between retention and other key factors such as organizational commitment and turnover intention. Third, a discussion is presented of the scholarly literature related to organizational socialization theory in terms of its relationship with organizational commitment and turnover intention.

This research adopts theory of organizational socialization that is common in the literature (Van Maanen & Schein 1979, Feldman 1976, 1981). Organizational socialization is defined as ‘the process by which an employee acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role’ (Van Maanen & Schein 1979, p. 211). The interest in understanding the socialization process comes from the considerable positive practical organizational implications that can result from effective socialization. Employees attain the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors they require to contribute as organizational members through the practice of organizational socialization (Van Maanen & Schein 1979). Research on organizational socialization has evolved over the past few years. The work on socialization includes the idea of occupational socialization, stage models of socialization (Fisher 1986), organizational socialization tactics and the role of information seeking (Wanberg 2012).

Scholars investigating organisational socialization have employed diverse methods to study this topic. One method considered the area of socialization and the factors that contribute to it (Chao et al. 1994). Another method adopted by scholars such as Feldman (1981), Wanous (1992) and Garavan and Morley (1997) focused on the stages through which employees would progress. A third method emphasized many strategies used by firms to facilitate socialization (Louis, Posner & Powell 1983, Taormina 1997, Van Maanen & Schein 1979). However, organizational socialization in the literature has been categorized into two broad domains; the process and the content (Taormina 2007).
These domains are separated as one deals with organizational socialization as a process through which newly joined employees go as they advance in their organization (Van Maanen & Schein 1979). Whereas the other domain suggests that organizational socialization is principally the content learnt by the employee during the progress in their organization (Taormina 1994).

The developers of the stage models described organizational socialization as a continuous process, (e.g. Van Maanen & Schein 1979) with others (e.g. Chao et al. 1994, Fisher 1986, Takahashi 1994) confirming that the socialization process is a dynamic learning practice that comprises many stages. The most common model of socialization, as proposed by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) and Feldman (1976, 1981) consist of three stages. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) suggest three stages for the socialization process comprising pre-arrival, encounter and metamorphosis stages. The pre-arrival or anticipatory socialization stage is the period of learning that happens before new employees join the firm. In the encounter stage those employees learn about the firm and confront the potential that expectations and reality can differ. The metamorphosis stage is when employees adjust to the work and the firm. Furthermore, Ardts, Jaosen and Van der Velde (2001) recognized three key stages that are experienced by employees before and after they join their new jobs: anticipatory, encounter and acquisition stages. Similar to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), anticipatory socialization involves all of the learning that happens before the employee's first day on the job. A number of approaches are promoted to enable the anticipatory socialization stage. The first approach includes appropriate preparation for training and suitable exposure while conducting training (Arnold & Garland 1990). Similarly, the encounter phase happens when the new employee enters the firm and starts learning the job tasks and establishes work relationships. Throughout this stage these employees face
several challenges - for instance understanding and adapting to the organisational culture, demonstrating their capability and learning new tasks (Garavan & Morley 1997). The process influences the employee’s commitment and intention to stay in the organization (Van Maanen & Schein 1979).

However later on, Taormina (1997) developed a new model which was explicitly continuous and consists of four constructs. He further claims that all these dimensions fit into four more comprehensive constructs that are consistent with other models and frameworks. Taormina’s framework is employed in this study. The dimensions are: (i) Training received, which refers to the development of skills and capabilities; (ii) Employees’ understanding of the job and of the organization, that is the capacity to implement concepts based on possessing a clear awareness of the nature, importance or clarification of what happens in the firm; (iii) Co-worker support, which refers to the moral or emotional sustenance that is offered without financial compensation by other employees in the firm; and (iv) Future prospects within the workplace, which refers to employees expectation of achieving a rewarding career in the firm. In the current study, Taormina’s (1997) Organizational Socialization Model was used in order to measure organizational socialization.

3.3 Relevant Literature on Localization

The globalization of business has resulted in a growth of two somehow divergent human capital issues. One is an expanding incidence of expatriate workforce (Metcalf 2007, Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011), and the other is the topic of localization (Al-Lamki 2007, Godwin 2006, Harry 2007, Lee 2005). Furthermore, a key problem facing many multinationals and local organizations in third world countries is how to balance the two goals of a high quality and a nationalized workforce (Potter 1989).
Williams, Bhanugopan and Fish (2011) describe localization as the replacement of home-country national employees with qualified locals. Bhanugopan and Fish (2007, p. 366) define localization as “a process in which local officers increase their competencies, and consequently improve their performance, the main objective being to train and develop locals to enable them to replace expatriates with competency and efficiency”. According to Wong and Law (1999), localization refers to developing job related skills and delegating the authority of decision-making to local employees in order to prepare them to replace expatriate managers. Basically, localization refers to policies adopted by countries to substitute non-national workforce by locals (Al-Enezi 2002, Kapiszewski 2000). Potter (1989) suggests that localization is effective when positions previously held by expatriates are occupied by competent local employees who are capable of performing the job. He further suggests that localization occurs when locals competently fill jobs. It is the extent to which positions originally held by non-nationals are filled by local employees who are capable of performing the job (e.g. Law, Wong & Wang 2002, Potter 1989, Wong & Law 1999). In order to appreciate the complexity of localization initiatives, this section provides a background of localization worldwide.

Localization initiatives differ globally and there is no universal approach to localization due to the variation in political, cultural and economic contexts, especially with the growing globalization (Forstenlechner 2010, Harry 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Some argue that localization can be realized by increasing the cost of foreign labor through minimum pay levels and rising fees to organizations employing expatriates (Harry 2007).
Even though localization is a key issue for multinational companies operating in the host country, there are comparatively few scholarly research studies on this subject (Law et al. 2009). Two key themes emerge from these limited studies. One is whether localization is beneficial to multinational companies (e.g. Selmer 2004a) and the other emphasizes conditions that promote successful localization (e.g. Fryxell, Butler & Choi 2004). It is a significant employment concern for transnational businesses going into or operating in this specific region of the world (Looney 2004, Mellahi 2007b, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Nations such as China (Wong & Law 1999), Singapore (Ruppert 1999), Zimbabwe, South Africa (Muthien, Khosa & Magubane 2000) and Malaysia (Ahmad, Mansor & Ahmad 2003) have all adopted localization policies (Jomo & Wah 1999). The following sections will shed light on some localization initiatives around the world.

Wong and Law (1999) define localization as a process of employing an indigenous workforce in host states instead of parent states' expatriates in multinational companies, joint venture enterprises and transnational companies (TNCs). These authors refer to the context of foreign firms operating in South East Asian countries such as China and other states having open market investment strategies that allow and promote foreign firms and investors to start their businesses in their host states (Wong & Law 1999). In China, localization is a key concern for many international companies operating in the country (Jones, S 1997) and localizing top management and technical employees is a key objective for many TNCs (Wong & Law 1999). Further, multinational organizations are required to implement localization policy.

Although localization is a major concern in China, only a few studies have investigated the issue of localization in that country (e.g. Lam, Tse & Yim 2001, Law, Wong &
Wang 2002, Wong & Law 1999, Worm, Selmer & de Leon 2001). Localization in China focuses on developing and offering development opportunities to the local workforce so that they will ultimately move into jobs currently filled by expatriates (Selmer 2007). The government rewards expatriates who mentor locals in an attempt to provide them with job opportunities and reduce the dependence on the expatriate workforce (Lynton 1999, Wong & Law 1999). However, as in other countries, local (Chinese) firms need to retain on average 5 to 10 percent of expatriates employees to sustain competitive advantage (Selmer 2004a).

Selmer (2004a) identified foreign managers' reluctance and competence as two antecedents of localization success, while Fryxell, Butler and Choi (2004) focused on selection and retention efforts as potential antecedents to localization. Nevertheless, in general, the pace of localization initiatives is not very fast and many firms have become disappointed with their slow advancement. The unwillingness of expatriates to support localization efforts is associated with the level of localization of western companies operating in China. Many studies have discussed examples of unsuccessful localization in China (e.g. Keeley 1999, Luo 2000). Expatriate employees in China are reluctant to promote localization. Selmer (2007) claims that one reason for this is that many expatriates are unwilling to support the localization process merely because they do not want to leave their jobs to provide employment for locals. On the other hand, even though expatriates are being held accountable to train and develop locals to replace them, they might not perceive themselves appropriate for this task (Selmer 2007).

Furthermore, countries such as Malaysia and Singapore implemented similar policies on expatriate workers. In order to enhance the recruitment of its locals, the government of these countries introduced regulations on foreign labor including work permits for
expatriate employees, employment passes for skilled workers and a security bond for each non-local employee to be paid by their employers (Ruppert 1999).

Fryxell, Butler and Choi (2004) suggest that planning and selection were key elements in successful localization. Selmer (2004a) claimed that the readiness of foreign managers to train locals was a major determinant of localization success. Selmer (2004b) in another study, found selection, recruitment and retention of appropriate locals as core contributors to localization success. Law, Wong and Wang (2004) suggest that localization objectives, planning and commitment and related human resource management (HRM) practices have significant influences on localization outcomes.

Localization initiatives differ globally due to the variation in political and economic contexts (Forstenlechner 2010, Harry 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007) especially with the growing globalization (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). There is still no clear conceptualization of localization or of what it comprises. Most of the previous research concerning localization describes it from a limited perspective of finding job opportunities for locals only (Dale 2004; Ingo 2008), neglecting a very critical aspect of retaining already employed locals. Some argue that localization can be realized by increasing the cost of foreign labor through minimum pay levels and rising fees to organizations employing expatriates (Harry 2007). Others suggest that localization focuses on developing and offering development opportunities to the local workforce so that they will ultimately move into jobs currently filled by expatriates (Selmer 2007).

The practice of localization seems to be gaining awareness and the economic recession which began in 2008 has strengthened political awareness of the policy as a way of guaranteeing the jobs of locals (Sadi & Henderson 2005, 2010). Forstenlechner (2010) suggests that there is a lack of comparability given the significant differences between
localization in Africa, Asia and the GCC in terms of demographics, history and culture. There is evidence of localization adoption in the Middle East where countries in the GCC have a history of dependence upon an imported workforce. Employee recruitment and retention in the Middle East pose a challenge for the public and private sectors (Harhara, Singh & Hussain 2015). Localization in the GCC region is sophisticated as it links openly with other political and social issues.

The labor market of the GCC is faced with the Gulf paradox which refers to high domestic unemployment whereas, at the same time, it depends on expatriate employees (Metwally 2003, Zerovec & Bontenbal 2011). There are several key characteristics of GCC labor markets. The GCC comparably has the largest share of imported labor in the world and this share has been increasing over the past twenty years (Zerovec & Bontenbal 2011). On the other hand, most locals are employed in the public sector, leaving the private sector mainly for expatriates (Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011). At the same time, the population of the GCC states has been growing rapidly, from 4 million in 1950 to 40 million in 2010 (Kapiszewski, Andrzej 2006, Shah 2008). On the other hand, there is particularly high reliance on expatriate workforce and education systems that are not broadly coherent with job market requirements (Gonzalez et al. 2008). The present labor situation in the GCC has strong implications for the employability of locals. The comparably high reservation wage for GCC locals is regularly not being met (Forstenlechner 2010) and as a result creating a strong preference among locals to work in the public sector (Mellahi 2007b), leading to highly segmented labor markets and “a low elasticity of substitution between local and foreign workers” (Fasano & Goyal 2004, p. 3). There is a general preference for government sector in all GCC countries (except in Oman), a sector that is unable to employ more locals as they have already reached a saturated employment rate (such as the case in the
UAE public sector) (Forstenlechner 2010). The UAE government sector cannot accept to be part of the workforce as this sector is saturated and there are few job openings for new Emirati candidates. According to Forstenlechner (2010) unemployment pressures among locals in the GCC have emerged as a result of the government no longer being able to be the employer of first and last resort, and the non-oil sector continuing to rely on non-national (expatriate) labor.

Forstenlechner (2010) claims that the attention in the GCC has shifted towards the private sector. Most of the other localization initiatives in the GCC such as Saudisation, Omanisation and Kuwaitisation were launched in the 1990s and are designed on a quota-based system to increase the proportion of local employees in the private sector and at the same time reduce the proportion of foreign workers overall (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2010, Randeree 2009). Local populations increasingly demand that their governments put pressure on the private sector to recruit more locals (Angell 1986). Nonetheless, localization in the GCC has faced resistance especially in the private sector and locals were perceived to be more costly to hire and less skilled and willing than expatriates (Sadi & Henderson 2010).

Other GCC countries with similar cultures and circumstances face similar difficulties with their localization initiatives. Saudi Arabia has launched its localization program in an effort to tackle the issue of unemployment among its citizens. Saudisation requires all private sector companies to increase their employment of Saudi locals to 30 percent; however only one third of that target had been achieved by 2009 (Salih 2010). Al-Asmari (2008) and Al-Haran (2004) indicate that the localization approach in Saudi Arabia involves the government requiring relevant training and educational programs. Al-Dosari (2011) criticized the poor implementation of Saudisation because it lacked
equality in packages between locals and non-nationals. According to Al-Dosari, a lack of equality resulted in locals becoming lazy and just perceiving the job as a way of getting paid.

Emiratization on the other hand is similar to other GCC countries’ localization initiatives, though there is more emphasis on skills and competencies (Forstenlechner 2010). However, the UAE is a special case where the Emirati jobseekers cannot find adequate employment opportunities, while they only represent a minority of the total workforce (Abdelkarim 2001, Al-Ali 2008a).

Other hindering factors could be found in the legal framework in the GCC, which provides organizations with more power and control over their expatriate workforce than over locals (Forstenlechner 2010). Residence permits seems to bond expats to a single employing organization, leaning the balance in workforce turnover unfavorably against locals (Mellahi & Wood 2002). While organizations acknowledge the necessity to adjust their human resource management strategies, many prefer engaging in expensive one-time initiatives than a step-by-step scheme to successfully roll out their localization strategy (Kuntze & Hormann 2006).

These localization practices are mostly seen as having failed or having only had a negligible impact as the number of non-national workers in the GCC increased dramatically alongside many locals still being unable to find jobs (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2010, 2011). Changes to government policies and legislation have meant more complicated recruitment requirements in the GCC (Mellahi 2007; Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). The growing utilization of quotas and security from termination for local labor force and other practices to increasing the participation of locals in the labor market have changed the human resources landscape (Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish
In fact, because of such alterations in legislation, it has become progressively less likely for big firms to establish themselves in the GCC without being concerned with localization in these countries.

The literature on localization has emphasized implementation and embedding locals into the labor market in a manpower sense. Localization literature has not considered the significance of organizational socialization efforts although there is evidence to indicate that merely considering localization as recruitment by filling of quotas without adequate attention to employees’ integration into organization can have a detrimental effect in the long run. Besides, there are no follow-up strategies or program initiatives to guarantee that these locals are managed effectively, hence increasing the probability of potential failure of localization efforts.

Overall, there is a scarce body of theoretical knowledge on localization strategies (Mashood, Verhoeven & Chansarkar 2010). Wong and Law (1999) argue that despite its significance, there is a lack of systematic discussion of how localization should be managed. Further, while literature on localization exists in most GCC countries, most scholars of this literature claim that there is an underrepresentation of scholarly studies on localization programs (Forstenlechner 2010; Mellahi 2007; Metcalfe 2007; Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007).

This study focuses on localization in the context of the UAE. As an answer to the challenge of workforce imbalance in the country, the government endorsed a localization policy under the name of Emiratization (Yaghi & Yaghi 2014). Emiratization is an initiative by the government of the UAE to influence features of employment practices in public and private organizations to support the employment of Emiratis (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Abdelkarim (2001, p.57) defines
Emiratization as “a multi-level process through which dependency on the expatriate labor force is reduced and Nationals are prepared to perform their jobs equally as good if not better than expatriates in the shortest possible period”. Toledo (2006) describes Emiratization as initiatives by the government of the UAE to develop local talent for local labor market jobs and to close the gap between the numbers of non-national workers versus local employees in the country. Emiratization’s key objective is to increase employability of Emiratis and as a result reduce the nation’s dependence on foreign labor (Al-Ali 2008a, Dale 2004, Forstenlechner 2008, Lim 2012, Mashood, Verhoeven & Chansarkar 2010). Al-Ali (2008a) suggests that Emiratization focuses to build a skillful Emirati workforce that can take the responsibility of leading the country in the future on their shoulders. It aims to employ Emiratis in an efficient and meaningful manner in both public and private sectors (Al-Ali 2008a).

UAE locals face comparably less economic pressure to join the workforce (Forstenlechner 2010) than, for instance, locals in South Africa (Muthien, Khosa & Magubane 2000) or Malaysia (Jomo 1993). As mentioned before, UAE is considered a special case as Emiratis represent a minority of the total workforce and represent only 15.5 percent of the total population of the country (Abdelkarim 2001; Al-Ali 2008a). Recent statistics indicate that Emiratis represent less than 10 percent of the total workforce (Salem 2010). As a minority in the population and the workforce, Emirati need to work hard so they can take the lead in their country and secure their careers.

3.4 Localization in UAE “Emiratization”

The UAE government started its Emiratization scheme in both public and private sectors in the 1990s. While Emiratization strategies vary from one emirate to another, they all comprised of mainstream human resource functions such as recruitment and
selection, training, career development, and the design of reward schemes (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). UAE appears to be an appropriate case within which to investigate concerns of localization given official enthusiasm for Emiratization (Al-Ali 2008a, Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010).

The government has initiated a number of programs, under the Emiratization scheme (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007) with the intention of increasing the proportion of local employees in the local labor market and at the same time reducing the proportion of foreign workers (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2010, Randeree 2009). The purpose of these programs is to reinforce the employment of Emiratis in the labor market.

Emiratization initiatives can mainly be categorized under three practices: long-term plan to diversify from the oil sector; Tawteen a ‘bottom-up’ approach, which emphasizes empowering young Emiratis with skills required in the job market; and Ihlal a ‘top-down’ approach to implement a range of direct labor market programs such as setting quotas and the allocation of particular positions to be held solely by Emiratis (Forstenlechner et al. 2012). The first is part of the continuing aim of the UAE to diversify away from an over-dependence on the capital-intensive hydrocarbons sector. The second, Tawteen, is designed to empower young Emiratis to contribute to the economic growth of their nation using a bottom-up approach (Shallal 2011). It aims to renovate educational and training systems to align the skills acquired with the requirements of the job market. The third, Ihlal, also known as “job Emiratization” aims to apply a range of direct labor market schemes such as quotas’ settings and allocation of specific jobs to be held merely by Emiratis as a ‘top-down’ method (Forstenlechner et al. 2012). Ihlal started in the government sector by replacing current expatriate workers with Emiratis (Godwin 2006).
According to many scholars, Emiratization initiatives, similar to other localization initiatives, were first applied through structural reform, instead of specific measures (Al-Ali 2008a). Al-Ali (2008a), goes further, observing that Emiratization is currently a quota-driven recruitment plan, suggesting certain recruitment quotas for particular sectors including banking, insurance and education (Jabeen, Cherian & Pech 2012). The intention was to guarantee Emirati employment opportunities in the private sector. The problem with these quota-based systems is that they aim to hire a token number of Emiratis to non-strategic positions (Forstenlechner et al. 2012) where companies only aim to achieve these required quotas regardless of whether or not the job provided matches the employee’s qualifications or experience.

After 2000, the government of the UAE, like other GCC countries, issued a variety of economic policies concerning local job markets and encouragement for the recruitment of UAE locals (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007), including salary subsidies, government salary restraints, charges on non-national labor, and quotas and employment targets for UAE locals (Karam, Jayashree & Lindsay 2014). However, these initiatives are mostly seen as having had only a negligible effect and didn’t succeed in the long-term (Jabeen, Cherian & Pech 2012, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007), as the number of non-national workers has increased dramatically over recent years (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2010, 2011).

Emiratization has had only a limited impact insofar as only 1.3 percent of Emiratis work in the private sector and an estimated 12 percent of other Emiratis are neither in education or employment (Forstenlechner et al. 2012). For example, at the time of his study, only one of the 46 registered insurance firms reached the required 5 percent quota target (Al-Ali 2008a, p. 370). According to Al-Ali (2008a), initiatives to support private
sector organizations to employ Emiratis, enhance the education system, and applying education-to-employment transit schemes has not fully achieved the UAE government’s goals of increasing productive employment opportunities for Emiratis.

Further, in 2006, the UAE Council of Ministers issued a decree, the Council of Ministers Order No. (259/1)\(^1\) of 2004, that gave private sector organizations eighteen months to substitute all expatriate human resources managers and secretaries in all departments with Emiratis. However, after three years Sheikh Mohammed Bin Rashid AlMaktoum, the Ruler of Dubai, criticized this initiative, claiming the decision disregarded the reality and country’s priorities (Al-Ali 2008a).

The commitment of the government of UAE to develop its locals has resulted in the establishment of various governmental institutions dedicated to the development of the locals. TANMIA was one of the first specialized organizations established by the government of UAE to address issues related to Emiratization. Its responsibilities include suggesting relevant Emiratization strategies to the federal government, establishing employment opportunities for the Emiratis and providing learning and development interventions and resources to the Emirati workforce (Tanmia 2005). Although there is no clear common method of accomplishing these, best practices include strong leadership and implementation of organizational policies and practices (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). They include policies that influence the cost of living, illegal immigrant’s deportation and strict regulation of visas. Other polices include creating employment opportunities through training, development and different market-based and administrative measures such as setting up quota based systems, bans, and the localization of the government sector (Shah 2006). Although there are various

\(^1\) Council of Ministers Resolutions on Training and Employment of UAE citizen in the private sector
responsibilities of TANMIA, its main focus is to create jobs for Emiratis in the private sector and specify the training required to enable them to fit the role of those jobs. This has put the private sector under great pressure to ensure the employment of Emiratis and establish appropriate criteria to make the Emiratization goals realistic and achievable.

3.5 Barriers to Localization

Regardless of the considerable efforts of governments to make localization initiatives in general successful, many argue that these initiatives have not actually realized the anticipated purposes (Al Ghadeer 2011, Pech 2009, Yaghi & Yaghi 2014). The application of the initiative appears to be incompatible with the aims and expectations of the stakeholders (Yaghi & Yaghi 2014). Challenges such as reliance on a foreign workforce and locals not possessing the required skills and expertise to join the labor market are all preventing locals’ employment in the labor market. One of the main barriers facing localization is the considerable reliance on a foreign workforce. Non-nationals view localization as a threat, where sooner or later they are going to be replaced by locals and as a result they avoid transferring knowledge and expertise to locals. Expatriate managers and experts are always reluctant to transfer their knowledge to locals (Selmer 2004a; 2007). Morada’s (2002) study highlighted that many locals think that expats do not intend to transfer their knowledge to them. In addition, many others believe that expats actually exhibited discrimination toward them. On the other hand, there is a general perception that local employees are not quite ready to join the workforce as they don’t possess the required skills and expertise to join the labor force, especially in senior positions. Employers point to inadequate skills and expertise among locals as impediments to their employment (Ahmed 2003, Al-Ali 2008a).
Emiratization is implemented by the government as a means to combat the demographic imbalance in the country (Yaghi & Yaghi 2014). However, of the total number of the workforce there are less than 4.2 percent Emiratis in the workforce now and this is expected to decrease dramatically in the next few years (Forstenlechner & Rutledge 2011). There are many obstacles and barriers to the successful Emiratization of the UAE labor market. Challenges such as the differences in working between private and government sectors, reliance on a foreign workforce and Emiratis not having the required skills and expertise to work in the private sector are all preventing UAE locals’ employment in the labor market (Al-Ali 2008a). The literature suggests a clear preference of Emiratis for the government sector over the private sector (al-Suwaidi 2011, Godwin 2006, Mellahi 2007b). Despite the clear commitment of the UAE government to facilitating Emiratization, there seems to be a general lack of mutual commitment from local organizations and Emiratis themselves (Karam, Jayashree & Lindsay 2014).

**Emiratis’ preference for the government sector**

Much like locals of other GCC countries, Emiratis overwhelmingly prefer working in the government sector. According to TANMIA (2006) there are 192,000 UAE locals working in the Government sector. Most Emiratis from both genders look for jobs in the government sector as a more favorable option (Nilson 2010). Al-Ali (2008a) reports that several scholars have discussed the reasons why Emiratis favor working in the government sector; these include offers of better wages, rewards, hours of work, and job security. There are differences in working conditions between the private and government sectors: working hours in government sector are generally shorter, with less work pressure, more incentives and higher job security than the private sector.
that low rates of employment or high attrition rates might eventually drive Emirates out of work in the government sector. Working in private sector companies is quite a new phenomenon for Emiratis. This has resulted in 80 percent of Emiratis working in the government sector and the remaining 20 percent either have their own business or work directly or indirectly for the private sector. Since only about one percent of Emiratis are employed in the private sector, UAE locals have only general and sometimes vague impressions of it, but little firsthand knowledge or experience (Al-Ali 2008a).

In the UAE, work in the government sector is strongly linked to cultural preferences that affect which types of jobs are appropriate for Emiratis (Mellahi 2007). There is a different path for Emiratization in the government sector where the focus is on Ihlal (Godwin 2006). Ihlal started by categorizing certain positions that should only be held by Emiratis; however this initiative requires Emiratis to possess certain skills and qualifications for higher and mid-level jobs since they will not accept low income or non-skilled jobs (Abdelkarim 2001). Examples of such positions include administrative and managerial jobs (Al-Ali 2008b). Managers in the public sector think that Emiratization can actually have a negative overall effect on organization’s production and performance (Abdelkarim 2001).

About a decade ago, the public service attempted to develop the managerial competencies of Emiratis, since, to that time, development of work policies including on-job training and education system reform had been slow. In order to develop the managerial competencies of Emiratis, government departments based promotion on particular standards including deployment of courses, high school education and grade
reforms. As a result, Emirati graduates were obligated to look for opportunities in the private sector (Al-Ali 2008a).

**The private sector dilemma**

The private sector in the UAE is different to that of other countries as it controls about 4 million jobs in the UAE and is the biggest employer in the country. However, it is struggling to compete with the government sector in terms of hiring Emiratis. The average number of Emiratis in private companies stands at around 7-8 per cent, lower than what is needed to integrate UAE locals into the private sector. The Minister of labor indicated that 20,000 Emiratis will be joining the workforce each year and the government sector cannot occupy them (Al Sadafy 2012). According to Essa Al Mulla, Chief of Emirates National Development Programme, the unemployment rate among Emiratis is more than 13% (about 40 thousand of 300 thousand Emiratis eligible to work in UAE) (Osman 2013).

With the public sector no longer capable of accepting Emiratis at the same rate that it used to, private sector engagement is paramount to reduce unemployment in the Emirati workforce (Marchon & Toledo 2014). A crucial element for the success of Emiratization lays in the private sector cooperation where the government of UAE hopes that the private sector will pass on the professional knowledge and skills required for jobs in this sector. This will help the government to develop the Emirati workforce to produce an Emirati cohort possessing high standard qualifications, knowledge and experience. The private sector has to work very closely with the government sector to develop local workforce development.
The provision of jobs for Emiratis remains a high priority for the UAE which applies quotas for the percentage of Emirate staff working in banking, insurance, professional, and distribution services. Emiratis currently occupy around one percent of the private sector workforce (Forstenlechner et al. 2012, Rees, C., Mamman, A & Braik, A 2007). The private sector is not only governed by different rules and regulations but also subject to economic considerations that are more demanding than the public sector. Another factor relating to the private sector is a cultural tendency to view specific, physically demanding work such as building, roads and maintenance as unsuitable and inappropriate for Emiratis (Al-Ali 2008a). According to Al-Ali (2008a), there are many obstacles to Emiratization in the private sector and the negative attitude of UAE locals towards physical work, such as in construction, is a key barrier. The standard of living of UAE locals is high in general, and, consequently, they cannot accept certain types of professions and jobs, such as construction company workers, and other basic occupations and Emiratis believe that it is their country’s moral obligation towards its people to provide them with suitable jobs. Forstenlechner and Rutledge (2010) suggest that the provision of a very well-paid and unchallenging public sector job for Emiratis is major barrier.

Many private sector organizations are reluctant to hire Emiratis because of their salary expectations (Abdelkarim 2001; Forstenlechner 2010). The private sector always thinks of the cost and rarely takes any social or national concerns into consideration (Abualresh 2011). Even those private sector organizations which hire Emiratis are focusing more on placing Emiratis with high school qualifications and below, rather than on graduates, who may wish to join the private sector. Private sector hires high school graduates because they are much cheaper in terms of salaries and packages than university graduates. In addition, the private sector may hire some Emiratis to fill the
quotas or demonstrate their obligation towards Emiratization; in reality those Emiratis will often be neglected in those companies and will eventually leave.

The government is aware of the incapacity of the private sector organizations to employ with Emiratization approaches, and that some of these organizations think of Emiratization requirements as a form of taxation (Godwin 2006). In an attempt to establish stable solutions the government selected appropriate sectors for Emiratis to work in, including banking, insurance and trade where different quotas were set for those sectors (Alserhan, Forstenlechner & Al-Nakeeb 2010).

**Different types of barriers**

The literature suggests several categorizations of barriers facing Emiratization depending on the nature of those barriers. For example, Abdelkarim (2001) categorizes problems with Emiratization in three main areas; a continuing demand for recruiting, unfair competition between Emiratis and foreign employees who come from their countries with superior experience and are willing to work for lower salaries, and, lastly, inadequate skills of Emiratis. This reflects two dilemmas: resistance of (mainly) private sector organizations to employ from the local cadre, and unwillingness of Emiratis to work for organizations (mainly) from the private sector. These are discussed below.

*Employer’s resistance to Emiratization*

Reasons for resistance of private sector employers to recruit Emiratis include a general perception that Emiratis, especially the fresh graduates, are not quite ready to join the workforce as they don’t possess the required skills and expertise, such as social skills and ethics (Ahmed 2003; Al-Ali 2008a). Employers claim that Emirati jobseekers lack professionalism, particularly those not holding university degrees as they just care about
getting a job and might not even know about the activity of the organization. Their main concern is the financial incentives that the job offers (Farghali 2011).

Another obstacle Emiratis seeking to join the labor market face is the language barrier, since many Emiratis do not have sufficient English skills (Abdelkarim 2001). The English language is considered crucial to attaining higher qualifications and a professional career in both the public and private sectors (Abdelkarim 2001).

There are many reasons why Emiratis lack professional skills and competencies. The training and development programs provided for Emiratis are one of the challenges. Al-Ali (2008b), in his study concerning structural barriers to Emiratization, found that Emiratis do not tend to train well; further, the provision of training is not always sufficient or appropriate to the needs. Moreover, being one of world’s highest per capita income countries has resulted in high life-style standards for UAE locals (Godwin 2006) and the attitudes associated with this have led Emirati to have little interest in pursuing their education or getting professional training.

In addition, education levels of Emiratis are another challenge. Many jobs in the labor market are considered to be unsuitable for the Emirati workforce because of the current levels of education and experience in certain areas (Alserhan, Forstenlechner & Al-Nakeeb 2009). It is not a priority for many Emiratis to pursue higher education (Nelson 2004) as they prefer to join either the police or the military; these institutions offer good salary packages, even for those with only secondary school-level education or lower. For male Emiratis, three out of five secondary school graduates prefer to join the army or the police force (Abdelkarim 2001). About 47 percent of unemployed Emiratis have a secondary school certificate and 17 percent have lower than secondary school level
education. With respect to female Emirati secondary school graduates, three out of four prefer employment in the government sector.

Another challenge is the education system itself. According to TANMIA (2006), one of the main reasons for the unemployment of locals is that local education qualifications do not match workplace requirements closely enough especially in the private sector. Like most of the Arab and Middle Eastern countries, the UAE education system focuses on traditional learning styles characterized by rote learning, rather than critical thinking. This has resulted in graduates without the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to enter and sustain a successful career in the local labor market (Al-Ali 2008b).

Many researchers recommended that the government should focus closing the gap between higher education outcome and the labor market by improving a long term education strategy (Godwin 2006; Abdelkarim 2001; Al-Ali 2008a). It is claimed that education in the country did not reach the expected level (Forstenlechner 2010). Randall (2010) argues that it is not appropriate for the government to measure the output of education based only on economic indicators. He further suggests that the government should focus on improving the quality of Emirati graduates and try to find the causes for the lack of motivation of Emiratis towards educational accomplishment.

Even in the government sector there is currently some resistance towards Emiratization by Emirati managers. Emirati managers prefer foreign employees despite the equivalent expertise and capabilities of Emiratis. The reasons for this preference for Emirati managers over expatriates including for example the lack of the English language skills for Emiratis and at the same time the span of control they have on foreign employees (Salom 2011).
*Emiratis unwillingness*

The unwillingness of Emiratis to work for some organizations especially in the private sector is a key barrier for Emiratization (Al-Ali 2008b). Scholars such as Al-Ali (2008b) have addressed the unwillingness of Emiratis to be employed in what they perceive as a meaningless job. This has been attributed to personal aspects: impracticable expectation of compensation and working conditions, lack of skills and competencies and lack of interest (Al-Ali 2008a). There are many reasons for this unwillingness of Emiratis as they view that those organizations cannot comply with their expectations. More often Emiratis prefer to work for the government sector in comparison to the private sector even though it has more than four million jobs and can easily incorporate them. The next sections will present some different perspectives on this issue.

Emiratization focuses on providing Emiratis with better opportunities and salaries which Emiratis see as their right; however many organizations especially in the private sector find this difficult to accept. A key challenge is the difference between salary packages between both sectors where the salaries offered in the private sector are much less than in the government sector. This is according to many scholars considered as the main obstacle facing Emiratis to work in the private sector (Al-Ali 2008a; Abdelkarim 2001). Emiratis working in government organizations are paid more than those in the private sector and this imbalance is a result of the job market, which offers work opportunities mainly in the private sector (Al-Fakhri 2004).

Working conditions in the private sector present a major challenge to Emiratization, as the government sector has certain criteria that the private sector cannot match, such as working hours, which are lower in the government sector than in the private sector (Abdelkarim 2001). Furthermore there are fewer working days in the government sector
(five working days) than in the private sector (six working days) (Alserhan, Forstenlechner & Al-Nakeeb 2010, Neal 2010). In his research, Morada (2002) found that more than 24 percent of Emiratis leave the private sector for this reason.

Job security is another important factor that pushes Emiratis away from the private sector. Emiratis in the private sector can easily lose their jobs as the private sector does not offer any sort of job security (Al-Ali 2008a; Alserhan, Forstenlechner & Al-Nakeeb 2009). In contrast, the government sector provides Emiratis with a sense of stability, knowing that they will not lose their jobs even if they do not perform well.

The following sections present a review of the literature on the key constructs and variables of interest: stereotypes, organisational socialisation, organisational commitment and turnover intention. These lead subsequently to a conceptual framework and hypotheses that propose relationships between them.

**Stereotypes**

Underlying assumptions and stereotypes seem to be crucial to the success of localization, especially the retention aspect, as negative stereotypes are associated with low levels of commitment and high levels of intention to leave the place of work (Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry 2013). The literature suggests that there is a gap in research here, as there have been no studies yet that connect stereotypes to antecedent variables, including organizational socialization. There is conceptual and empirical merit to examining stereotypes as this construct is thought to impact antecedent variables, such as organizational socialization.

Stereotypes are "widely shared assumptions about certain types of people that are represented cognitively as extensive, well-organized categories or schemata"
Stereotypes play a significant role in organizational settings (von Hippel et al. 2011) and people tend to use stereotypes to make decisions about others with little information about that individual (Page 2007). According to Page (2007) stereotypes act like an ‘uncertainty-reducing mechanism’ to facilitate judging of others, when the public is provided with perceptions that are considered as generalizable about individuals of certain social groups. The effect of stereotype occurs when stereotyped group members represent a small percentage of a professional firm (Murphy, Steele & Gross 2007). Stereotypes place individuals in groups and make assumptions based on those classifications. Some stereotypes signify the precise demonstration of a reality to which the perceiver is exposed. Stereotypes work as object schemas that permit more effectual processing of information about individuals while representing components of reality (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007).

Negative stereotypes influence the degree of trust experienced by individuals towards the potential and actual employing organizations (Kary & Shirako cited in Posthuma & Campion 2009). In GCC nations trust is often an obstacle to a local’s employability (Al-Ali 2008b). Al-Lamki’s (1998) study of the Oman context showed that expatriate managers favor tight control and central decision making, with only modest delegation and empowerment to subordinates. In general expatriate managers prefer expatriate employees to work for them. In the UAE Al-Ali (2008a) claims that this is the result of negative perceptions and beliefs about locals. According to TANMIA (2006) expatriate managers have little concern for local employees’ skills and knowledge, an attitude that may explain Emiratis’ preference for government sector employment.

Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) argue that stereotyping particularly applies to Emiratization. The initiatives of UAE government bodies seek to identify the reasons
for the separation of Emiratis from the nation’s rapidly expanding economy: “this dichotomy is evident as Emiratis’ bonding capital of their families and tribal structures, and the transient bridging capital of the overwhelming expatriate numbers” (Al-Ali 2008a, p. 368). Forstenlechner et al. (2012) argue that negative stereotypes are one of the strongest barriers that reduces an organization’s willingness to recruit Emiratis. Although Emiratis hold several of the nation’s most senior posts, they might not be fully capable of sufficiently planning or directing the country’s future.

From the employers’ point of view, failed localization initiatives in the past have contributed to an evolving negative stereotype of locals (Mellahi 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007; Forstenlechner 2010). In the UAE, the failure of past imposed Emiratization programs has resulted in the rising negative stereotyping of Emiratis (Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Such stereotypes frequently result in a self-fulfilling prophecy, whereby companies are forced to employ Emiratis under quota-based schemes and lower the standards to recruit locals for posts these particular individuals cannot possibly be successful in, thus reinforcing existing stereotypes (Forstenlechner 2008). It is clear throughout the literature that Emiratis are perceived as unmotivated, lazy individuals with deficient work ethics, arriving at and leaving work as they desire (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010, Behery 2011, Mellahi 2007a, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). These perceived negative stereotypes about Emiratis are held not only among foreigners, but among Emiratis themselves to such an extent that it appears to form more or less an aspect of identity (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). Stereotyped employees are not seen for who they are or what they could contribute to the workplace. Negative stereotypes limit manager’s ability to best utilize their subordinates’ skills and support them in developing new skills. For instance, if a manager sees an Emirati as a lazy individual who lacks work ethics, he might never be offered the chance to develop
his skills and he might ultimately leave the organization due to the lack of training and development opportunities. Employees are more likely to leave their organizations if they perceive that negative stereotypes control how they are treated in the workplace.

Similar to other schemas, therefore, the issue with stereotypes is that they tend to result in perceivers failing to notice individual differences (Page 2007). In the labor market context, if stereotypes are strongly present in individual’s thoughts of the out-group members, they might impede an individual’s ability to think about others objectively; as managers, co-workers, or more importantly as job candidates (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). According to Riaz, Anjum and Anwar (2016) negative stereotypes are a key cause of anxiety. Research shows that negative stereotypes have a negative influence on employee performance (Hess, Hinson & Statham 2004, Jordan & Lovett 2007).

Additionally, Page (2007) asserts that negative stereotypes might reduce the motivation of those stereotyped. Negative stereotypes in the organizational environment affect employees in many ways, including job security and promotions (Walker 1999). Page (2007) argues that negative stereotypes may become self-fulfilling and may act as disincentives that impair willingness to work hard and further reduce career opportunities for those who are subjected to negative generalizations. Negative stereotypes obstruct open communication and group work. When negative stereotypes persist in organizations, work groups do not function appropriately, development opportunities are lacking and candidates for promotion might be overlooked (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). Thus negative stereotypes are more likely to harm the career progress of individuals of the social group that is being stereotyped.
Although stereotypes are important in themselves, they have the potential to lead to destructive behavioral consequences that justify the main focus of scholars’ attention (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). Research shows that employees’ perceptions of negative stereotype are associated with low levels of commitment and high levels of intention of quitting (von Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry 2013). According to Riaz, Anjum and Anwar (2016) negative stereotypes have a negative relationship with organizational commitment. Furthermore, negative stereotypes have a huge potential to disrupt important behavioral intentions including high turnover intentions (von Hippel et al. 2011). Wang and Shultz (2010) also claim that negative stereotypes create social pressure on employees to leave the organization. There is a positive relationship between negative stereotypes in organizations and turnover intentions (Abrams, Ando & Hinkle 1998, Glazer & Beehr 2005, Parasuraman & Alutto 1984, von Hippel et al. 2011). High employee turnover can be a sign of employee perceptions of bias based on negative stereotypes.

3.6 Productive Employment

Although earliest initiatives of developing localization models exist (e.g., Selmer 2004a, b; Law, Fryxell Butler, & Choi 2004; Wong & Law 1999), research on realizing successful localization remains scarce (Law et al. 2009). Localization traditionally referred to recruitment and filling jobs with locals (Al-Enezi 2002; Kapiszewski 2000; Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011) and not necessarily on local employee’s integration and retention. Localization still has a rather narrow meaning to some, where it is looked upon as a method to fill jobs by locals. This study takes a broader view of localization, looking at it as influencing more direct productive employment, or as described by Potter (1989) as ’effective localization’.
Potter (1989) argues that the traditional narrow view of localization is an organizationally inappropriate definition. Potter (1989, p.27) stated “Effective localization has occurred when a local national is filling a required job sufficiently competent to fulfill organisational needs”. Effective localization relates to the successful transition of locals into jobs formerly held by skilled expatriates, and this is relevant to the successful placement of locals in higher management (Al-Ali 2008a). Effective localization is influenced by personal characteristics of locals, identified by Potter (1989) as linking to the combination of different attributes of individuals including qualifications, abilities and experience. Potter (1989) suggests that localization is not effective if the local person is only appointed in a post not required by the organization or is not competently filling a post to the satisfaction of the manager. Based on this understanding, localization consists of two main aspects; finding suitable jobs for locals, and ensuring that already employed locals remain in their jobs. Thus, the two main aspects, or full scale of localization, are recruitment and retention (Forstenlechner 2010). Of these two aspects employee retention has received very little research attention either in the localization literature, or as an aspect of the Emiratization initiatives undertaken.

With the main emphasis on skills and competencies development, Emiratization aims to build a constructive employment environment for UAE locals (Al-Ali 2008a, al-Suwaidi 2011) and focuses on productive employment of its locals in the local labor market. Productive employment emphasizes the placing of Emiratis in jobs that match their qualifications and expertise. The UAE government is currently concerned about the relatively meaningless jobs offered to Emiratis, especially in the private sector, that fail to use those Emiratis’ qualifications and this might be one of the key reasons for high job turnover among Emiratis (Al-Ali 2008b).
3.7 Retention

Employee retention is a key objective and a considerable worry for most firms (Deckop et al. 2006, Moncarz, Zhao & Kay 2009). From a management point of view, the attraction and retention of individuals is more essential nowadays than it was before (Holtom et al. 2008). Fryxell, Butler and Choi (2004) suggest that for a localization initiative to be effective, it needs to focus on the retention of talented locals, particularly in developing countries. These scholars further argue that the heart of successful localization lies in the effective education and retention of locals. Moreover, Selmer (2004b) found that selection, recruitment and retention of suitable locals are key determinants of successful localization. Fryxell, Butler and Choi (2004) also focused on selection and retention as potential antecedents to localization.

Wong and Law (1999) suggest that a key obstacle to localization in China is the high turnover amongst local managers. They further claim that many local managers quit their jobs even after being trained, thus affecting the success of the localization initiative. Hence, the commitment of local managers is a significant indicator of the success of localization (Wong & Law 1999).

Chaminade (2006, p. 1) defines retention as “a voluntary move by an organization to create an environment which engages employees for the long term”. Another definition of retention suggested by Chiboiwa, Samuel and Chipunza (2010, p. 2104) is “to prevent the loss of competent employees from leaving productivity and profitability”. Employee retention is seen as the result of implementing policies and procedures that help employees to stay with the organization through providing a satisfying environment at the workplaces that meets the employees’ requirements (Baer, Fagin & Gordon 1996).
The retention of talented employees is a benefit to a firm because employees’ skills and knowledge are essential to an organization’s capacity to be competitive (Kyndt et al. 2009). Employee retention develops progressively more essential to companies as periodic employee scarcities can result in reduction of well performing employees; therefore, employees are looking for enhanced work opportunities, and organizations are looking to enhance their employee’s productivity (Leeves 2000). Nevertheless, difficulties exist in trying to retain employees (Barney 1991, Taplin & Winterton 2007).

According to Metcalfe (2008), attracting and retaining talent can be an issue for organizations because of limited rationality, principally of national-level social and cultural norms.

Employers are concerned about retaining their workforce because intention to leave is unsatisfactory for both parties. Firms have to deal with the various costs of recruiting, and losing their employees; hence, firms attempt to retain their current people (Lockwood & Ansari 1999). Scholars report that firms employ various methods to keep their staff, such as good work environment, training and development and various forms of remuneration. The early departure of new employees has generally been related to an inability to fit in at the organisation, poor career decisions and unrealistic expectations (Barham & Winston 2006, Winston & Creamer 1997).

Mello (2010) argue that the challenge to retain employees lies in addressing their different needs, which are often diverse. Retention strategies can be implemented in a way that is guaranteed to tackle the desires of employees who appear likely to leave. It becomes a necessity for organizations to adopt effective retention programs to achieve profitability and competitiveness in the market. Moreover, Walker (2001) has identified seven factors that can enhance employee retention. These factors are: Appreciation of
work performed, offer of challenging work, opportunities of learning and promotion, attractive organisational atmosphere, positive relationships with fellow co-workers, good balance of professional and personal life and good communications.

Employees’ retention is one of the key concerns in the workplaces and academics have attempted to resolve this issue by investigating various factors impacting on employees’ turnover intention, in addition to their commitment levels (Holtom et al. 2008). Furthermore, it is important to consider organisational factors in the context of employee retention (Kyndt et al. 2009). Researchers argue that higher levels of job satisfaction result in higher commitment levels, decreasing turnover rates (Judge 1993, McNeese-Smith 1996, Murrells, Robinson & Griffiths 2008, Shawn 2011). In other words, employees dissatisfied with their jobs will be less committed and tend to leave their organizations (Tsai & Wu 2010). The literature emphasizes the significance of employee retention and organizational commitment as factors that have a positive effect on intention to leave. Retaining committed employees in today’s competitive environment is considered to be challenging (Samuel & Chipunza 2009). Furthermore, given the growth of new managerial methods to deal with retention and labor market dynamism, it is not surprising that turnover remains a vibrant area for study (Holtom et al. 2008). Employee retention is the opposite of turnover, which is defined as the separation between employees and their organizations (Starosta 2006).

3.8 Employee Turnover

Although differences exist, turnover costs and labor shortages in key industries across the world have focused on the importance of retaining their workforce for organizations to succeed. As a result, executives have applied HR policies and practices to decrease preventable and adverse turnover (Hom, Roberson & Ellis 2008, Kacmar et al. 2006).
Turnover has significant implications for the employees quitting their jobs. Substantial energy is spent to find new jobs and adjust to new situations (Holtom et al. 2008). Hence, the subject of turnover is relevant to individuals, managers and researchers (Zedeck & Mosier 1990).

Retention is a critical and generally unappreciated subject in the UAE, where there is a fleeting environment with high turnover rates and lack of organizational attention to a commitment focused firm culture, and limited training or career opportunities (Al-Ali 2008a). Nevertheless retention has been recognized as one the clear advantages of career management (Forstenlechner 2010). Sidani and Al-Ariss (2014) suggest that organizations in UAE face key challenges in retaining local talents as retention strategies differ for locals compared to foreigners. They argue that the challenge with locals is that they might not be ready (although still able) to handle the difficulties of corporate work. The reason behind that is the availability of a more relaxed government job that pays better with additional benefits (Sidani & Al-Ariss 2014).

Organizations’ success depends on the hard work of their loyal employees which increases their productivity; therefore low turnover rate among their workforces is a critical factor (Al-Kahtani 2002). It is essential to focus on employee turnover rates generally and Emiratis specifically in firms operating in the UAE labor market. Harhara, Singh and Hussain (2015) argue that one of the key challenges facing firms in the UAE is the high employee turnover rates. They further suggest that high employee turnover rates cost firms in the country about $2.7 billion a year. Although the public sector offers Emiratis better benefits, it does not satisfy them. In private sector organizations, there is always a concern of job loss. Many Emiratis quit their jobs and there is often a noticeable lack of organizational commitment among Emirati employees (Al Ghadeer
In their study about commitment and turnover intention in the UAE oil industry, Suliman and Al-Junaibi (2010) found that organizational commitment affect employee’s turnover intention negatively. Al-Dosari (2011) found poor organizational commitment and a low level of motivation amongst locals in GCC nations. Emirati turnover rates are higher in the private sector compared to the public sector. According to Al Ghadeer (2011), there is high rate of turnover among Emiratis in general. The government and employers do not consider this to be an important issue, seemingly not knowing how critical the impact of turnover is on the productivity of firms and growth of the country. The literature clearly indicates that there is much research exploring the UAE labor market, but little research is available on employee turnover in UAE or its reasons.

McCabe et al. (2008) note that a key reason for employee’s intention to quit is a lack of professional and personal advancement. Candidates tend to join companies that have attractive career advancement and growth programs. Other researchers argue that employee turnover can be due to a lack of rewards in the firm (Urichuk 1999). On the other hand, Apker, Propp and Zabava (2009) suggest that challenging employee relationships is perceived to be one of the factors that influence employees’ intention to remain. They further argue that improved communication between employees in any firm can support and enhance their attachment to their firms and as a result increase retention levels (Khan, Farooq & Imran 2010). For example, researchers such as Ongori (2007) recommend that in order for organizations to lower turnover rates, they should ensure they have good communication amongst their workforce. More specifically, inappropriate communication between employees and managers is the main reason that employees leave their jobs; this would have an impact on the employees’ access to their job related information, for which they rely on their management (Branham 2005).
Throughout the literature on retention, organizational commitment and turnover intention have generally been recognized as key antecedents to turnover (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005).

### 3.9 Organizational Commitment

The interest of practitioners and academics in organizational commitment is due to its association with other variables. Research shows that organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran 2005, Cooper & Schindler 2005) and absenteeism (Farrell & Stamm 1988). The literature on the relationship between organisational commitment and turnover is well established (Mathieu & Zajac 1990, Randall 1990) and shows that employees who are really committed to their organizations stay (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982).

The literature presents many different definitions of organizational commitment. Generally, organizational commitment could be defined as the degree of dedication that employees have for their workplace, the level to which employees are keen to work on the behalf of their firm, and the possibility that those employees will continue with their organizational membership (Jex & Britt 2008). Commitment is defined as “accepting and realizing the objectives of the organization and the willingness to work with commitment to the organisational membership” (Porter et al. 1974, p. 604). Over the past few decades, organizational commitment has been recognized as an essential element to understand and explain the work-related attitudes and behavior of employees at workplaces, and many academics have attempted to investigate this concept. According to O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) organizational commitment is the psychological attachment that employees feel for their workplaces. Steers (1977) suggested that organizational commitment is defined as the relative strength of an
employee’s identification with and involvement in a specific firm. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) and Buchanan (1974) described organizational commitment as a link between the employees to the firm.

It is suggested that organizational commitment incorporates the recognition of the organizational goals and values, readiness to exercise substantial effort on the firm’s behalf and a strong aspiration to retain membership of the firm (Mowday, Richard, Steers & Porter 1979). Employees’ attitudes in the organization are strongly related to their organisational commitment (Koch & Steers 1978, Porter, Crampon & Smith 1976, Porter et al. 1974).

Organizational commitment is described as the level of involvement and identification that employees have to their firm’s goals and values (Price 2003). Porter et al, (1974) define organisational commitment as “the belief in and acceptance of organisational goals and objectives, the willingness to work hard on behalf of the organization and a definite intention to remain in the organization”. Organizational commitment is recognized as both antecedent and consequence of various variables (Foote et al. 2005). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), commitment is fundamentally based on the idea that committed employees have a need to stay with their firms.

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) suggest that commitment represents the affective feelings as well as the behavioral tendencies that employees have toward the firm. An effective response of an employee goes beyond passive loyalty, and according to Porter (1974) comprises three linked aspects: (1) Strong belief in the organizational goals and values, (2) A willingness to put in substantial effort for the workplace, and (3) A strong desire to retain membership in the firm.
Bateman and Strasser (1984) argue that organisational commitment is a multidimensional concept. They further suggest that organizational commitment involves workforce loyalty to the firm and employees’ readiness to accomplish its goals, sustain its values and support its membership. Kelman (1958) suggested a different approach to classifying different types of commitment. He proposes that organizational commitment is derived from compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance commitment suggests that employees will follow the organization’s rules and adopt specific behaviors and attitudes to get particular rewards or avoid particular punishments. Identification commitment suggests that employees accept the effect of the firm so as to remain an adequate, self-defining association with the firm and its members. Internalization commitment suggests that behaviors and attitudes are further taken on as corresponding with employees’ own values system. Nevertheless, the application of Kelman’s model has been limited as further research showed that the measures of Kelman’s model are likely to correlate highly, so it is challenging to distinguish between the constructs, especially measures of identification and internalization (Caldwell, Chatman & O'Reilly 1990). In their study of organizational commitment in higher education, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) concluded that commitment is positively correlated with prosocial behaviors and negatively related with turnover.

Furthermore, Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) have identified commitment in three forms, namely affective, normative and continuance. According to these authors, affective commitment refers to employee’s emotional attachment to the firm and is based on Mowday and his colleagues’ conceptualization of commitment. This suggests that an employee with strong affective commitment will identify with the organization’s goals and thus maintain his/her membership of the firm (Sommer, Bae & Luthans 1996).
While normative commitment is based on an employee’s obligations towards the firm. Employees with strong normative commitment will stay with their organizations because of the obligations they feel. Continuance commitment on the other hand, represents a result of an employee’s perception of the economic costs and risks related to losing organizational membership. Employees who have a strong continuance commitment remain with the firm because of financial needs and benefits, such as pensions and health benefits (Sommer, Bae & Luthans 1996).

In terms of the factors that influence the development of commitment, it is suggested that employees are likely to develop affective commitment if they think that the firm is being supportive, treating them fairly, and providing appropriate job scope, participative decision-making and job autonomy (Meyer & Allen 1991, 1997). With respect to continuance commitment, the longer employees stay in a firm, the more likely that they will be eligible to receive benefits based on their seniority and to develop connections with other members in the firm. Continuance commitment can be assessed by employees’ thoughts and anticipation of the prospect of successfully finding another job. If the possibilities are good, the continuance commitment will be low. As for developing normative commitment, this is associated with employee characteristics, particularly the sense of morality and the type of transactions employees have with their workplace (Meyer & Allen 1997). When employees have a strong sense of moral obligation and values, they will be more likely to possess strong normative commitment to the firm. Although moral obligation is developed through the socialization practices, the treatment that employees get from the firm also strongly affects their normative commitment.
Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) identified different behaviors and attitudes associated with commitment. They further suggest that organizational commitment encompasses three behavioral and attitudinal dimensions: recognition of the goals and values of the firm, readiness to exercise substantial effort on the firm’s behalf and a strong aspiration to retain membership of the firm. Although there is a strong belief among researchers and scholars in the Arab countries that a workforce that is committed is considered a competitive advantage, commitment research in the Arab countries including the UAE has been rather overlooked (Abdulla & Shaw 1999; Behery 2009). The literature suggests that the emphasis of the research concerning commitment should be on the lower and mid-level personnel in addition to the top management (Abdulla & Shaw 1999, Behery 2009, Suliman 1995).

Reichers (1985, p. 467) suggests that although the literature is objectively clear in terms of the consequences of commitment, its antecedents appear to be more diverse because of the various means by which commitment was defined conceptually and operationally. Besides, one important outcome of commitment is a high level of employee attendance (Gellatly 1995). In contrast Somers (1995) suggests that employees who have lower commitment levels show higher absenteeism. Blau and Boal (1987) supported this view in their research of insurance employees which revealed that the employees committed to their firm show lower levels of absenteeism, and thus low turnover.

Furthermore, Meyer and Allen (1997) claim that if firms better handled the employees’ experience, they could be capable of demonstrating the anticipated commitment; on the other hand, if employees perceived that the firm was not obligated to them, they would feel less committed to the firm, and this would be shown in their intention to remain or leave.
Research shows that highly socialized employees are more highly committed than their less-socialized co-workers (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). Organizational socialization offers employees with clear information, which help them to handle stress and other job related issues, therefore, increasing their affection with their workplace (Allen & Meyer 1990). Cohen (2003) further argues that different socialization techniques have different impacts on organizational commitment (Cohen 2003). Organizational socialization has been described as a way to help employees to keep fit for effective work (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982) hence considerably affecting their commitment levels. According to Ongori (2007) organizations can increase their employees’ organizational commitment by enhancing jobs, increasing rewards and empowering them.

3.10 Turnover Intentions

Turnover intention refers to employees’ perceived possibility that they will be leaving their organization. Turnover intention is perceived as a measure for understanding turnover before employees actually quit their jobs and leave their organizations (Harhara, Singh & Hussain 2015). Turnover intention is accepted as the most significant cognitive variable having a direct causal impact on turnover. Supporting this, Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978) claim that actual turnover is anticipated to increase as intention to quit increases. These findings support the relevance of turnover intention to investigate employee’s turnover behavior.

Mobley (1977) comprehensively investigated the psychological practice related to departure from a job and suggested a broad description for what employees mostly think and do when taking the decision to withdraw. Based on his model, when employees feel unsatisfied at their workplace, they change their job related attitudes and behaviors to ease the negative effects. One of the changes is to leave.
In Mobley’s (1977) conceptualization, intention to quit the firm is seen as the last stage in the withdrawal decision-making process and as a result intention therefore develops to be an appropriate proxy for actual turnover behavior. Furthermore, many researchers have employed turnover intention as the best predictor of actual turnover (Hom, Griffeth & Sellaro 1984, Hom et al. 1992, Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982, Mobley 1982).

According to Mobley (1977) employees experience various potential mediating steps from feeling dissatisfied to getting to the decision to actually leave. These steps include: assessing the anticipated usefulness of a job search as well as cost of leaving, developing behavior intention to look for job replacements, performing actual job searches, matching their current job and replacements, developing intention to leave and actual withdrawal.

According to Smart (1990) there are three main sets of factors that describe turnover intention: Personal characteristics, work related elements and the several dimensions of organizational and career satisfaction. Laroche and Rutherford (2007) suggest that retention requires listening to and working with others. They add that employees have to work productively with their managers so that they don’t think of them as poor employees, they are less likely to stay and may leave in a few years.

Achoui and Mansour (2007) suggest that negative effects of turnover for an organization include the costs of recruitment and training, the loss of employees’ morale and disintegrated performance. They further claim that other consequences of turnover include financial factors linked to replacement. Researchers argue that inadequate retention strategies can damage both morale of employees and productivity (Heneman & Judge 2006).
Employee intention to leave is based on the behavioral consequences of the current organizational and labor market policies and opinions of the employee (Gaertner & Nollen 1992). Stovel and Bontis (2002) suggest that an increase in turnover rate can affect the productivity of organizations.

Recent research explains that low turnover rates are linked with successful organizational socialization strategies. Wanous (1980) explored organizational entry practice, Steers (1977) explored organizational commitment issues, and Mowday, Porter & Steers (1982) investigated the withdrawal process. Manzoor and Naeem (2011) suggest that socialization leads to commitment or turnover intention. Researchers argue that training and career development schemes are critical in employee retention (Kapur 2010; Achoui & Mansour 2007; Ongori 2007). For organizations to maintain their workforce, they will need to offer improved employment opportunities, consistent career growth and advancement and a good work environment (Luby 2009). Achoui and Mansour (2007) suggest that investment in matters such as proper communication, employee involvement and development and career counseling maintain job satisfaction and organisational commitment in UAE organizations.

Organizational socialization is the mean to help employees to keep suitable for effective work (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982) hence considerably affecting their commitment levels. Feldman (1981) claimed that in socialization processes the employees settle and define their positions and relationships with others and thus increase their organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982). Even though many investigators have attempted to offer a rich understanding of commitment and turnover, there is still a necessity to discover more determining factors of both organizational commitment and turnover intention (Cohen 2003; Manzoor & Naeem 2011). According to Manzoor and
Naeem (2011), one such factor is organizational socialization which apart from the studies mentioned, is generally overlooked in the context of commitment and turnover.

### 3.11 Organizational Socialization: An Overview

The implementation of effective human resource strategies for supporting localization is a key component of its success (Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011). Organizations that focus on the strategic imperative of acquiring, developing, and retaining the best employees will secure a competitive advantage over their competitors who leave it to chance (Bauer, Talya & Erdogan 2014). Organizations who value their employees are more profitable than those that do not (Huselid 1995, Pfeffer & Veiga 1999). Localization can be realized most efficiently through constructive training programs, career management and effective training improvement that continually monitors and offers guidance to local employees and a high degree of job security (Forstenlechner 2010; Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011).

According to many scholars localization has been referred to in a range of research areas, including socialization processes influencing locals and expatriates in the workplace (Lee & Larwood 1983, Mendenhall & Oddou 1985). Organizational socialization is regarded as the practice by which an employee moves from being an organization outsider to an insider as he or she adjusts to the new role (Bauer & Erdogan 2014). Taormina (1997, p. 29) suggests that organizational socialization is “the process by which a person secures relevant job skills, acquires a functional level of organizational understanding, attains supportive social interactions with co-workers, and generally accepts the established ways of a particular organization”. Wentworth (1980) defines socialization as “the activity that confronts and lends structure to the entry of non-members into an already existing world or a sector of that world”. Van
Maanen & Schein (1979) define organizational socialization as a course of learning the ropes inside a new company. In practice, Ellis et al. (2014) describe organizational socialization as the extent to which employees “acquire the knowledge, skills, and functional understanding of their new jobs, make connections with others in the organization, and garner insight into the culture, processes, and people in their new organization.”

Although there are many different definitions of organizational socialization but one definition seems to have consensus among researchers. Organizational socialization is an “ongoing long term process through which an individual learns and secures relevant job skills, acquires the knowledge of organizational understanding, becomes an acceptable member of social group of organization and accepts and understands values and expected behavior within the organization” (Feldman 1989, Fisher 1986, Louis 1980, Morrison & Hock 1986, Taormina 1997, Van Maanen & Schein 1979).

Fryxell, Butler and Choi (2004) suggest that local managers ultimately assume their role in organizations, but only if the localization process was successful in initially socializing them. Unsuccessful socialization which fails to socialize employees could be particularly costly as turnover is regularly the eventual result (Bauer, Morrison & Callister 1998, Bodoh 2012). Good socialization can assist the firm to keep valuable employees and save substantial costs. Thus, organizational socialization is critically important for organizational effectiveness (Bauer & Erdogan 2011, Bauer, Talya & Erdogan 2014, Louis 1980).

Researchers have investigated a range of factors contributing to effective socialization including aspects which employees have to learn about and adjust to. This includes the organisational culture; group unit’s behavior; resource utilization; knowledge required
and the means by which tasks have to be achieved (Ardts, Jaosen & Van der Velde 2001). Besides learning about the formal side of the firm and adjusting to it, employees can gain advantage personally from socialization by learning informal means to perform and behave (Dorsman & Kelly 1983, Garavan & Morley 1997).

Organizational socialization helps newly joined employees learn about their roles and adjust to the working environment (Bauer, Morrison & Callister 1998, Ostroff & Kozlowski 1992, Van Maanen & Schein 1979). Scholars have found that these learning experiences affect new employees’ job satisfaction, performance and organizational commitment (Bauer, Morrison & Callister 1998, Ostroff & Kozlowski 1992). According to many organizational scholars, unsuccessful socialization strategy is one of the key causes of employees quitting or being discharged (Fisher 1986), loss of productivity (Shaw, Gupta & Delery 2005), and loss of the organization’s investments in functions such as recruitment, training and development (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg 2003). The literature suggests many advantages of socialization; however its significance lies in increasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment, reducing uncertainty and as a result decreasing turnover (Allen 2006, Bauer et al. 2007, Boehman 2007, Jones 1986, Myers & Oetzel 2003, Saks, Alan & Ashforth 1997b, Waldeck & Myers 2007, Wanous 1980).

Investigators regularly find that the new employees who feel more accepted and have better relationships with their fellow co-workers and managers feel more committed during socialization than do their fellow co-workers who do not feel as accepted (Bauer & Erdogan 2014). According to scholars, individuals who join organizations are basically outsiders who in general become insiders through organizational socialization processes (Lave & Wenger 1991, Van Maanen & Schein 1979). This process requires
learning the job duties and organizational mission, as well as the dynamics of the work groups. Employees need to achieve an acceptable level of shared understanding by knowing how to perform their tasks and understanding why things are done in certain ways and the meanings they have (Korte & Lin 2015). In the socialization process, novices have to understand how their jobs fit in and develop in relation to the others’ jobs (Chao et al. 1994, Van Maanen & Schein 1979).

As discussed earlier, one of the new employee’s key tasks is the transition from being an outsider to the organization to an insider in the group (Lave & Wenger 1991; Van Maanen & Schein 1979). Generally, organizational socialization can be determined by the level to which newly joined employees gain the skills and functional understanding of their new roles; establish contacts with other employees in the organization; and increase their awareness of the processes, people and culture in their new workplace.

**Organizational Socialization Model**

There are two different sorts of organizational socialization literature that originate from either the organizational socialization content or process (Chao et al. 1994). According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979) and Wachtfogel (2009), the research concerning the organizational socialization process emphasis on the stages that individuals go through from being an outsider of the organization to integrated insider. While the research concerning the organizational socialization content focus on “What needs to be learned for effective socialization to occur?” (Wachtfogel 2009), the scholars who investigate the content of organizational socialization claim that its conceptualization has been limited (Özdemira & Ergunb 2015). Researchers such as Chao et al. (1994) and Wachtfogel (2009) suggest that in order to define and measure the extent of
socialization accurately, the question of what is essentially being learned throughout socialization has to be answered.

Jablin (2001) suggested a four stage model that provides a framework to examine socialization. This stage model of socialization includes anticipatory socialization, encounter, metamorphosis and exit. Further, organizational socialization could be defined by many dimensions which are related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment as well as turnover (Bauer et al. 2007, Bauer, Morrison & Callister 1998, Chao et al. 1994, Saks, Uggerslev & Fassina 2007). The literature suggests that socialization researchers have emphasized job performance and attitudes including organizational commitment, job satisfaction and intentions to leave when investigating consequences of new employee adjustment (Bauer et al. 2007; Saks, Uggerslev & Fassina 2007).

Taormina (1994, 1997) suggests that socialization is a continuous process with four constructs. Training is an important aspect of organizational socialization and is directly linked to employee performance. Ideally, training programs permit employees to develop required skills for greater performance and gain new skills for advanced positions. Generally, socialization strategies are developed to foster employee adjustment and organization training is developed for this purpose as highly skilled employees will be more effective and as a result successful and satisfied (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). Similarly, employees who appreciate the training they get are also more committed to their organizations. Likewise, the orientations to organizational policies and activities that an organization provides to its members are also developed to facilitate employee adjustment.
Understanding is the second dimension of the socialization process which some researchers have referred to as information seeking or learning (e.g. Fisher 1986, Ostroff & Kozlowski 1992). Understanding of the duties required and supervisor support reduce mistakes and produce more effective employees who are more satisfied. These behaviours permit the employees to identify what firms do, how things are performed in those firms, and why things are performed in particular ways. Besides, greater understanding leads to higher levels of organizational success, leading employees to become more committed. Like training, employees with a better understanding of their job and firm can do a better job. Moreover, Wang et al. (2011) suggest that fit mediates the relationship between new employee’s adaptability and outcomes such as job satisfaction, performance, and turnover intentions. Bauer and Erdogan (2014) suggest that achieving fit is a key part of the socialization process. Louis, Posner and Powell (1983) claim that guiding new employees in how to do their jobs and providing them the necessary advice and other social facilitation facilitates employee adjustment and those employees will accumulate greater social capital than those who are not receiving such support. Generally, studies on social support have regularly shown that peers and supervisors may assist new employees to adjust (Fisher 1985) and that assistance is associated with more positive job attitudes (e.g. Bauer, Talya & Erdogan 2014).

Another aspect of the socialization process as Feldman (1988) suggest is the employees’ interaction with their fellow co-workers. According to Arora (2013), co-worker support is the degree to which employees consider that their co-workers are willing to assist them to perform their duties. Actually supporting one another by sharing expertise and knowledge is also a sort of co-worker support (Zhou & George 2001). Socialization literature recognizes that supervisors and peers play an important role in assisting newly
joined employees to adjust effectively (Bauer, Morrison & Callister 1998). Co-workers, by their supportive behavior, can turn the organizational environment pleasing to spend time in (Bateman 2009). Some researchers even argue that relationships with peers and supervisors start even before entry and those relationships are essential to overcome unmet expectations (Riaz, Anjum & Anwar 2016). Many researchers suggest that positive relationships with co-workers will help in attaining good outcomes, such as improved productivity and enhanced performance (Eisenberger & Fasolo 1990, Staw, Sutton & Pelled 1994, Wolf 1989). Moreover, Tull (2009) proposed that supervisory relationships influence job satisfaction and professional development. Korte and Lin (2015) propose that relationships are the prevailing social aspect in the socialization process and the relationships quality among a group members is essential. Katz (1988) proposes that these interactions should be encouraging for employees to perform effectively and according to Gundry (1993) such interactions are found to be associated with organizational citizenship behaviors. Furthermore, there is a growing acknowledgment that other senior employees have an important obligation to facilitate the success of new employees (Cooper-Thomas & Anderson 2006). Therefore, how well new employees integrate into the firm’s social structure and what assets they obtain through the socialization process are reliant on the joint constitution of learning and association by new employees, co-workers and supervisors. Korte and Lin (2015) argued that the resources offered to new employees by the members of the workplace during socialization are described as the social capital of the group.

The fourth dimension of socialization is employees’ perceptions about their prospects for a rewarding career in their organization including whether their organization will continue to employ them, what future projects will be assigned to them and potential rewards that may be gained (Fisher 1986). Employees’ anticipations about continuous
employment and chances for rewards are a critical aspect of the socialization process. Theoretically, rewards should increase job satisfaction and commitment. Moreover, promotions encourage employees and support them to develop professionally (Fairburn & Malcomson 2001), which should result in enhanced commitment. Employees who are happy with future prospects in their organizations will be more satisfied and committed (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). When employees believe that they can have a promising future in the firm, they can be more committed and thus less likely to leave.

Furthermore, with respect to organizational socialization, it is important to include the influence of social relationships on new employees in a socialization process. This includes the relationships among members in the group. Korte and Lin (2015) suggest that novices’ learning is an essential factor in the socialization process but cognition is important to understanding the impact of social relationships on novices learning through the process. Peoples’ opinions, expectations and principles about relationships with others in addition to the essentials of the situation, influence the formation of relationships (Fitness et al. 2007). Merriam, Caffarella and Baumgartner (2007) suggest that in social settings, learning is deeply affected by the quality of mutual support and collaboration empathy amongst beginners and mentors. During socialization, integrating the employee into the firm depends on high levels of mutual support, understanding, appreciation and shared control (Mahoney & Stasson 2005).

Bigliardi, Petroni and Dormio (2005) suggest that organizational socialization is the practice by which persons recognize values of the organization, expectations concerning behaviors related to the job and the knowledge required to undertake duties as productive employees. Notably, as Reichers (1987) proposed, organizational socialization is acknowledged as a mutual process in which firms inspire newly joined
employees to adjust to characteristics of the firm’s culture and recognized approach of performing things; while those employees are keenly seeking information to improve their understanding and simplify their own adjustment. Vital to comprehending the significance of organizational socialization is Ashforth et al. (2007, p.2) acknowledgment that “early socialization experiences appear to strongly affect the course of long-term adjustment, triggering either a success cycle or a failure cycle”. Miller and Jablin (1991) suggest that employees seek information to decrease uncertainty and this information is usually available with the fellow workers or supervisors. Seeking information is noticeably associated with social capital provided its emphasis on networks and transmission of information (Bauer & Erdogan 2014). It is argued that employees seeking information have a better fit and are more effective within their companies (Morrison 1993). Additionally, Ashford and Tsui (1991) argue that managers who pursue feedback on how to progress their performance are more effective than those who do not, which clearly proposes that performance and information seeking are related.

The uncertainty that employees face when first joining their organizations can be reduced through different communication channels that provide them with the information they need and help them understand the new environment, particularly social communications with senior employees (Katz 1980, Saks, Alan & Ashforth 1997a). Employees use communication channels such as feedback processes and interactions to reduce uncertainty.

The significance of organisational socialization, which the literature highlights for both the firms recruiting and the employees joining, justifies the investigation of this construct in the context of localization. Organizational socialization exercises an
astounding influence on employees’ performance and organizational stability (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). This socialization process is a performance management issue as many studies have established its strong relationship with job satisfaction and commitment which are strongly associated with turnover intention (Fisher 1986). Organizational socialization has been linked to increased organisational commitment and high levels of job satisfaction of employees (Chao et al. 1994; Taormina 1997). The importance of organizational socialization suggests that firms should plan effective training and orientation programs that guide employees about the pressures of the workplace along with proposed coping strategies. According to Ashforth et al. (2007) a key role of the socialization process is in the presentation to employees of realistic scenarios of the organization’s environment and the potential that it offers to its employees. Manzoor and Naeem (2011) argue that effective socialization has the potential to have a long lasting productive influence on employees by increasing person-organization/ person-job fits in addition to organizational commitment.

3.12 Gaps in Literature

The literature on localization was introduced from a global perspective, where trends and gaps were identified. The review then narrowed to localization initiatives in the GCC region, and then focused on Emiratization in UAE, while identifying and discussing areas of convergence, distinctiveness and gaps in the literature. Table 3.1 provides summary of key literature and research gaps found.

Although the fact that localization is still a major topic of interest to the UAE government, there are few scholarly research reports in the literature on this subject, and research on understanding successful localization remains scarce (Law et al. 2009). Therefore, there is a gap in terms of the scarcity of localization research as well as
research on localization strategies (Mashood, Verhoeven & Chansarkar 2010). Further, there is a lack of systematic discussion of the factors impacting on localization and how it should be managed (Wong & Law 1999). In addition there is an underrepresentation of studies on localization programs in GCC countries (Forstenlehner 2010, Mellahi 2007b, Metcalfe 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007).

Localization traditionally referred to recruitment (Al-Enezi 2002, Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011) and the other key aspect of localization, retention, has not received much attention, even though this may provide a better means of realizing the goals of localization. This study aims to go beyond the narrow understanding of localization, by focusing on retention as an important aspect of localization, and following research which indicates that the full scale of localization consists of recruitment and retention (Forstenlehner 2010, Selmer 2004b). Retention is, therefore, identified as a key aspect of effective localization programs and localization does not appear to have been conceptually or empirically tested in the context of retention. Furthermore, the literature to date suggests that localization in the UAE has been studied with a key focus on recruitment but not retention (e.g. Al-Ali 2008a, Forstenlehner 2010, Metcalfe 2007, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). The UAE is in a relatively mature stage of localization, but with the main challenges associated with local employee retention. Researchers have tried to resolve the issue of retention by investigating factors relating to employees’ turnover intention and commitment (Holtom et al. 2008).
### Table 3.1 Summary of key literature and research gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Main Results</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Understanding successful localization remains scarce</td>
<td>There is a gap in terms of the scarcity of localization research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forstenlechner &amp; Rutledge (2010, 2011)</td>
<td>Localization initiatives had only a negligible impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ali (2008b), Forstenlechner et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Localization in the UAE made virtually no progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Bhanugopan &amp; Fish (2011)</td>
<td>Localization traditionally referred to recruitment and finding job opportunities for locals</td>
<td>Localization does not appear to have been conceptually or empirically tested in the context of retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forstenlechner (2010)</td>
<td>Recruitment and retention are potential antecedents to localization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresentation of studies on localization in GCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selmer (2004b)</td>
<td>Retention is a core contributor to localization success</td>
<td>Retention can be measured by organizational commitment and turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full scale of localization consists of recruitment and retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtom et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Retention issue can be resolved by investigating factors impacting employees’ turnover intention and commitment</td>
<td>Localization has not been understood within the context of organisational socialization which clearly indicates the significance of organisational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intention thus retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao et al. (1994), Taormina (1997)</td>
<td>Organizational socialization increases organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzoor &amp; Naem (2011)</td>
<td>Organizational socialization increases commitment and decreases turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodoh (2012), Fisher (1986)</td>
<td>Ineffective socialization is a key reason for employee turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Shultz (2010)</td>
<td>Stereotypes increases turnover intentions</td>
<td>Despite the direct effect of stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention, it has never been studied in combination with organisational socialization, which would be particularly significant within the context of localization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riaz, Anjum &amp; Anwar (2016)</td>
<td>Stereotypes decreases organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Hippel et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Stereotypes is key reason for high turnover among locals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippel, Kalokerinos &amp; Henry (2013)</td>
<td>Stereotypes increase turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational socialization literature is the body of literature that has studied employee retention and organizational socialization, increased organizational commitment and decreased turnover intention (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). Localization literature has not considered the significance of organizational socialization efforts even though the evidence indicates that simply viewing localization as recruitment by filling quotas without ample consideration to employees’ integration into the organization can have unfavorable effects in the long run (Al-Ali 2008a). Researchers investigated antecedents of turnover intention and organizational commitment to resolve the issue of retention (Holtom et al. 2008). In addition, the organizational socialization model appears to be one of the most established models which predict retention. Local employees will assume their role if the organization is effective in socializing them through the localization process. It is argued that unsuccessful socialization leads to increased turnover (Fisher 1986). The literature suggests that the importance of socialization lies in increasing employee commitment and as a result decreasing turnover (Chao et al. 1994, Taormina 1997, Manzoor & Naeem 2011). Ineffective socialization is one of the key reasons for employees quitting their jobs (Bodoh 2012). This suggests that organizational socialization affects localization in terms of retention of local employees in the workplace. However, organizational socialization is overlooked in the context of local employee’s commitment and turnover in the localization process.

Applying the organizational socialization model within the unique context of localization and within the localization context, stereotypes has been identified as an important construct impacting the success of localization efforts. The literature review indicates that factors such as negative stereotypes represent a challenge to local’s competitiveness in the local labor market. Negative stereotypes appear to reduce an organization’s willingness to recruit locals (Al-Ali 2008a). Furthermore, negative
stereotypes affect a local’s motivation levels and thus their engagement at work (Page 2007). This in turn is likely to affect their willingness to stay in the job. Negative stereotypes are one of the key reasons for high turnover among local employees (von Hippel et al. 2011). Wang & Shultz (2010) argue that stereotypes create social pressure on employees to quit their jobs. Negative stereotypes have been shown to be associated with low levels of organizational commitment (Riaz, Anjum & Anwar 2016), which in turn, are related to an increase in turnover intentions (Abrams, Ando & Hinkle 1998, Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry 2013). Furthermore, there appears to be a gap in the literature as there are no studies yet that connected stereotypes to antecedent variables including those representing organizational socialization. Since negative stereotypes are one of the significant reasons for high turnover rates among local employees and socialization can affect employees’ commitment levels, it makes theoretical and conceptual sense to investigate the relationships between stereotypes, organizational socialization, commitment and turnover intention.

Furthermore, although organizational socialization constructs appears to be related to each other, no published studies have investigated the relationships between these organizational socialization constructs. Training and co-worker support increase employees’ understanding but at the same time, gaining a better understanding of the job and organization increases employee’s future prospects. Therefore, this research explores the potential relationships between organizational socialization constructs.

On the other hand, the review of literature suggests that differences exist in various practices between the public and private sectors, such as training and future career opportunities as well as the presence of negative stereotypes in both sectors (Al-Ali
Thus, there is merit in investigating the differences between the public and private sectors with regards to the constructs of interest.

Thus this research plans to address this gap in the literature by examining whether stereotypes affect the willingness of employers to accept local employees as members of their organizations (organizational socialization) and how organizational socialization contributes to the retention of local employees in the workplace. In summary, this research plans to address the gap in localization literature in terms of local employee’s retention by examining the effects of organizational socialization and stereotypes on both organizational commitment and turnover intention as variables reflecting retention.
Chapter 4 : CONCEPTUALIZATION AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Focus

Based on the review of literature, this chapter discusses in detail the conceptualization and research model development. The theoretical framework ground is presented and research hypotheses for empirical testing are developed. This chapter discusses the relationships between the constructs of this framework, and introduces several hypotheses based on these relationships. The first part of this chapter presents and discusses the theoretical framework. This is followed by the development of the research hypotheses.

4.2 Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework graphically presents the main components of a study and interrelationship between them based on the existing theory and research, pilot and exploratory studies (Bickman & Rog 2009). After the primary review of the literature, the following conceptual model is proposed for this study (Figure 4.1). This framework targets to structure the relationship between the following variables.

The research framework proposed in this research makes a scholarly contribution by analysing localization through the combined lens of organizational socialization and stereotypes and how they affect organizational commitment and turnover intention. The key variables of interest are organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention. Organizational socialization and stereotypes play a significant role in affecting commitment and turnover intention. This research focuses on organisational commitment and turnover intention as indictors of retention (Fisher
In light of the review of literature of organizational socialization, stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention, this research undertaking to reveal the mediating impact of organizational socialization on the relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention. The study is concerned with the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on commitment and turnover intention. In addition, the research will shed light on possible indirect effects of organizational socialization constructs on the relationships between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention.

Figure 4.1 Theoretical Framework

In the subsequent sections, a model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intention is proposed, and its variations are tested, that is, the potential
mediating effect of organizational socialization on the relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention is explored. This research proposes that a lack of negative stereotypes has a positive impact on commitment (increases) and turnover intention (reduces), and that this is mediated by effective organizational socialization. Figure 4.1 shows the research model in which organizational socialization mediates the relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention.

4.2.1 The relationships between Organizational Socialization Constructs

As discussed earlier, Taormina (1997) suggests that organizational socialization consists of four constructs; training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects. He further suggests that all these dimensions fit into four more comprehensive constructs. Training is the development of skills and capabilities; employees’ understanding of the job and of the organization is the capacity to implement concepts relying on possessing an awareness of the nature, importance or clarification of what happens in the firm; co-worker support is the unconditional emotional sustenance or moral that is offered by other employees in the firm; and future prospects within the workplace is employees expectation of getting a rewarding career in the firm (Taormina 1994; 1997).

To date, from the review of the extant literature, it seems there is no published research that has studied the relationship between these organizational socialization constructs. In the organizational socialization process, the occurrence of these constructs does not happen simultaneously; rather it is likely that they come about sequentially. For example, understanding comes from training and co-worker support, and better understanding of the job increases the chances for future prospects. This research suggests that the four constructs of organizational socialization are related to each other.
and can be considered in an integrated manner because of their proposed interdependence. These relationships are explained as follows.

Employees understand a variety of types of information about their organizations and how those organizations function such as organizational goals and objectives, how they operate, how things get done. The orientation programs that an organization provides to its employees about its policies and operations are designed to facilitate employee adjustment (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). There is a research view which argues that curiosity-tempted behaviour such as information seeking plays a critical role in organizational learning and performance (Reio & Wiswell 2000). Employees obtain information from the socialization process, which sequentially helps them to cope with different issues related to their job (Allen & Meyer 1990).

Understanding enables employees to know what their organizations do, how things are done in their organizations and why things are performed in certain ways. Employees working in an organization view training as an investment their organization offers to them (Gao 2011). Organizations offer training to help employees acquire the skills and abilities required to perform their jobs in the workplace (Storey & Sisson 1993). The training provided by organizations permits employees to improve essential skills for superior performance and gain new skills for advanced or new positions. Many successful firms are well aware that providing training and development opportunities lies at the heart of attracting and retaining the best candidates (Bassi & Van Buren 1999).

Effective training programs for orientation processes guide newly joined employees, not only about different aspects of jobs and rules in their organization, but also strategies for coping with ambiguity and complexity. Researchers argue that offering employees
training and development advances their skills and capabilities (Harel & Tzafrir 1999, McEvoy 1997) and this training provides them with a better understanding of their jobs and organization. These arguments suggest the following hypothesis:

**H1:** *There will be a direct positive relationship between Emirati employee’s perceptions of training within their organization and their perceptions of understanding of their job and organization.*

Another important construct of socialization is the employees’ interaction with fellow co-workers (Feldman 1988) and these collaborations have to be favourable for employees to work effectively (Katz 1988). Employees support their fellow workers to perform their duties (Arora 2013). Besides supporting each other by sharing expertise and knowledge is a sort of co-worker support (Zhou & George 2001). According to researchers many employees rely on their managers for their job related information, whereas the rest depend on their fellow co-workers (Quirke 2008). The acceptance and support that employees get from their fellow co-workers during their day-to-day interactions help them do their jobs more effectively and gain a better understanding of how things work in their organization. Thus it could be suggested that when an employee joins the organization, the employee gains an understanding of their job and organization through support received from fellow co-workers. Thus following hypothesis is proposed:

**H2:** *There will be a direct positive relationship between Emirati employees’ perceptions of co-worker support in their organization and their perceptions of understanding of their job and organization.*
Future prospects refer to the employees’ expectation about continued employment, future assignments and potential rewards attained (Fisher 1986) including recognition, opportunities for promotion and career progression (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). Fairburn and Malcomson (2001) suggest that promotions encourage employees and support them to grow career-wise, which in turn lead to increased productivity. Moreover, when employees get a better understanding of their jobs and organization, their chances of securing a rewarding career in their organization increase as they are more likely to get opportunities for career progression and promotion.

**H3:** There will be a direct positive relationship between Emirati employees’ perceptions of understanding of their job and organization and their perceptions of future prospects in their organization

Based on the conceptual understanding of the organizational socialization constructs and as suggested earlier, training offered by the organization will help increase employees’ understanding, which will have a positive impact on their future prospects. Thus, it makes sense conceptually that training can have an indirect effect on future prospects through an employee’s understanding of their job and organization. However, since it is argued that training by itself can also help in increasing employees’ chances of career progression, then it can also be conceptually argued that understanding will partially mediate the relationship between training and future prospects.

**H4:** The effect of Emirati employee’s perceptions of training within their organization on their perceptions of future prospects in their organization will be partially mediated by their perceptions understanding of their job and organization.
Similarly, co-worker support will also help increase employees’ understanding which will have an impact on their future prospects. It is therefore proposed that co-worker support will have an indirect effect on future prospects through increasing the understanding among employees of the job requirements. Moreover, since it cannot be assumed that co-worker support by itself can help in increasing employee’s chances of career progression, it is argued conceptually that understanding will fully mediate the relationship between co-worker support and future prospects.

**H5:** The effect of Emirati employees’ perceptions of co-worker support on their perceptions of future prospects in their organization will be fully mediated by their perceptions of understanding of their job and organization.

### 4.2.2 Organizational Socialization, Organisational Commitment and Turnover Intention

The process of organizational socialization impacts employees’ performance and has a strong link to organizational commitment, which itself, is related to turnover intention (Fisher 1986; Manzoor & Naeem 2011). The socialization process is an important organizational concern, as many studies have established its strong relationship with job satisfaction and commitment (Chao et al. 1994; Taormina 1997), which according to Fisher (1986) are associated with turnover intention. Socialization processes present new employees with realistic perspectives of the job and the organization (Ashforth et al. 2007). The main goal of organisational socialization is to offer employees precise information in the form of an accurate preview of the job before entering the organization. Effective socialization can increase person-organization/job fit and organizational commitment, and thus has the potential of having long lasting productive effects on employees. Organisational socialization also plays an important role in
decreasing uncertainty. According to Bauer et al. (2007, p. 708), uncertainty reduction theory suggests that, “newcomers desire to increase the predictability of interactions between themselves and others within the new organization”.

Moreover, Manzoor and Naeem (2011) argue that socialized employees have high levels of commitment compared to less-socialized employees. Employees get clear information from a socialization process, which sequentially helps them to cope with different issues related to their job, including stress; hence they increase their commitment to their organizations (Allen & Meyer 1990). Cohen (2003) suggests that different socialization aspects have different effects on commitment. Indeed, organizational socialization is an approach to helping employees keep fit for effective work (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982), therefore, considerably influencing an employee’s commitment level (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). Researchers argue that employees are mostly concerned about how to get established and accepted in their organizations, thus they make thoughtful efforts to prove that they possess the capability of adjusting to the needs of their different environment (Buchanan 1974).

There is research evidence to indicate that organizational socialization has a significant impact on employees’ career satisfaction and turnover (Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley 1990). Previous studies suggest that turnover among new employees is high (Griffeth & Hom 2001) and one of the main causes of their turnover intention is poor socialization (Fisher 1986). Fisher (1986) further suggested that socialization processes can have different outcomes. According to him, socialization might have a long-term influence on employees; further, successful socialization may lead to commitment, while unsuccessful socialization can lead to turnover. Socialization is also the key practice by which an organization’s culture is communicated and preserved. Effective
socialization ensures that new employees understand and adjust to the firm’s values and norms. Further, effective socialization ensures improved collaboration between employees (Louis 1980).

Manzoor and Naeem (2011) suggest that organizational socialization leads to either commitment or turnover intention. Many researchers argue that socialization strategies affect turnover by influencing organizational commitment (e.g. Saks, Alan & Ashforth 1997a). Wanous et al. (1992) suggest that the disconfirmation of employees’ impractical expectations lead them to be dissatisfied with their job and hence increase turnover intentions. Nevertheless, successful socialization can result in successful amendment in the form of role clarity and fit, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and thus lowers chances of turnover (e.g. Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller 2000).

Training is considered to be one of the most significant aspects of organizational socialization, and it has a direct impact on employee’s performance. Bernardin and Beatty’s (1984) demonstrate that an organization can realize efficiency and effectiveness among its employees through recruitment and selection, training and development, placement and motivation. A large body of literature has investigated the ways in which practices including training and reward programs affect the development of organisational commitment (Gellatly et al. 2009, Gould-Williams 2004, Meyer & Smith 2000). It is thus vital that organizations offer a chance for their employees to learn, because proactive development strategies will not only advance the abilities of the workforce but will also inspire employees and consequently increase their sense of loyalty (Kyndt et al. 2009).

Bassi and Buren (1999) suggest that many studies in different industries have demonstrated a positive relationship between investment in training and development
and commitment. Many researchers have established that employees are more committed to their work and the attainment of the organizational goals when they perceive that the organization is concerned about the training opportunities offered to them (De Toro & McCabe 1997, Marchington 2000). Giauque, Resenterra and Siggen (2010) and Ulrich (1997) suggest that these practices are considered effective and valuable in improving employees’ commitment to their organizations. Besides, research by Meyer and Allen (1997) has shown that certain practices including training have a positive effect on commitment. Training provided by organizations can be a very beneficial means of fostering organisational adjustments since highly skilful employees will be more effective, and, as a result more successful and satisfied. Similarly, employees who appreciate the training they receive tend to be more organizationally committed (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005).

Researchers argue that equipping employees with training opportunities does more than advance their skills and capabilities: it also enhances organizational commitment (Harel & Tzafrir 1999, McEvoy 1997). Training is a key element in the early years of employees’ work life and a key part of organizational socialization. Laabs (1993), in his research at Bell Helicopter, found that the use of training programs reduces employee turnover. Training programs also clearly contribute to the positive growth of locals in the workplaces and are related to higher retention rates (Forstenlechner 2010, Mellahi 2007b, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). In brief, suitable training enhances employees’ job retention as it makes those employees feel acknowledged, and it establishes potential to improve their skills and capabilities (Kyndt et al. 2009, Visser 2001) thus increasing their organizational commitment.
The understanding construct of the socialization process enables employees to know what their organizations do, how things work in their organizations and why things are performed in specific ways (Gao 2011). Role understanding and supervisor support reduces mistakes and produces more effective employees, providing them with more satisfaction. Employees who have good understanding of their organization and their roles are more dedicated and their turnover intentions are lower. Similarly, greater understanding leads to higher levels of organizational success, allowing employees to be more committed to their organizations. Further, if requirements of the employee’s role are not appropriately embodied in an organization’s norms, it is expected that employees will not share a similar role vision as their managers and as a result actively seek jobs elsewhere (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005).

Ongori (2007) suggests that, in order to have lower turnover rates, firms should ensure they have healthy communication amongst their staff. According to Branham (2005) inappropriate communication between managers and employees is the key reason an employee quits a firm. Many studies have reached the conclusion that employees are more motivated to remain when their relationships with their fellow co-workers are strong (Clarke 2001); that employees who perform their tasks together as a team will tend to feel increasingly committed to the department and the firm as a whole (Griffeth et al. 1997, Meyer & Allen 1997); and that employees are more likely to stay in the organization (Marchington 2000). It is argued that good relationships with co-workers will result in increased productivity and superior performance (Staw, Sutton & Pelled 1994). Morrow et al. (2005) also suggest that there is a need to maintain good relations between employees and their supervisors. Many studies suggest that positive communication and support are highly related to employees’ citizenship behaviours (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005, Gundry 1993). Other researchers argue that support
which is positive and relevant to job performance, is directly related to turnover intention (Randall et al. 1999).

There is evidence that indicates that co-workers support can be particularly significant during early socialization. Employees’ commitment can greatly increase as they recognize greater levels of their co-workers support (Susskind, Kacmar & Borchgrevink 2003). Additionally, the perception of co-worker support affects employees’ performance, absenteeism rate and turnover intentions (Shanock & Eisenberger 2006).

Riaz, Anjum and Anwar (2016) argue that co-workers’ support increases the feelings of organizational commitment among employees. Bartlett (2010) suggests that the more employees feel supported by their co-workers, the more they will be committed to their organization. Nelson and Quick (1991) suggest that both co-worker and supervisor support provided to employees has a positive effect on organizational commitment and a negative effect on turnover intentions. The supportive environment created by co-workers will make other employees feel more committed to the workplace; thus, making it more challenging for them to leave (Riaz, Anjum & Anwar 2016).

Researchers argue that policies concerning certain aspects such as training, incentives, rewards and career advancement could directly affect employee’s commitment to their firms (Jaiswal 1982, Wimalasiri 1995). Nevertheless, future prospects have a strong effect on employees’ organizational commitment (Chew & Chan 2008). That said, Harel and Tzafrir (1999) suggest that offering employees opportunities for future advancement considerably enhances their enthusiasm to stay with a firm. Rewards increase job satisfaction and improve job performance (Gao 2011). It is proposed that employees who are satisfied with their future prospects are more committed (Bigliardi,
Petroni & Dormio 2005) and when employees perceive that they will have a rewarding future they will be less likely to leave their organizations (Gao 2011).

One of the most important reasons for employee intention to leave is the lack of professional and personal advancement (McCabe et al. 2008). Employees tend to join organizations that provide better career advancement and growth. Organizational commitment is decreased if perceptions of unfair practices in promotion and career growth activities are present (Mosadeghrad, Ferlie & Rosenberg 2008). A study conducted by Al-Ahmadi (2002) suggests that employees show greater degrees of commitment if they are provided with sufficient opportunities for career growth and advancement in their firms. Urichuk (1999) concurs that turnover can be as a result of a lack of rewards in the organization.

In brief, there is strong empirical support and theoretical justification demonstrating that all four of the socialization constructs have positive relationships with organizational commitment and negative relationships with turnover intentions (Fisher 1986). Specifically, socialization strategies are designed to foster employee adjustment. It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

**H6. The more favorably employees perceive (a) Training, (b) Understanding, (c) Co-worker Support and (d) Future Prospects in their organizations, the higher will be their organizational commitment.**

**H7. The more favorably employees perceive (a) Training, (b) Understanding, (c) Co-worker Support and (d) Future Prospects in their organizations, the lower their turnover intention.**
4.2.3 Stereotypes and Organizational Socialization

With respect to stereotypes, Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) identified distinct themes of stereotypes concerning locals’ work ethics, skills and competencies. The work ethic theme is related to the motivation levels of Emirati employees and their commitment to work in general. The skills and competencies theme is concerned with actual job-related skills and competencies that local employees possess. When negative stereotypes represent a challenge to an Emirati’s competitiveness in the job market, they also affect the employee’s engagement at work. Negative stereotypes make it difficult for locals to join the workforce because organizations may be reluctant to hire someone they perceive as lazy with insufficient motivation to work (Al-Ali 2008b, Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010).

Negative stereotypes have always affected workforces and organizations (Riaz, Anjum & Anwar 2016). These stereotypes influence the degree of trust experienced by individuals from potential and actual employers (Posthuma & Campion 2009). Stereotypes affect organizations’ perceptions of locals and if negative, reduce the support that those local employees receive. As discussed earlier in the literature, lack of trust is considered one of the main obstacles to individual’s employability (Al-Ali 2008b). Many scholars argue that trust embedded in a relationship reduces uncertainty (Colquitt et al. 2012). If employees feel supported, they are more secure in their identity as a learner. As a result, those employees will learn without being afraid of making mistakes (Bauer & Green 1998). When the support that employees get from their organizations is high, employees benefit from that support, therefore reducing their uncertainty and stress (Perrot et al. 2014).
Negative stereotypes obstruct open communication and teamwork (Kary & Shirako 2009). If negative stereotypes in the labor market are strongly available then they prevent employees’ ability to think about others objectively; as co-workers, or as potential job candidates (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). Some locals believe that non-national employees exhibit discrimination toward them. Expatriates managers or co-workers avoid transferring their knowledge to locals (Morada 2002) and this is especially true where there are stereotypes about work ethics. This has a negative effect on the support that local employees get from their fellow co-workers.

The evidence suggests that managers, especially non-nationals, have little concern for locals’ skills and knowledge (Tanmia 2006). Negative stereotypes inhibit management’s capacity to effectively utilize their workforce’s skills and assist them to develop new skills (Kray & Shirako 2009). As a result those who are negatively stereotyped about their work ethics might not be offered training from their organizations because the manager might think it is a waste of time and money. For example, if a manager sees a local employee as a person who is good with people but not computers, he/she might never be offered the chance to develop his technological skills because he/she is perceived as lacking a strong work ethic and will not benefit from such training. As a result, he/she might ultimately leave the organization due to a lack of opportunities.

Employers in the private sector might avoid investing in locals because of the perception that they will not stay at the organization long, as they only perceive jobs in this sector at a transient stage while waiting for a government job (El toum 2011). On the other hand, some local employees appear to take training programs lightly and rarely benefit from those programs.
Moreover negative stereotypes are self-fulfilling and act as hindrances that reduce the willingness of those who are subjected to stereotypes to work hard; this further limits their career opportunities (Page 2007). Negative stereotypes in an organization affect employees in many ways, including job security and promotion (Walker 1999). Negative stereotypes are more likely to harm the career progress of certain groups which in this case are local Emiratis (Kary & Shirako 2009). These arguments lead to the following hypotheses:

**H8.** *There will be a negative relationship between the perceptions of local employees regarding the negative stereotypes about their Work Ethics and their perceptions of (a) Training, (b) Co-worker Support and (c) Future Prospects in their organization.*

**H9.** *There will be a negative relationship between the perceptions of local employees regarding the negative stereotypes about their Skills and Competencies and their perceptions of (a) Training, (b) Co-worker Support and (c) Future Prospects in their organization.*

### 4.2.4 Stereotypes, Organizational Socialization, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

According to Steele and Aronson (1995) negative stereotypes can be a key reason underpinning anxiety, which has a negative influence on employee performance. Other researchers also argue that negative stereotypes negatively impact the performance of employees in the workplace (Hess, Hinson & Statham 2004). Further, employees are more likely to leave their jobs if they feel that negative stereotypes control how they are treated; thus, negative stereotypes increase turnover intention (Abrams, Ando & Hinkle 1998, Glazer & Beehr 2005, Parasuraman & Alutto 1984, von Hippel et al. 2011).
Wang & Shultz (2010) argue that negative stereotypes build social pressure on employees to leave the firm. Von Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry (2013) also found that negative stereotypes have an effect on intentions to resign. Furthermore, researchers such as Riaz, Anjum and Anwar (2016) argue that negative stereotypes have a negative relationship with organizational commitment. Employees’ beliefs of stereotypes are linked with low levels of commitment, and, in turn, to higher levels of intention to quit (von Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry 2013).

According to Page (2007), negative stereotypes are self-fulfilling and act as hindrances that weaken the willingness of those who are subjected to them to work hard and further reduce their career opportunities. In addition, these stereotypes increase the lack of trust in locals among employers and make it difficult for them to get empowered by their managers (Eltoum 2011). Negative stereotypes also make employees feel obliged and thus affect their commitment levels and increase their intention to leave.

It is argued that when organization’s support is low, employees experience high levels of uncertainty and stress (Perrot et al. 2014). The support and equal opportunities that organizations offer can have a positive effect on employees. It is argued that the degree to which future prospects relate to organizational commitment and turnover intention for locals is contingent on the degree to which the negative stereotypes are present in the labor market. It is hypothesized that future prospects mediate the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics, and skills and competencies to organizational commitment and turnover intention. It was previously argued that there is a positive relationship between future prospects and organizational commitment and a negative relationship between future prospects and turnover intentions (Manzoor & Naeem 2011, McCabe et al. 2008, Mosadeghrad,Ferlie & Rosenberg 2008). Similarly, when local
employees are negatively stereotyped, their commitment decreases and they are more likely to want to quit (von Hippel, Kalokerinos & Henry 2013; von Hippel et al. 2011; Riaz, Anjum and Anwar 2016). Negative stereotypes will have an impact on Emirati employees’ chances of having good future prospects which will affect their commitment and turnover intention. It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

**H10.** The effect of Stereotypes about (a) Work Ethics and (b) Skills and Competencies at work on a) Organizational Commitment and b) Turnover Intention will be **partially mediated** by Emiratis perceptions of Future Prospects in their organization.

### 4.3 Comparison between Public and Private sectors

This study proposes that the effects of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention will differ between the public and private sectors in the UAE with respect to various aspects, such as HR practices and the presence of stereotypes. As discussed in previous chapters, the literature on the private sector differs from that on the public sector in the UAE (al-Suwaidi 2011, Godwin 2006, Mellahi 2007b). Al-Ali (2008a) suggests that organizations operating in the private sector provide better training and career opportunities than do those in public sector organizations. Socialization processes are therefore expected to differ between the two sectors. Moreover, Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) argue that negative stereotypes are stronger in the private sector than in the public sector. Hence it is expected overall, that there will be different results for public and private sectors with respect to the study’s main constructs; organizational socialization and stereotypes, and their effects on organizational commitment and turnover intention.
Research suggests that public sector employees exhibit higher degrees of commitment to organizational objectives than other sector employees (Meyer & Allen 1997; Perry 1997). Moreover, public sector roles usually offer high degrees of job security, and facilitate the meeting of employees’ needs. According to Liou (1995) many employees working in the public sector in this current difficult period appreciate the fairly secure job circumstances related to public sector employment and see it as a major cause of their commitment.

As noted, it is expected that the effects of both organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention will be different for the public sector compared to the private sector. This can have different implications for localization, especially in the UAE as it will help in identifying which socialization strategies organizations should focus on for each sector and how to address issues related to negative stereotypes differently for each sector. Additionally, this will help to identify the commitment levels and turnover intentions of Emiratis working in both sectors, enabling the government to initiate programs to address this more effectively. Hence this research will test all the following hypotheses separately for each of the public and private sectors.

**H11.** The effect of Emirati perceptions of (a) Training, (b) Understanding, (c) Co-worker Support and (d) Future Prospects in their organization on organizational commitment will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.

**H12.** The effect of Emiratis perceptions of (a) Training, (b) Understanding, (c) Co-worker Support and (d) Future Prospects in their organization on Turnover Intention will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.
H13. The effect of stereotypes about (a) Work Ethics and (b) Skills and Competencies on Organizational Commitment will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.

H14. The effect of stereotypes about (a) Work Ethics and (b) Skills and Competencies on Turnover Intention will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.

H15. The effect of stereotypes about Work Ethics on Emiratis perceptions of (a) Training, (b) Co-worker Support and (c) Future Prospects in their organization will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.

H16. The effect of stereotypes about Skills and Competencies on Emiratis perceptions of Future Prospects in their organization will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.

4.4 Chapter Summary

The common theme in conceptual development is that organizational socialization and stereotypes influence organizational job retention (organizational commitment and turnover intention). The conceptual development takes into account the relationships between a comprehensive range of recognized variables and localization, and classifies organizational socialization constructs and stereotypes as potential variables that can affect organisational commitment, and employee’s turnover intention.
Chapter 5: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 Focus

In the previous chapters the background of this research was provided and the nature of the research was discussed. Drawing from Marshall and Rossman (1999), this chapter describes the research design and method, and the research process within which the purpose, objectives and research questions were established. This chapter primarily describes the procedures for data collection for the quantitative research and the approaches adopted for data analysis. The data for the analysis were sourced from survey questionnaires.

The research design, quantitative data collection procedures and the approaches adopted for data analysis are presented. The justification for selecting these techniques is also provided. This chapter refers to a quantitative survey conducted with participants from premier organizations in Abu Dhabi and Dubai to explore the research themes. The data collection method that was utilized will be described, as will the pilot test to verify the research instrument. Finally, the procedures and techniques for the data analysis are provided.

The objective of this research is to investigate the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention of local employees. In order to achieve this objective, this research develops and then tests a conceptual framework based on theories and concepts associated with organisational socialization theory, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention in the context of localization. As discussed in the previous chapter, it is hypothesized that organizational socialization and stereotypes affect organizational commitment and
turnover intention. The indirect relationship of stereotypes about local employees’ work ethics on organizational commitment and turnover intention through organizational socialization is also investigated. Further, interrelations between the constructs of the organizational socialization construct are examined. Based on this conceptual framework, research into the selected constructs was carried out to answer the research question.

5.2 Research Question

This study intends to answer the following question:

• What is the influence of stereotypes and organizational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intention in the context of localization?

Sub questions:

• What is the influence of stereotypes about local employees on organizational commitment and turnover intention?

• What is the influence of organizational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intention?

• Does the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention differ between public or private sector’s local employees?

5.3 Research Strategy and Plan

Research strategy is common plan developed by the investigator that highlights how the research questions are intended to be answered. The strategy "is a road map, an overall
plan for undertaking a systematic exploration of the phenomenon of interest” (Marshall & Rossman 1999, p. 61). The research plan identifies the source of data gathering, taking into account issues including access to data, location, time and ethical issues.

**Figure 5.1 Research Plan**

In order to generate the required information for the study, the researcher followed the steps as listed below:

1. Review and synthesize existing theoretical and empirical literature. (Chapters 2, 3)
2. Formulate the Research Questions. (Chapter 1)
3. Further develop the conceptual model and propose hypotheses. (Chapter 4)
4. Design the questionnaire survey. (Chapter 5)
5. Pilot the questionnaire on a small sample to identify whether the questionnaire elicited the required information, provide further information on the measure applied and incorporate additional contextually relevant questions. This test assists in establishing the
validity and reliability of the instrument before distributing it to the actual sample. (Chapter 5)

6. Distribute the questionnaire to the main sample. (Chapter 5)

7. Collect and analyze the data as per methodological standards. (Chapter 5)

8. Present, interpret and discuss the results of quantitative survey utilizing relevant literature. (Chapter 6)

9. Present conclusion and contributions to literature.

10. Recommendations and limitations.

The research plan followed in this study involved several stages (see Figure 5.1). First, during the initial stage of the study, the research problem was identified from a preliminary review of the literature. This process consisted of a critical review of research studies until gaps were identified within the area of research interest. Potential research questions were formulated from the research problem. The aim of the research was then recognized based on the research question identified, and the research objectives were developed from the key aim. The literature was reviewed in further depth to identify a suitable theoretical base and key variables relevant to the research area. Subsequently, the conceptual framework was developed, and the key constructs were identified, based on the extensive review of the literature.

Based on the conceptual framework, a questionnaire was developed and subsequently implemented. The data collection exercise, therefore, involved a quantitative approach utilizing a questionnaire survey method as the main data gathering approach. Data were then analyzed, using the SEM-PLS technique. The final stage included presenting,
interpreting and discussing the results of the quantitative survey, again drawing on relevant literature.

The survey strategy is a general and shared one that permits a large data to be gathered from a large population in an economical manner (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2003). The aim of this study is to test a research model developed and hypotheses.

5.4 Research Design

According to Kerlinger (1986, p. 279), the research design is “a plan, structure and strategy of investigation so conceived so as to obtain answers to research questions or problems. It is a complete scheme or program of the research”. Hair et al. (2014, p.57) defines it as “the basic directions or recipe for carrying out the project”. A research design offers the framework through which a study will address a specific research question and it guides the investigator in carrying out the research. Additionally, it aims to offer the most accurate and valid results to address the research questions (McMillan & Schumacher 1993). It also defines the procedure to conduct the study. According to Chisnall (1997) the research design can be classified in different methods, however, the most common descriptions are descriptive, exploratory and causal.

Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2003) suggest that exploratory research assists the investigator to explain the understanding of an issue and evaluate the phenomenon in a fresh light, specifically when the investigator does not have a clear knowledge related to the research area. Hair et al. (2014) on the other hand, proposes that descriptive research addresses situations or activities developed to measure an activity and event and it is also utilized to test hypotheses. The purposes of descriptive research are to describe the characteristics associated with a specific population and determine the relationships
between various variables (Cooper & Schindler 2003). Causal research is required when
the researcher wishes to examine whether one occasion or event causes another (Hair et
al. 2014).

Edmondson and McManus (2007) highlight the importance of the right methodological
fit for any research project. They argue that it promotes the development of accurate and
necessary field research and describe it as providing internal consistency among
elements of any research work. According to Edmondson and McManus (2007), there
are four main elements that any research should have in order to achieve
methodological fit, including research question, previous work, contribution to literature
and design of the research. The research question helped to focus this study by
narrowing the research topic to a meaningful aspect and addressing matters of
significance both theoretically and practically. Moreover, prior research literature
related to the topic of this research were discussed and presented in the literature review
chapter. The research design, type of data gathered, data gathering techniques and
procedures, and analysis plans are presented in the following sections. Finally, in terms
of contribution to the literature, new ideas that integrate prior streams of research help
to refine the understanding of the research topic – in the case of this study, localization.
The key contributions to knowledge and literature are presented in the Introduction and
Discussion chapters.

In this research, a conceptual framework has been developed and in this proposed
framework, four main variables (noted above) were identified based on previous
literature. A number of hypotheses were developed based on the framework. The
research tests these hypotheses in order to determine whether or not the proposed
relationships are supported. In addition, the quantitative approach of this research is
expected to help establish whether the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention differ between the public and private sectors. A comparison is made between public and private sector employees concerning the objective. According to the research objectives, this study is primarily descriptive. Exploratory and descriptive designs emphasize the phenomenon of interest, which, according to this research, is to investigate the effect of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention. Polit and Hungler (1991) argue that exploratory research is focused on the phenomenon of interest and studies the factors that influence, cause or relate to the phenomenon being investigated. Furthermore, based on Edmondson and McManus’s (2007) work on methodological fit, while localization itself may be in line with the intermediate stage of prior theory and research, very little is known about Emiratization and hence an exploratory approach is being utilized to collect data where a quantitative approach is being utilized.

5.5 Research Methodology Approach

Data obtained for research can be tested using quantitative, qualitative or a combination of both methods. This study uses a quantitative method. The quantitative method involves the collection of numerical data and employs statistical analysis to test for significant relationships. According to Creswell (2003), the key features are breaking the issue down to particular constructs, developing hypotheses and testing theories with observations and instruments that offer statistical data. Quantitative research generally comprises the formulation of hypotheses founded on theoretical foundations and constructs measured for their effects. It frequently depends on interpretive or critical
social science and seeks to analyze data using of words and concepts (Neuman 2006, Punch 2005).

Where investigators produce research ideas, and concepts are being examined, the objective is to explore in-depth the behaviors associated with the situation; qualitative investigation is appreciated in these cases (Chisnall 1997). Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and their related data gathering methods have advantages and disadvantages, with neither approach being superior to the other (Ackroyd & Hughes 1992). The advantage of quantitative research is that it allows us to explain cause and effect through testing hypotheses and theories and thereby leading to increased reliability and generalizability of findings (Creswell 2003). Nonetheless, there are several disadvantages of quantitative methodology. It does not allow the development and constant examination of a research phenomenon.

Qualitative methodology on the other hand is exploratory and focuses on generating hypotheses and theories in addition to allowing to conduct an in-depth investigation of individuals and groups in contexts that are relatively less known (Creswell 2003). Thus, qualitative methods permit scholars to analyze the opinions of an individual regarding a firm or the behaviors of individuals in a social setting (Punch 2005). Nevertheless, the disadvantages of qualitative research are that it is time-consuming, validity and reliability standards cannot be easily applied and it lacks anonymity for data gathering and reporting, which is often a concern for respondents (Babbie 2007, Neuman 2006, Sarantakos 1993).

A quantitative research methodology was selected for this study based on the research objectives, suggested conceptual model and proposed hypotheses, as discussed below. Following the review of the literature and according to the objectives and conceptual
development of the research, a quantitative methodology was chosen for this research. The next sections of this chapter will present the quantitative approach taken in detail.

5.6 Quantitative Approach

This study utilizes correlational research and it employs a cross-sectional study design using an exploratory and descriptive approach. Correlational research aims to determine the extent of the relationship between variables being studied using statistical data. It also examines the direction and strength of a relationship. In such a design, relationships between and among facts are pursued and interpreted (Taylor, Kermode & Roberts 2006). In terms of advantages of correlational designs, they are a relatively easy, fast and inexpensive means to obtain and process a lot of data that could be employed to examine relationships among variables. They are also useful in identifying relationships that may later be evaluated more explicitly (Taylor, Kermode & Roberts 2006). Furthermore, a study is regarded as cross-sectional if the information, to be gathered, is only gathered on one occasion (Barbie 1989).

Given that the purpose of the research is to examine the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention thus, the quantitative method was selected to empirically test the established research model since according to Hair et al. (2014), this method is more useful for theory testing. Additionally, it provides the investigator with a greater variation of data gathering for utilization with a large representative sample, to ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument employed.
As noted earlier, the review of the literature recognizes a lack of quantitative data that statistically tests and recognizes workplace related issues to investigate the perceptions of Emiratis.

5.7 Sample Selection and Size

Nonprobability sampling was used for this research, which is defined as “any technique in which samples are selected in some way not suggested by probability theory” (Babbie 2007, p. 183). This sampling is chosen because it is suitable when absolute accuracy is not significant; nevertheless, it frequently yields samples quite similar to the population of interest (Al-Ali 2008b). It also has benefits in terms of time and cost, as probability sampling requires better planning to ensure that each chosen sample member responds (Babbie 2007). Thus, nonprobability sampling is the reasonable choice for this research.

Purposive sampling was selected for this study. This sampling allows focusing on individuals with specific characteristics who will have better potential to assist with the relevant study (Palys 2008). As suggested by Al-Ali (2008b), organizations with a large number of employees were chosen; this helps to focus the research as the effect of organization size will be controlled. In this case, organizations with no less than 1000 overall employees working of which at least 20% of Emiratis were selected, with the intention of obtaining adequate data for analysis. The outcomes will be with important contributions to the country and its economy (Davis & Fisher 2002, Khatri & Budhwar 2002) cited in (Al-Ali 2008b).

To obtain candidate organizations for the main study sample, organizations with a large number of employees were selected from the two Emirates, Abu Dhabi and Dubai,
which are populated with the highest amount of labor in the country. A representative sample was chosen to increase the generalizability of study findings. Emiratis from nine organizations were reached on the basis of their awareness of matters concerning Emiratization. The respondents were Emirati employees from different levels of seniority in these organizations. The age-range of respondents was from 18 to 60-years-old since that is the range of legal employability in the UAE. The following criteria were used for selecting the organizations. The organization has to have no less than 1000 overall employees working of which at least 20% are Emiratis. The organization also has to be reputed as having policies for implementing Emiratization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location/Emirate</th>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>no. of Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization1</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization2</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization3</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization4</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization5</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization6</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization7</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization8</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization9</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1000 +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sample Size

There are many factors that help the researcher decide how large a sample should be including:

- Population size, variation in the population(s), the true difference between the parameters to be estimated
- Number of variables (or items or factors)
- The trusted power of the test (power to target)
- Parametric vs. non parametric tests
- Significance level of the test
- The communality of the factors extracted in the case in reduction techniques such as (Factor Analysis)

Roscoe (1975) claims that the sample size has also be mant times as large as the number of constructs in the research. Garson (2008) also suggests there should be at least 10 cases for each item in the instrument being used. This study has eight variables; four organizational socialization constructs and two types of stereotypes as predictors and organizational commitment, turnover intention as dependent variables. Moreover, the total number of items in the questionnaire is thirty nine.

Roscoe (1975) argues that a sample size larger than 30 and smaller than 500 is suitable for most multivariate studies. Additionally, Norusis (2005) suggests that the sample should be at least 300. Yamane (1973) provided the following formula \( n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \), to calculate the sample size where \( n \) is the sample size; \( N \) is the target population; and \( e \) is alpha or percentage of error. However Yamane (1973) claims that if the target population is larger than 100,000 then the sample size should be 400. The UAE census data related to the local labor force are hard to access but based on the data from the UAE National Bureau of Statistics (2011) the population of Emiratis who are eligible to work is estimated to be more than 100,000 individuals so the sample size for the study should be 400 participants.

**Study Area**

The scope of this research covers the labor market in the UAE including the public and private sectors, with a focus on the emirates of Abu Dhabi and Dubai, which are
populated with the most labor in the country. Besides, all major firms in the UAE labor market are headquartered in these two emirates.

5.8 Research Administration

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher and the participants were Emiratis from different organizations in the UAE labor market based in organizations in Abu Dhabi and Dubai. An opportunity sample of Emiratis was asked to participate in the study from each of the participating organizations by an organisational representative, generally the HR manager.

5.8.1 Ethics and Confidentiality

To undertake the study, approval was sought for data collection from the University of Wollongong in Dubai Ethics Committee. On approval by UOWD, the application was submitted to the Ethics Committee at University of Wollongong. As per the ethical codes of conduct for research, various issues were addressed including participant information sheet that detailed the objectives of research, consent form that addressed issues related to confidentiality, privacy and potential risks associated with participation in the research.

In this research, participant’s names and addresses were removed throughout to further assure anonymity. The involvement of participants in the study was voluntary and the researcher ensured anonymity for the information collected, treated all participants equally and respected the individuals’ values and beliefs. Furthermore, the participants had the freedom to withdraw their participation before taking the questionnaire or while writing it (at any time). They were also assured that refusal to participate in the study would not affect their relationship with the University of Wollongong in Dubai.
Individual responses were anonymous and data were analyzed at an aggregate level. Anonymity was assured, and the participants were not identified during the final survey. Data (including questionnaires, surveys, computer data, tapes and transcripts) were retained during the project and will be kept for a minimum of 5 years after the project completion, in line with the research guidelines and requirements of the University of Wollongong in Dubai.

5.9 Primary Data Collection Method

Burns and Grove (1997) define data collection as the process by which the subjects of the study are identified and data from these subjects are gathered. Questionnaires are a technique of collecting self-reported data from participants through administration of questions (Polit & Hungler 1991). According to Asika (2000) questionnaires consist of sets of questions developed to collect information or data in order to later analyze them, the result of which are employed for testing the hypotheses developed and answer the relevant research questions. The researcher collected primary data through questionnaires. Zikmund (2003) suggests that questionnaires are considered effective research tools that are cost effective and reduce misrepresentations in the data. As this research intended to explore personal beliefs, some of which might be sensitive in nature, anonymity permitted participants to show their beliefs and perceptions freely. In this study, the questionnaire formed the mode of data gathering, allowing the researcher to cover locals in related emirates.

5.10 Developing measures for the study

The measures utilized in this research were adapted principally from prior research. The questionnaire included closed questions to establish the context of the study by
requesting participants to answer demographic questions such as age, gender, tenure and job classification. For the remainder of the questions, multiple choice items were used with Likert scales as it generates interval data, thus responses to items can be analyzed with different statistical tests (Mitchell & Jolley 2004) and can increase the comparability of responses (Babbie 2007).

In this research, 39 items pool was developed by reference to present survey questionnaires and published scales in the relevant literature; they also drew on the experience of the researcher. The study examined eight variables: Four organizational socialization constructs, two stereotypes, and organizational commitment and turnover intention. To measure these constructs, the following instrument was employed. The questionnaires used a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The survey measured respondents’ perceptions and beliefs in terms of various job-related characteristics of Emiratis. The study focuses on organizational socialization and stereotypes that are expected to have an impact on local employee’s commitment and turnover intention thus capturing the context of localization.

**The scale selection process**

The scale selection process began with a comprehensive review of the literature related to localization in order to generate a pool of items that reflect the retention aspect of localization, stereotypes and organizational socialization constructs. A list of items was collected to cover all aspects of these constructs. In order to ensure face validity and content validity, two experts reviewed and approved the questionnaire. A pilot study was also used to pretest the scales and further enhance face and content validity.
Stereotypes

Stereotypes was measured by adapting existing survey instruments designed to measure stereotypes (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010) and the stereotypes were measured using the 8 items as predefined in this questionnaire. These measures were not intended to do a comparison between Emiratis and non-Emiratis. They were used to measure perception about Emiratis.

Organizational Socialization

Organizational socialization was assessed using a revised version of Taormina’s (1994) four part, 20-item Organizational Socialization Inventory (OSI) scale (Taormina 2004). This measured respondents’ evaluations of four aspects of the socialization namely: Training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects, with an overall original reliability for the whole scale of 0.90

Taormina (2004) argues that while some of the items in the previous OSI have been adapted from initial theoretical literature that are merely unclear linked to the four aspects, some new items were generated to take the place of the older items. He further suggests that the new items more precisely relate to the four theoretical dimensions and as a result their meaning more specifically link the related socialization constructs.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured employing the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) in its reduced 9-item scale; this is a standard measure developed by Mowday, Steers & Porter (1982) who provided research evidence demonstrating that the scale is psychometrically stable and sound. The OCQ was originally developed in
1979 as a 15-item scale and is a widely used and accepted measure of organizational commitment that has been regularly tested and demonstrated to have high reliability and validity scores ($\alpha$ ranging from 0.81 to 0.93) (Commeiras & Fournier 2001, Edgar & Geare 2005, Ensher, Grant-Vallone & Donaldson 2001, Guest 1997, Kacmar et al. 1999, Millward & Hopkins 1998) and good psychometric properties (Ensher, Grant-Vallone & Donaldson 2001). It captures the extent to which an employee identifies with the organization, their desire to remain in the organization and their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization (Edgar & Geare 2005, Guest 1997). The 9-item scale was chosen as many researchers have pointed out the superiority of the reduced 9-item version of the OCQ's over the 15-item version and recommend using it without item 4 because it demonstrates better fit properties and is more parsimonious (Commeiras & Fournier 2001). Many researchers have pointed out the merits of the short OCQ to measure organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer 1990, Cramer 1996, Mathieu & Zajac 1990, McElroy et al. 1995). Therefore an 8-item OCQ scale was used to measure organizational commitment.

**Turnover Intention**

*Turnover intention* was measured using scale adapted from Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cummann et al. 1979). This 3-item scale emphasis on how much employees think or plan to leave the firm and it has been used extensively in previous research. Employees are asked to rate how frequently they think about each of the items using a five-point scale. An overall turnover intention score is calculated by computing the average of the three items in the scale. This scale has an original reliability of $\alpha = 0.90$. 
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All variables (except for the control variables) were rated on five point Likert scale ranging from 1 depicting “strongly disagree” to 5 depicting “strongly agree”.

**Control Variables**

Besides the information related to the main variables, the study also collected data related to other factors that could affect the variables being investigated, so that the analysis can include such extraneous factors (Al-Ali 2008b). The control variables included: Gender, age, location, highest educational qualification, the job title of employees, income and overall years of experience and in the organization. The details of the measurement of control variables are provided in appendix A.

**5.10.1 Measurement Principles**

The principles of measurement refer to the scales employed to measure concepts and the assessment of validity and reliability of the instrument employed (Al-Ali 2008b). In this study the Likert scale is chosen because it produces interval data that could be analyzed using various statistical tests (Al-Ali 2008b). More precisely, the five-point Likert scale was used in the design of the questionnaire. In practice, scales of five categories are typical (Grigoroudis & Sikos 2002, Reichheld 2003). This provided respondents with the facility to make fine distinctions between attitudes (Alnaqbi 2011).

**5.10.2 Questionnaire Design**

A questionnaire design can influence the response rate and the validity and reliability for the data collected. In order to maximize these factors, some criteria needs to be fulfilled including paying attention to the design and wording; questionnaire form and clear explanation for the purpose of the questionnaire followed by testing of the
questionnaire (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 1997, Hussey & Hussey 1997) as cited in Al-Ali (2008b). Specific design criteria such as the questionnaire appearance and wording have been followed in the present study to maximize reliability and validity, drawing from Cavana, Delahaye and Sekaran (2001) cited in Al-Ali (2008b). Furthermore the methods by which variables are scaled, categorized and coded also followed the rules alluded to by Cavana, Delahaye and Sekaran (2001).

Furthermore, following the principles of Cavana, Delahaye and Sekaran (2001) cited in (Al-Ali 2008b) in questions wording, attention was given to several aspects. First, the questionnaire was developed to be comprehensible by all participants and questions were all framed in the questionnaire to record subjective matters such as stereotypes, organizational socialization, commitment and turnover intention; and control variables: Gender, age, location, highest educational qualification, the job title, years of experience and income. The purpose of all the questions was carefully taken into account so that the constructs would be relevant and properly measured. The researcher developed the questionnaire in simple English, and then translated into Arabic by an expert conversant in both English and Arabic. The researcher then back translated the Arabic version into English (Mostafa 2004a) and then resolved any discrepancies in consultation the translator.

The questionnaire comprised of close-ended questions to ensure quick turnaround from the participants, as well as negatively worded questions to further minimize biases if any that might result as an outcome of lack of attention (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekaran 2001). In compliance with survey practice, demographic questions were placed at the end of the questionnaire. Cavana, Delahaye and Sekaran (2001) suggest that awareness of the content permits participant confidence and time to be open to address personal
questions. This might well be the case in this study as in the UAE cultural reticence is challenged by early demands for personal information for example income or education details can be extremely sensitive issues especially for Emiratis (Al-Ali 2008b).

5.10.3 Questionnaire Presentation

The questionnaire was grouped into five sections. A copy of the questionnaire is attached in Appendix A. In the following table (Table 5.2), the questionnaire items and sources are presented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Q. Code</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>OS_TR1</td>
<td>This organization has provided excellent job training for me.</td>
<td>Taormina (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR5</td>
<td>The training in this company has enabled me to do my job very well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR9</td>
<td>This company offers thorough training to improve employee job skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR13</td>
<td>Instructions given by my supervisor have been valuable in helping me do better work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR17</td>
<td>The type of job training given by this organization is highly effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>OS_UN2</td>
<td>I know very well how to get things done in this organization.</td>
<td>Taormina (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_UN6</td>
<td>I have a full understanding of my duties in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_UN10</td>
<td>The goals of this organization have been made very explicit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_UN14</td>
<td>I have a good knowledge of the way this organization operates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_UN18</td>
<td>This organization’s objectives are understood by almost everyone who works here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>OS_CS3</td>
<td>Other workers have helped me on the job in various ways.</td>
<td>Taormina (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_CS7</td>
<td>My co-workers are usually willing to offer their assistance or advice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_CS11</td>
<td>Most of my co-workers have accepted me as a member of this company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_CS15</td>
<td>My co-workers have done a great deal to help me adjust to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_CS19</td>
<td>My relationships with other workers in this company are very good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>OS_FP4</td>
<td>There are many chances for a good career with this organization.</td>
<td>Taormina (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_FP8</td>
<td>I am happy with the rewards offered by this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_FP12</td>
<td>Opportunities for advancement in this organization are available to almost everyone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_FP16</td>
<td>I can readily anticipate my prospects for promotion in this company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_FP20</td>
<td>I expect that this organization will continue to employ me for many more years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>OrgComt1</td>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt2</td>
<td>I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt3</td>
<td>I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt4</td>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt5</td>
<td>This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt6</td>
<td>I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt7</td>
<td>I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt8</td>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>TrnOvr1</th>
<th>I probably look for a new job in the next year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TrnOvr2</td>
<td>I will likely actively look for a new job in the next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TrnOvr3</td>
<td>I often think about quitting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotypes</th>
<th>Str_WE1</th>
<th>Emirati graduates are hard to motivate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_WE1</td>
<td>Emirati graduates are hard working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_WE7</td>
<td>Emirati graduates lack communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_WE8</td>
<td>Emirati graduates need additional technical/functional training before they are ready to work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills &amp; Competencies</th>
<th>Str_SC3</th>
<th>Emirati employees lack conflict solving skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_SC4</td>
<td>Emirati graduates lack practical experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_SC5</td>
<td>Emiratis are lazy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_SC6</td>
<td>Emirati graduates lack work ethics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mowday, Steers & Porter (1982)
Cumann et al. (1979)
Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner (2010)
Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner (2010)
Part (A) Organizational Socialization

This section draws on a revised version of Taormina’s (1994) four part 20-item Organizational Socialization Inventory (OSI) scale (Taormina 2004). It measures respondents’ evaluations of four aspects of the socialization, namely: Training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects.

Part (B) Stereotypes

This section comprises eight questions adapted from existing items from survey instruments designed to measure stereotypes (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). The measures included two types of stereotypes: Stereotypes about Emiratis skills and competencies and stereotypes about Emiratis work ethics. These stereotypes about Emiratis are held by both expatriates and Emiratis as explained in the literature review chapter. These measures include indirect questions to assess the perception regarding the extent to which negative stereotypes about Emiratis exist in the job market thereby addressing potential risks such as social desirability bias.

Part (C) Organisational Commitment

This assesses respondent’s commitment toward their respective organization. Organizational commitment was measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) in its reduced 8-item scale, a standard measure developed by Mowday, Steers & Porter (1982) who provided research evidence demonstrating that the scale is psychometrically stable and sound.
Part (D) Turnover Intention

This part covers questions on the respondent’s’ desire to stay connected with their respective organizations. A 3-item turnover intention scale adapted from Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cummann et al. 1979) was used to measure turnover intention. This three-item scale revolves around how much the employee thinks about or plans to leave the organization. Employees are asked to rate how frequently they think about each of the items using a five-point scale.

Part (E) Demographic Information

This section required respondent’s demographic information: Age, gender, their experience and educational qualifications, location, the job title and the income bracket.

5.10.4 Pre-testing of Questionnaire

After the questionnaire items were established, the questionnaire was assessed by two experts as well as the main-and-co supervisors. Expert views were sought from other scholars with an interest in similar field of research. One of the experts was from industry and another researcher in the field of Emiratization. Experts reviewed the items of the questionnaire to decide on the suitability of those items and to ensure that all the questions included completely covered all aspects of the research questions. The experts were requested to give their opinion about the clarity of instructions provided, time to complete the questionnaire and the quality of the questions in terms of clarity, redundancy or difficulty to answer, and add any other comments.

Based on the participants’ feedback, the wording of a small number of questions was changed and amendments were made in the order of the questions in each part of the
questionnaire. Additional details were also added to the questionnaire’s cover page including more detailed instructions on how to complete the questionnaire.

5.10.5 Pilot Study

In order to evaluate the design of the instrument it is essential to conduct a pilot test before moving on to the primary study. Cooper and Schindler (2005) suggest that a pilot study of the data collecting instrument should be conducted before proceeding with the research. A pilot study is a smaller scale version conducted before the main study on a few subjects from the same population as proposed for the main research. A pilot test can help to identify issues in research methodology and data collection methods. Moser and Kalton (1958) state that a “pilot survey usually results in significant improvements to the questionnaire and increases the efficiency of the inquiry; with numbers in the group ranging from 25 to 100 subjects” cited in (Cooper & Schindler 1998, p. 495).

According to Baumgartner, Strong and Hensley (2005), the objectives for pilot tests include determining if the questions provide suitable data, or other questions are required to be included. These tests also verify that the participants comprehend the context of the questions. They also provide the opportunity to rectify any ambiguity and to reduce bias (Brink 1996). However, they are mostly helpful in determining the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire.

During the pre-testing stage, a pilot test was performed to verify the completeness of the instrument. The pilot study was therefore performed to assess the survey questionnaire for understandability and readability of its content. The 40 participants were volunteers from the target population who helped classify minor issues such as spelling. In this case employees from a semi government organization were reached on the basis of their knowledge. The participants indicated that the questionnaire completion time of 30
minutes was adequate and the questions were clear and the flow reasonable. Therefore no changes were made in the questionnaire.

5.10.6 Reliability and Validity

The research design took into account reliability and validity to increase the quality of the research findings. Reliability is ‘the quality of measurement method that suggests that the same data would have been collected each time in repeated observations of the same phenomenon’ (Babbie 2007, p. 143) cited in Al-Ali (2008b). This suggests that the results from the employed instrument have to be consistent when the instrument is repeated. According to Asika (2000), reliability is defined as the consistency between independent instruments on the same topic. Salkind (2008) suggests that ‘the assessment tools used to test the hypothesis must be reliable and valid; otherwise the researcher may act incorrectly in supporting or rejecting the research hypothesis’. Researchers who design the measuring instrument have to ensure that the instrument used offers similar, close or the exact same results if the research to which the instrument is employed is replicated. According to Neuman (2006), there are many techniques and methods for verifying the reliability of instruments such as test-retest, split-half, multiple (alternate) form and the use of established measures. In this research, the established measures method was used, given that the researcher was using measures from prior studies; therefore the questionnaire was developed based on prior research. The reliability of each scale was measured by calculating Cronbach’s alpha reliability co-efficient of each item.

The validity of an instrument is its capacity to measure what it is supposed to measure (Asika 2000, Polit & Hungler 1991). Validity of instrument is the ‘extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under
Content and face validity were used to ensure the instrument contained the main items to be measured and to ensure internal validity. This was established by reviewing present literature for the region and internationally to find out the most suitable items to be considered in the measurements used. Treece and Treece (1986) propose to include face validity in every test for validity. Face validity was tested by a pilot test of the questionnaire which demonstrated the appropriateness of the questions used. Content validity ensures that all the related dimensions of the phenomena are being completely explored and that the instrument employed appropriately covers all the dimensions of the topic of research (Brink 1996). This implies that the measures include a sufficient and representative set of items that tap the concept. This was achieved in the review of literature and the judgment of experts (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekeran 2001, p. 213). In this research, as stated earlier, expert views were sought to review the questionnaire. Moreover, the researcher has identified, from the literature, possible explanations of some of the concepts involved in this study. Furthermore, data gathered from the pilot test of the questionnaire were also evaluated to ensure that questions measured the variables they were intended to measure. In terms of construct validity, factor analysis was used to test the construct validity and identify required changes in wording of questions.

Further details about validity and reliability of the instrument are offered in the next chapter.

5.11 Survey Distribution and Data Collection

As mentioned before, data were gathered using a well-structured instrument which in this case was a self-administered questionnaire. Structured questionnaires provide participants with a variety of alternative choices to select from (Polit & Hungler 1991).
The researcher sought support from representatives of each of the participating organizations in Abu Dhabi and Dubai in order to administer it. The questionnaire was distributed to 1000 employees in nine organizations located in Abu Dhabi and Dubai, who were approached for the purposes of data collection to identify various issues related to Emiratization.

Participants were locals (Emiratis) working in these organizations. The selection process was as follows. The researcher hand delivered copies of the questionnaires to the representative of each of the nine organizations who was asked to gather the completed questionnaires from the participants after a week of the distribution. The representatives approached the HR department in each of the organizations to select participants from their employees’ database. The representative approached the participants by email or in person to ask them to participate in the study. The participants were given an option of either completing an online survey or a paper copy of the questionnaires with attached information sheets. “It (the online survey) is becoming the most popular method for data collection” (Money et al. 2003; p.141) cited in (Hair et al. 2003). There are many advantages of online surveys such as global reach, low cost, ease of administration and their capability to capture and analyze data rapidly (Hair et al. 2014).

The representative of each organisation hand delivered the hard copy of the questionnaire to participants at their organizations or provided them with the link to the online survey questionnaire. Participants were able to fill the survey at their workplace, at a time convenient to them. The hard copies of the completed surveys were returned to a locked drop box monitored by a representative of the organization.
5.12 Analytical Techniques

Data was analysed using Partial Least Squares (PLS) estimation method (Chin 1998b, Eberl 2010) as applied in SmartPLS 2.0, a structural equation modeling (SEM) package (Ringle, Wende & Will 2005, 2007). PLS is a second generation SEM method developed by Wold (1985) as a general technique to estimate path models comprising variables indirectly measured by multiple constructs. Gustafsson and Johnson (2004) argue that PLS works well with SEM that contains latent variables and a chain of causality relationships. PLS is as ordinary least squares regression, however being a components-based SEM approach it attains estimates by simultaneously modeling both structural and measurement paths (Chin, Marcolin & Newsted 1996, Lohmoller 1989).

Chin (1998) suggests that PLS comprise two models: (1) the measurement model which identifies the relationships between latent variables and their related manifest variables; (2) the structural model which specifies the relationships between the latent constructs.

PLS has been widely applied in recent research not only in business field but also in many other social sciences fields (Hair et al. 2012, Lee et al. 2011, Ringle, Sarstedt & Straub 2012). PLS has been as an preferred approach for a number of reasons. PLS is robust in coping with non-normal distribution (Cassel, Hackl & Westlund 1999). Co-variance-based SEM methods have limitations with models having non-normal data and sample size constraints (Qureshi & Compeau 2009, Reinartz, Haehlein & Hensler 2009). According to Qureshi and Compeau (2009), the group’s differences can be more likely detected by PLS when the data are not normally distributed. PLS however, entails few distributional assumptions related to the data. Falk and Miller (1992, p. 3) stated that “*The mathematics underlying the PLS system are rigorous, but the mathematical model is soft in the sense that it makes no measurement, distributional, or sample size*
assumptions”. PLS is used to avert the limitations of covariance-based SEM in terms of sample size, distributional properties, model complexity, measurement level, identification and factor indeterminacy (Chin 1998a, Fornell & Bookstein 1982, Wetzels, Schroder & Oppen 2009). In fact, PLS solves the factor indeterminacy issue of covariance-based SEM (Fornell & Bookstein 1982), does not require the observation independence assumption, handles small sample sizes, is better capable of dealing with formative measures (Anderson & Gerbing 1988, Falk & Miller 1992, Wittingslow & Markham 1999).

PLS is chosen by researchers for various reasons (Lee 2000). The model complexity and the exploratory nature of the research is a key driver for selecting PLS over other covariance based models (Bagozzi & Yi 1994, Chin 1998b, Fornell & Cha 1994, Wold 1982b). PLS can be utilized for exploratory as well as confirmatory applications (Wold 1982a). PLS permits a simultaneous analyses to check if the hypothesized relationships are empirically confirmed (Chin 1998b). PLS has three key benefits over other SEM approaches that make it more appropriate. According to Bontis and Booker (2007), in PLS, variables can be evaluated by one item while in covariance-based techniques; at least three items per variable are needed (Hair, Black & Babin 2010). They further claim that in most research, data tend not to be normally distributed and PLS handles non-normal distributions comparatively well as it does not necessitate any normality assumptions. They add, PLS provide estimates of interaction effects including mediation that are more accurate (Chin 1998b). Furthermore, PLS results are proven to be robust against multicollinearity as PLS can mitigate the multicollinearity issue in the data and limit the possible bias in the results (Fornell & Bookstein 1982). PLS is able analyse models that have both reflective and formative variables (Gefen & Straub 2005).
Justification for selecting PLS

Additionally, unlike other covariance-based SEM, SmartPLS is a variance-based SEM that is less sensitive to smaller sample sizes usually less than 300 cases (Chin 1998a). The reason for selecting PLS is that a smaller sample might be prone to incorrect solutions as suggested by Reinartz, Haenlein and Henseler (2009). Furthermore, PLS is able to explain complex models and approximately constantly converges (Chin 1998b, Fornell & Bookstein 1982, Wold 1981). As this study investigates a complex model it was considered practical to choose the technique that is most suitable for dealing with such issues. According to Chin (2010), PLS offers robust solutions in assessing complex relationships between constructs. The exploratory nature of the research is a key reason for choosing PLS. PLS is widely used where the objective of the researcher is to test whether the relationship may or may not exists and develop propositions for later testing (Chin 1998b). PLS is was utilized to examine the relationships among the variables, test the hypotheses and assess differences between the public and private sectors. PLS can deal with a larger variety of residual distributions and sample sizes including smaller sample sizes (Chin 1998b, Whittaker, Ledden & Kalafatis 2007, Wold 1985). In this study the two groups of public and private sectors had unequal sizes. In addition, the private sector sample size was only 135 cases which is much smaller than a co-variance based model can handle. Therefore, in this research, PLS makes it easier to investigate the differences between public and private sectors.

The analysis process

The analysis process carried out to test the measurement and structural models is detailed in the following sections before the presentation of findings in the next chapter. According to Geisser (1975) and Stone (1974), the assessment of the measurement and
structural models employing PLS comprises statistics that evaluate path coefficients, predictiveness ($R^2$) and the Stone-Geisser Q-square test. Bootstrapping is employed to measure parameter significance of paths and loadings as well as estimates stability. The PLS model was analyzed in two stages, two-step modeling method based on Hulland (1999) recommendation, first evaluating the validity of the measurement model and then conducting the structural model assessment by testing standardized path coefficients (Eberl 2010, Jarvis, Holford & Griffin 2003, Petter, Straub & Rai 2007). The measurement model is evaluated to build the unidimensionality and validity of the constructs of the study (Chin 1998b, Hattie 1985). The assessment of the measurement model for both public and private sectors was performed by estimating discriminant and convergent validities as well as internal consistency. Convergent validities were evaluated through item loadings on their related factors while discriminant validities were examined through a comparison between the average variance that the variables and their measures share to the variances the variables themselves share (Hair et al. 2006, Fornell & Larcker 1981, Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011). After the measurement model is considered suitable, the structural modeling is completed. In order to assess the structural model, the structural model coefficients were tested for their respective sign and contribution. The bootstrap re-sampling procedure was used to compute dependent variable’s $R^2$ values and the size, $t$ statistics, and significance level of the path coefficients. In order for the path coefficients to be significant, bootstrapping with 5000 bootstrap samples (Preacher & Hayes 2008) and sample sizes that are equal to the original sample sizes is essential (Efron & Tibshirani 1993, Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011).

*Meditation Analysis*
The traditional way of testing mediation is based on Baron and Kenny’s (1986) approach for testing mediating effects which is as follows: 1) The independent variable has an effect on the dependent variable(s); 2) the independent variable has an effect on the intervening variable(s); 3) and intervening variable(s) have to have an effect on the outcome, after controlling for the independent variable. The Sobel test is a common approach of testing mediation effects (Sobel 1982, 1986). According to Helm, Eggert and Garnefeld (2010) it inspects the relation between the independent and dependent variables in comparison to the relation between the independent and dependent variables, including the mediating variable. The Sobel test is generally specified for a formal test of mediation in multiple regression (Castro & Roldán 2013). Nonetheless this test depends on the distributional assumptions, which commonly do not occur for the indirect effects. Specially, the product of two normally distributed variables results in an abnormal distribution of product variables. Additionally, Hair et al. (2014) suggest that the Sobel test necessitates unstandardized path coefficients and lacks statistical power, particularly when applied to smaller sample sizes which happens to be the case here with the private sector sample. Nevertheless, such a test is not suitable for PLS as the path coefficients are not independent when estimated employing PLS and according to Sosik, Kahai and Piovoso (2009), PLS does not offer raw unstandardized path coefficients needed by the Sobel test. Moreover, Hayes (2009) specifies that the Sobel test has a key flaw as it necessitates the sampling distribution of the indirect effect to be normal.

When testing for mediation, researchers should follow Preacher and Hayes (2004, 2008) alternative method to test mediation bootstrapping, a nonparametric resampling method that does not require the normality assumption on the sampling distribution. Bootstrapping can also be applied to a smaller sample size with more confidence.
Moreover, the method shows higher levels of statistical power in comparison to the Sobel test. The performance of bootstrapping is higher than the Sobel test (MacKinnon, Cumbers & Chapman 2002, MacKinnon, Lockwood & Williams 2004). When it comes to testing mediation, researchers such as MacKinnon, Lockwood and Williams (2004) suggest the superiority of the bootstrapping technique to the other approaches of testing indirect effects including the Sobel test, in terms of power and Type I and Types II error rates. The approach is suited to the PLS-SEM method. Therefore, the bootstrapping method was applied in the current study.

**Difference between Public and Private Sectors**

The differences in sample sizes can highlight different attributes related to various kinds of participants (Tabachnick & Fidell 1996). The unequal sizes of the samples of public and private sectors are a result of the nature of the study population as this might be because the number of Emiratis working in public sector is much larger than in the private sector. The differences between the public and private sector were analysed utilizing path coefficients’ comparison as suggested by Chin (2009) and Wilson (2010). Carte and Russell (2003) suggest that evaluating differences in path coefficients between groups entails that the constructs are established in the equivalent manner for all groups. Unlike co-variance based modelling approaches PLS can’t test measurement model invariance by comparing fit statistics. PLS utilizes the bootstrapping technique to address the measurement model invariance and variability between two groups. According to Efron and Tibshirani (1993), this involves re-sampling the dataset one thousand times. A recommended by Chin (2009), the path coefficients between the two groups are compared employing the parametric procedure. This procedure illustrates a t-distribution with m+n-2 degrees of freedom as shown below.
**Formula for path coefficient comparisons**

\[
t = \frac{Path_{sample\_1} - Path_{sample\_2}}{\sqrt{\frac{(m-1)^2}{(m+n-2)} \cdot SE_{sample\_1}^2 + \frac{(n-1)^2}{(m+n-2)} \cdot SE_{sample\_2}^2}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n}}
\]

Where \( path \) = path coefficient; \( SE \) = standard error; \( m \) = sample 1 size and \( n \) = sample 2 size. It determines a \( t \)-value with \( m+n-2 \) degrees of freedom dependent on the standard error of the estimated path coefficients from bootstrapping as well as the sample size (Chin 2009; Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011).

**5.13 Chapter Summary**

This chapter presented the research philosophy and methodology that has guided the research design, methodology and methods. The research utilized a quantitative approach. A questionnaire survey approach was used for data collection. The participants were chosen from Emiratis of public and private sectors organizations from both Abu Dhabi and Dubai. The following chapter discusses the results of the research with the focus on the key contributions of the research.
Chapter 6 : DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

6.1 Focus

This research sought to investigate the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention by Emirati employees. In the previous chapter the research methodology selected in this study was described. This chapter presents the data analysis and the statistical techniques used in analysing the data gathered. Several steps are required before conducting data analysis or testing the hypotheses (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekaran 2001). This chapter is divided into three sections. It starts with a description of the data preparation process. The key concern was on the adequacy of the acquired data to be analyzed. The next section presents descriptive statistics of the sample used in this research. The chapter also details the techniques carried out to inspect reliability and validity of constructs. The chapter shows that the constructs being studied measure what they aim to measure and exhibit adequate psychometric properties excluding some items of stereotypes. The following section used the independent samples t-test to examine whether there are significant differences between the two types of sectors (public and private) in terms of the variables being studied. The last part of this chapter describes the results of PLS analysis for testing the research hypotheses.

Several statistical techniques were employed to analyze the data utilizing the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS). SPSS software was utilized to conduct the preliminary data analysis of the data collected. Descriptive statistics distinguish simple patterns in data (Lawrence 2006). The research design and analyses used in this research is all framed at the individual level. Results were screened for violation of assumptions and outliers. Descriptive statistics were used to describe some personal demographic
characteristics of the sampled Emirati employees working in public and private sectors. Independent samples t-test was used to measure the difference between the public and private sectors regarding the level of organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention variables.

6.2 Data Preparation

This part of the chapter discusses the screening and cleaning of data gathered prior to being analyzed.

A total of 1000 questionnaires were distributed using the online version and the paper based formats along with the participant information sheet. Several follow-up calls were made to the representatives of the participating organizations. A total of 430 (43%) complete surveys were collected.

After receiving the completed questionnaires from the participants, the researcher used a coding sheet for data transcription and then entering the data to avoid errors in transferring data from the questionnaires. This method prevents confusion, particularly with large number of questionnaires having various items (Cavana, Delahaye & Sekaran 2001). The data from the questionnaire were entered into the SPSS 19. After that, editing was performed to ensure that the data is complete and reliable.

Sometimes not all questions were answered by the respondents thus data were screened for missing data and outliers. No improperly coded responses or out-of-range were detected. However, there were several cases in the completed questionnaires that had missing responses. The missing value analysis (MVA) was performed to inspect and yield a complete dataset for subsequent model estimation. The missing data accounted for less than 5% of the data and MVA results indicated that data were not missing
completely at random (MCAR) (Little's MCAR test: Chi-Square = 3072.46, $df = 2110$, $p = 0$). As suggested by Harrington (2009) missing values were imputed using expectation maximization (EM) algorithm available in SPSS, since the missing data were not MCAR. EM is perceived to be a generally accepted method for imputing missing values (Tabachnick & Fidell 2007).

*Normality*

Measuring the effect of the violation of the assumption of normality is particularly significant because statistical tests depending on the assumption of normality might not be valid. Accordingly, Kerlinger and Lee (2000) argue that any conclusions made from the sample could be questioned. Thus data were tested for violations of normality. According to Pallant (2011) a distribution is perceived as normal if skewness and kurtosis values are equal to zero. Thus the study variables were tested for acceptable skewness and kurtosis (see Table 6.1). Assessment of skewness and kurtosis estimates for all constructs demonstrated that most constructs were normal. According to Newsom (2005), the absolute value of skewness two or less and the absolute value of kurtosis three or less are adequate limits for normality to be achieved. In the current research, all of the distributions were reasonably normal as the skewness and kurtosis for all variables were within specified limits. The results of the descriptive analysis comprising the detailed values of skewness and kurtosis are offered in Appendix B.
Table 6.1 Skewness and Kurtosis statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethics</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>1.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and Competencies</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>-1.042</td>
<td>2.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Support</td>
<td>-1.053</td>
<td>2.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-1.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Profile of the respondents

In this section, a detailed analysis of the respondents’ profile is presented. The profile includes gender, age, job classification, education level, monthly salary, years of experience with current employer, overall years of experience, emirate of origin, the current emirate where the respondent is working, last promotion received and intention to leave their current employer. Respondents were employees of nine organizations from both public and private sectors in Abu Dhabi and Dubai. The respondents were composed of managers from different levels and support personnel. Heads of corporate affairs, human resource or public relations departments in these organizations were approached to acquire approval to conduct the study by distributing the questionnaires to the possible respondents. Table 6.2 shows the respondents’ demographic profile.
Table 6.2 Respondents profile (N 419)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First level management</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/technical</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Diploma</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly salary (AE Dirham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 5,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 34,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000 - 44,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000 - 54,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000 and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emirate of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi &amp; Dubai</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern emirates</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emirate Working in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience with current employer</td>
<td>1 to below 5</td>
<td>5 to below 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall experience (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to below 5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to below 10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to below 15</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to below 20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to below 25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years or more</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the next 6 months</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the next year</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the next 5 years</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization size (Total number of Employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 – 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 – 10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Demographic Data**

**Gender and age:** The results show that 53.7% of the respondents were male while 46.3% were female. The age groups of the respondents were divided into seven groups. Descriptive data analysis highlights that the majority of more than two-thirds of respondents were between the age of 26 and 40 years.

**Job classification:** The results show that first level management constituted 40.5% of all respondents, followed by non-managerial staff with 30.4%, middle management with 28.5% and top management with 0.7%.

**Educational level:** The majority of the respondents were educated, possessing a university degree. The statistics indicated that 38.8% attained a bachelor degree while 13.6% had a postgraduate degree. Those who had a diploma or higher diploma accounted for 15.6% and 28.7% with technical school or secondary certificate.

**Monthly salary:** The results showed that only 0.9% earned the minimum monthly salary of less than 3,000 AED while the majority of 43.9% made between 6,000 to 14,999 AED and 38.5% who made between 15,000 to 34,999 AED. On the other hand, 12.7% who made more than 35,000 AED.

**Emirate of origin and work:** The vast majority of respondents were from Abu Dhabi and Dubai (81.6%) while Emiratis from northern emirates accounted for only 18.4%. As for the Emirate the employee worked, the majority of respondents worked in Dubai (85.1%) while Emiratis worked in Abu Dhabi accounted for only 14.9%.

**Years of experience:** 33.5% who had between 5 and 10 years of experience with their current employer, followed by 31.4% who had between 1 and 5 years and 32.3% who
had between 10 and 25 years of experience. Only 2.8% of respondents had more than 25 years of experience.

As for overall years of experience, the results highlight that 32.7% of the respondents had between 5 and 10 years of overall experience, followed by 21.6% who had between 1 and 5 years, 20.7% who had between 10 and 15 years, 14.6% who had between 15 and 20 years, 6.8% who had between 20 and 25 years of experience and finally 3.5% who had more than 25 years of experience.

_Last promotion:_ most of the respondents have been at least promoted once by their current employers but the date that they received their last promotion varied between respondents. The results showed that 35.0% have received their last promotion less than 2 years ago. Whereas 20.6% have received their last promotion 3 to 4 years ago and 18.2% have received their last promotion 5 years ago or more. Those who haven’t been promoted by their current employer accounted for 26.2%.

_Intention to leave:_ Most of the respondents (33.2%) stated that they are thinking of leaving their current employers within the next 5 years. This is followed by 14.7% who stated their intention to leave in the next year then 12.6% who stated their intention to leave in the next 6 months. Those who stated that they would never leave their current employers accounted for 27.7% of respondents.

_Business Sector:_ As presented in Chapter 3, organizations in the UAE can be grouped into two broad categories: public (government) sector and private sector. The respondents were distributed among these two sectors. Those who worked in public sector organizations accounted for 68.8%, followed by 31.2% who worked in private sector organizations.
Organization size and age: 54.0% of respondents worked for organizations who had between 1001-5000 employees followed by 34.4% worked for organizations employing between 5001-10,000 employees, and 11.6% who worked for organizations employing more than 10,000 employees. All of the participating organizations had been more than 20 years in existence.

6.4 Measurement model validation

First, to the researcher assessed whether the same measurement model held for the whole sample and the two groups by evaluating the measurement model invariance between the public and private sectors. Figure 6.1 presents the measure model for the whole sample. Two items were eliminated, one from each of the two types of stereotypes until the various diagnostics revealed that the variables were adequately explained for all three samples. The loadings of indicators on variables are required to be greater than 0.55 (Falk & Miller 1992). Chin (1998b) proposes that loadings have to be above 0.707 in order to be suitable. However, for first time research, Chin and Newsted (1999) argue that loadings can be between 0.5 and 0.6. As table 6.3 shows that the threshold within this study is 0.71 and above (except for one item loading at 0.53).

Furthermore, following the recommendation of Gefen and Straub (2005), the psychometric properties of the measures were tested by investigating internal consistency, reliability and both discriminant validity and convergent validity. First, internal consistency was evaluated utilizing Cronbach’s alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) values. The reliability scores for most of the constructs in the model for the whole sample and both the public and private sector samples exceeded the threshold of 0.70 for both Cronbach’s α and hence captured a high degree of variance in each construct (Nunnally 1978). In this research, as illustrated in table 6.3, all CR values
were above the benchmark of 0.8, demonstrating high internal consistency (Straub et al. 2004).
Figure 6.1 Measurement Model
Furthermore, the PLS approach to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to examine both convergent and discriminant validity (Gefen & Straub 2005). Contrasting covariance-based SEM techniques, which compare loadings of the items to pre-defined thresholds, the PLS method to CFA tests significance levels of loadings of the measurement items on their intended constructs to establish sufficient convergent validity (Gefen & Straub 2005). The average variance extracted (AVE) and CR scores are used to measure convergent validity. According to Ormrod and Henneberg (2009), for more than half of the variance of a construct to be explained, the AVE scores should exceed the minimum threshold of 0.5 (Chin 1998b; Fornell & Larcker 1981; Hair et al. 1998; Bagozzi & Yi 1988; Gefen, Straub & Boudreau 2000; Nunnally 1978), which was the case for all constructs in both groups in the study (ranged from 0.60 to 0.85 whole sample, from 0.53 to 0.85 in the public sector sample and from 0.55 to 0.85 in the private sector sample). Each of the measurement items also demonstrated significant loading scores on their constructs, showing adequate convergent validity. CR is associated with the more widely acknowledged Cronbach’s α statistic but has the benefit of permitting an extent of heterogeneity among items, with the suggested minimum value of 0.7. Employing the bootstrapping method and the Fisher z transformation, item loadings (as shown in Table 6.3) were not significantly different across both public and private sector groups. For all three models, most individual item reliabilities exceeded the suggested level of 0.70 (see Table 6.3) (Chin 1998b; Hulland 1999) and all were highly significant under the PLS bootstrap results suggesting that both models possess good levels of convergent validity (Fornell & Bookstein 1982; Nunnally 1978). Nevertheless, according to Chin (1998b), loadings of 0.5 or 0.6 are considered adequate when other indicators exist in the block for comparative purposes. Rod and Ashill (2013) on the other hand suggest that cases with loadings between 0.6
and 0.7 can be kept if they are conceptually related to the measurement of their respective construct and do not load highly on any other construct in the measurement model.
Table 6.3 Model Validation Results for Public and Private sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Names &amp; Items</th>
<th>Whole Sample (n=431)</th>
<th>Public (n=296)</th>
<th>Private (n=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item Code</td>
<td>Load ing</td>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization</td>
<td>OS_TR1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR5</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR9</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS_TR17</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>OrgComt1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt4</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt6</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt7</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgComt8</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>TrnOvr1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TrnOvr2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TrnOvr3</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethics</td>
<td>Str_WE2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_WE7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_WE8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>Str_SC3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_SC5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str_SC6</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: IC: Internal consistency; AVE: average variance extracted; α: Cronbach’s alpha
Measuring discriminant validity consists of comparing the loading of each item on its relevant construct to that item’s loading on any other construct in the model. In order to ensure that constructs have acceptable discriminant validity, the square root of the AVE for each of the study’s constructs should be larger than the correlation between the particular construct with another construct in the model (Chin 1998b; Fornell & Larcker 1981). In other words, items have to explain more of the variance of their constructs and ensure that the AVE scores for any two constructs have to be higher than their squared correlation (Ormrod & Henneberg 2009). All of the items in the model loaded higher on their intended constructs than on any other construct in the model, indicating acceptable discriminant validity. For the whole sample model and the two subsamples this was the case, indicating that discriminant validity criteria were met. Tables 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 illustrate that all constructs in the estimated model for the whole sample, public sector and private sector samples satisfied this condition of discriminant validity. The AVE for each specific construct was also larger than any shared variance, thus demonstrating adequate discriminant validity for total sample and the two subsamples.

Table 6.4 Shared Variance and Average Variance Extracted for the whole sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future Prospects</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stereotypes Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understanding</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Square root of average variance extracted (AVE; italics on diagonal) and construct correlations (below diagonal) for the whole sample
Table 6.5 Shared Variance and Average Variance Extracted for Public Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future Prospects</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stereotypes Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understanding</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Square root of average variance extracted (AVE; italics on diagonal) and construct correlations (below diagonal) for public sector

Table 6.6 Shared Variance and Average Variance Extracted for Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future Prospects</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stereotypes Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understanding</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Square root of average variance extracted (AVE; italics on diagonal) and construct correlations (below diagonal) for private sector

**Common Method Bias**

Since all data on the study’s variables were self-reported from a single questionnaire, the probability of common variance exists. Besides, similar sources could present spurious relationships among the study variables. Based on Podsakoff et al.’s (2003) advice, all the procedural steps concerning questionnaire design was followed. The measurement of independent and dependent variables were separated and response anonymity was guaranteed. Every question in the instrument was different and so are the constructs.
In order to ensure that common method bias is not a serious issue in the data, a number of tests were performed. First as Harman's one-factor test is currently the most commonly used method to test detecting common method bias (Pavlou & El Sawy 2006), it was applied to the generated data. In this method factor analysis is used to assess the amount of variance in constructs that could be explained by one factor. In order to reveal that no common factor loading exists on all measures where all measurement items were included in a principal components analysis by entering all the principal constructs into factor analysis (Podsakoff & Organ 1986). Considerable common method bias is signalled by the appearance of either a particular factor or one factor explaining most of the total variance accounted for. This suggests that a monomethod bias is unlikely. Generally the results of Harman’s one-factor test on the dataset have shown several factors with no particular one factor accounting for most of the variance in the data (Podsakoff & Organ 1986) and the variance explained by any single factor is less than 50%. Hence, common method bias was not considered to be an issue that can affect the results and the data can be accepted as valid (Podsakoff & Organ 1986). Details of Harman's one-factor test are shown in Appendix D.

Moreover following Podsakoff and Organ (1986), a partial correlation technique was employed. The highest factor from previous factor analysis was added as a control variable to the PLS model. Podsakoff and Organ (1986, p. 536) suggest that this factor is expected to “contain the best approximation of the common method variance if is a general factor on which all variables load”. Nevertheless, this factor did not yield a major change in variance explained in each one of the dependent variables, again indicating that there was no excessive common method bias.
Analysis of Global Fit Measures

The factor patterns were similar across the groups indicating that the model fits the data adequately for the groups. A Goodness-of-Fit (GoF) measure is suggested for PLS (Tenenhaus et al. 2005). According to Tenenhaus et al. (2005), GoF is defined as the geometric mean of the average communality and average $R^2$. According to them, GoF is based on calculating the square root of the product of the variance extracted with all variables with multiple indicators and the average $R^2$ value of the endogenous variables (Tenenhaus et al. 2005). Wetzels, Schroder and Oppen (2009) suggest that GoF values considered to serve as cut-off values for global validation of PLS models. Based Cohen’s (1988) classifications, GoF measure is calculated between 0 and 1 using a cut-off value of 0.50 (Fornell and Larcker 1981) for communality.

The GoF measures were 0.60 for the whole sample and both public sector and private sector (main effects) model, which exceeds the cut-off value of 0.36 for large effect sizes of $R^2$. Hence, it can be suggested that the research model has superior explaining power compared to the standard values of GoF (small = 0.1, medium = 0.25, large = 0.36). Additionally, the block wise average communalities values greater than 0.6 are considered acceptable (Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011) (in this research the average communalities were 0.68 for the whole sample, 0.67 for the public sector group and 0.65 for the private sector group). The interpretation of these results shows the models are able to account for approximately 68% of the achievable fit for the whole sample, 67% of the achievable fit for public sector and 65% of the achievable fit for private sector. Generally, these results suggest very good fit proposing that the model has good explanatory power in both groups and the measurement model was stable for
all three sample groups as well. According to Wetzels, Schroder and Oppen (2009), this indicates acceptable support to validate the PLS model globally.

The GoF statistic has recently come in for a lot of criticism. Henseler and Sarstedt (2013) have challenged its usefulness both conceptually and empirically. These authors recommend calculating the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) following the recommendations of Hensler, Hubona and Ray (2016). The SRMR is “an absolute measure of fit and is defined as the standardized difference between the observed correlation and the predicted correlation” (Hensler, Hubona & Ray 2016). Since the SRMR is considered as an absolute measure of fit, a perfect fit is indicated by the value of zero. According to Hu and Bentler (1999), a value less than 0.08 is usually perceived as a good fit.

Taking into consideration the limitations of the GoF (Henseler, Ringle & Sinkovics 2009, Tenenhaus et al. 2005), the composite model SRMR analysis (Henseler, Ringle & Sarstedt 2015) shows that the value (0.068) is lower than the most conservative threshold of 0.08 (Hu and Bentler 1999). This offers the exact fit of the composite factor model, hence constituting a confirmatory composite analysis.

6.5 Results

The algebraic sign, magnitude and significance of coefficients, the amount of explained variance of variables ($R^2$), and the Stone-Geisser ($Q^2$) test for predictive relevance permit an assessment of the structural model. Bootstrapping with 5000 resamples was employed to generate standard errors and t-statistics (Hair, Ringle & Sarstedt 2011) and this allowed the assessment of the statistical significance of the path coefficients. According to Henseler, Ringle and Sinkovics (2009, p. 306), “if a confidence interval
for an estimated path coefficient \( w \) does not include zero, the hypothesis that \( w \) equals zero is rejected”. Specifically, a percentile approach, which has the advantage of being completely distribution free (Chin 2010) was applied. Similarly, the results were achieved by employing the percentile bootstrap 95% confidence interval.

The predictive power of the model evaluation was tested by the Stone-Geisser test (Geisser 1975, Stone 1974). Hair et al. (2014) suggest that the \( Q^2 \) statistics measure the accuracy of the model. The \( Q^2 \) statistics must be higher than 0 to suggest that the model has predictive power (Geisser 1975; Stone 1974) and according to Hair et al. (2014, p.184) \( Q^2 \) statistics values of 0.02, 0.15 and 0.35 indicate that an independent variable respectively has a small, medium or large predictive relevance. The \( Q^2 \) statistic tests how adequately the model reproduces the observed values and its parameter estimates. If the \( Q^2 \) value is greater than zero then the model has predictive relevance, while \( Q^2 \) value less than zero indicate that the model lacks predictive relevance. The \( Q^2 \) values of latent constructs suggest that all three models possess adequate predictive relevance. For the whole sample group, \( Q^2 \) was 0.04 for organizational commitment and - 0.02 for turnover intention. In contrast, in the public sector group, \( Q^2 \) was 0.04 for organizational commitment and - 0.02 for turnover intention and in the private sector group, \( Q^2 \) was 0.04 for organizational commitment and - 0.01 for turnover intention. Overall, even though based on Hair et al. (2014) classification of \( Q^2 \) statistics the model has small predictive relevance; the results suggest that the model had an acceptable degree of predictive power for all three samples.
**Descriptive Analysis**

Table 6.7 Descriptive Results for the whole sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker support</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Intention</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stereotypes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethics</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Scale 1-5*

### 6.6 Structural model results

The hypotheses testing were conducted by evaluating the structural model results, which are presented in Figure 6.7 and Table 6.8. The measurement of the structural model involved the estimation and testing of the significance of the path coefficients and the indirect effects of the latent constructs through intervening constructs. The hypotheses were tested by examining the PLS results and the relative amount of explained variance of variables ($R^2$). The explanatory power of the structural model was measured using the $R^2$ value in the ultimate dependent variable in the model (Chin 1998a, Keil, Mann & Rai 2000) which in this case was organizational commitment and turnover intention. In the $R^2$ classification, according to Cohen and Cohen (1983) values of 0.01, 0.09 and 0.25 are considered respectively as small, medium and large and suggest that these figures are generally acceptable for the behavioral sciences. On the other hand, Hair et al. (2014, p.175) propose that $R^2$ values of 0.25 are weak, 0.50 are moderate and 0.75 are substantial evaluation levels. Both the dependent variables had $R^2$ values of 0.68 for the organizational commitment and 0.32 for turnover intention. The value of $R^2$ exceeded
significantly the minimum 10% criterion for any meaningful interpretation of the results (Falk & Miller 1992). This model, hence, has a large $R^2$. “A criterion for evaluating the significance of the individual paths is the product of the path coefficient and the relevant correlation coefficient” (Falk & Miller 1992, p.74). Since SmartPLS does not introduce significance measures for the values of $R^2$, effect sizes (Cohen’s $f^2$) were measured to reveal if the variance explained is negligible, small (< 0.15), medium (< 0.35) or large (> 0.35) (Cohen 1988).

SmartPLS implements a bootstrapping technique for evaluating the significance of the path coefficients and estimating means and standard errors which can then be examined for significance by the t-statistic (Bontis & Serenko 2007). Moreover, MacKinnon, Lockwood & Williams (2004) suggest that bootstrap processes offer stronger protection against type II error since they do not require normal distribution. For the stability and significance of the parameter estimates to be fully established, the t values on the basis of 5000 bootstrapping runs were computed.

More specifically, the model for the whole sample explained the following variances in the variables. The variances explained in training ($f^2 = 0.021$) and co-worker support ($f^2 = 0.065$) were small. Large amounts of variance were explained for turnover intention ($f^2 = 0.46$), organizational commitment ($f^2 = 2.13$) and organizational socialization constructs: understanding ($f^2 = 1.73$) and future prospects ($f^2 = 1.22$). Table 6.8 presents the results of the hypotheses testing, including the path coefficients and the t-values employing the bootstrapping technique in PLS.
Figure 6.2 Structural Model
Table 6.8 PLS Results of the hypotheses testing for the main effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Hypothesis support</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Training</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>2.49**</td>
<td>Yes H8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Understanding</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>+0.53</td>
<td>12.24***</td>
<td>Yes H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker Support</td>
<td>+0.35</td>
<td>6.97***</td>
<td>Yes H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Co-worker Support</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>3.81***</td>
<td>Yes H8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Future Prospects</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>+0.67</td>
<td>21.12***</td>
<td>Yes H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
<td>2.40**</td>
<td>Yes H8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1.28 ns</td>
<td>No H9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>1.14 ns</td>
<td>No H6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>+0.34</td>
<td>6.32***</td>
<td>Yes H6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>1.27 ns</td>
<td>No H6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>+0.47</td>
<td>9.74***</td>
<td>Yes H6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Turnover Intentions</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>0.82 ns</td>
<td>No H7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.14 ns</td>
<td>No H7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
<td>0.79 ns</td>
<td>No H7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>12.14***</td>
<td>Yes H7d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < .050, *** p < .000, ns: not significant

6.6.1 The inter-correlations between organizational socialization constructs

This section will present the inter-correlations between organizational socialization constructs. First, training is positively associated with understanding. The results indicate that the path between training and understanding was statistically significant (p < 0.05) as Table 6.8 illustrates and in the hypothesized direction supporting H1. The results indicated that training has a significant positive influence on understanding (β = 0.53, t = 12.24).

Similarly, co-worker support is positively associated with understanding. The results indicate that the path between co-worker support and understanding was statistically significant (p < 0.05) and in the hypothesized direction, thus supporting H2. The results
indicated that understanding is positively influenced by co-worker support ($\beta = 0.35$, $t = 6.97$).

Results also suggest that understanding is positively associated with future prospects. The results indicate that the path between understanding and future prospects was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) and in the hypothesized direction supporting H3. Specifically, understanding has a significant positive influence on future prospects ($\beta = 0.67$, $t = 21.12$).

Mediation tests were performed by measuring the significance of the indirect paths that emerged from the independent variables to the dependent ones, employing the bootstrapping technique within SmartPLS. In this regard, the analytical technique recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2008) was used to test the mediation hypotheses ($H4$, $H5$ and $H10$). Based on Williams and MacKinnon’s (2008) recommendation, the bootstrapping technique to test the indirect effects was chosen. Preacher and Hayes (2008) suggest that the 95% confidence interval of the indirect effects was acquired with 5000 bootstrap resamples. It is crucial to estimate both the values of the upper and lower limits of the bootstrap confidence interval. If the interval for a mediation hypothesis does not contain zero, this indicates that the indirect effect is significantly different from zero with 95% confidence (Preacher & Hayes 2008).

The significances of the indirect effects was tested both in the presence of the intervening variables and in their absence. In the present analysis total effects (in the presence of the intervening variables) were denoted $c'$ paths and direct effects (in the absence of the intervening variables) were denoted $c$ paths. The effects of independent variables on intervening variables were denoted by $a$-paths and the effects of intervening variables on dependent variables were denoted by $b$-paths.
Moreover, the variance accounted for (VAF) determines the size of the indirect effect with respect to the total effect. Thus, the level to which the variance of the dependent variable is directly explained by the independent variable and to what extent the target variable’s variance is explained by the indirect relationship via the mediating variable is determined (Hair et al. 2014).

According to the research model, H4-H5 represent mediation hypotheses, and suggest that training and co-worker support affect future prospects through the mediating variable understanding.

The mediating role of Local Emiratis Understanding on relationships between Training/Co-worker Support and Future Prospects

Hypothesis H4 proposes that the relationship between training and future prospects is partially mediated by understanding. In this hypothesis, understanding acts as a mediator because it explains why training is related to future prospects. That is, local Emiratis who perceive training offered by their organization as effective are expected to perceive greater understanding of their jobs which in turn results in a higher perception of future prospects. Figure 6.3 describes the total effect of the training on future prospects, c being the path coefficient of training on future prospects.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.3**

Hayes (2009) suggest that this total effect of one variable on another can be calculated using various direct and indirect effects. Specially, the total effect of training on future
prospects can be calculated as the sum of the direct and indirect effects. According to Alwin and Hauser (1975), the indirect effects can be estimated using the product of the path coefficients for each of the paths in the mediational chain.

Hypothesis H5 proposes that the relationship between co-worker support and future prospects is fully mediated by understanding. In this hypothesis, understanding acts as a mediator because it explains why co-worker support is related to future prospects. That is, Emiratis who perceive co-worker support offered by their organization as effective are expected to perceive their understanding of their jobs as effective, which in turn results in higher perception of future prospects. Figure 6.4 describes the total effect of the co-worker support on future prospects, $c$ being the path coefficient of co-worker support on future prospects.

**Figure 6.4**

First, it was found that training was positively associated with future prospects ($\beta = 0.70, p < 0.05$). Training was also found to be positively related to understanding ($\beta = 0.53, p < 0.05$). Lastly, results indicated that the mediator, understanding, was positively associated with future prospects ($\beta = 0.29, p < 0.05$). Because both the a-path and b-path were significant, mediation analyses were tested using the bootstrapping method (MacKinnon, Lockwood & Williams 2004; Preacher & Hayes 2004). Results of the mediation analysis confirmed the mediating role of understanding in the relationship between training and future prospects ($\beta = 0.16, p < 0.05, 95\% \text{ LL} = 0.08, 95\% \text{ UL} = 0.22$). In addition, results indicated that the direct effect of training on future prospects
is still significance but there is a drop in the coefficient ($\beta = 0.54$, $p < 0.05$) when controlling for understanding, thus suggesting partial mediation. Figure 6.5 and table 6.9 display the results.

![Diagram of causal relationships](image)

**Figure 6.5 Indirect effect of Training on Future Prospects through Understanding**

**Table 6.9 Results of the analysis of Understanding mediation for Training influence towards Future Prospects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model without Mediation Variable</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient ($\beta$)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>TR -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model with Mediation Variable</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient ($\beta$)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>TR -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>TR -&gt; UN</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>UN -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR -&gt; UN -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analyses, it shows that future prospects is influenced indirectly by training through understanding ($\beta = 0.416$, $t = 4.747$, $p < 0.05$). As a result, H4 is supported; there exists an indirect effect in the relationship between training and future prospects. The relationship is highly significant below the 0.01 level and $VAF = \text{indirect effect/total effect} = 0.156/0.694 = 0.225$ or 22.5% (partial mediation), which states that
the effect of training is partially mediated by understanding to improve future prospects. The results show that the direct effects of training on future prospects are significant. As expected, the effect of training on future prospects was partially mediated by understanding. Therefore, H4 is supported.

With respect to the mediation role co-worker support, results show that co-worker support was not significantly associated with future prospects. It was also found that co-worker support was positively related to understanding ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.05$). Lastly, results indicated that the mediator, understanding, was positively associated with future prospects ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.05$). Because both the a-path and b-path were significant, mediation analyses were tested using the bootstrapping method. Results of the mediation analysis confirmed the mediating role of understanding in the relationship between co-worker support and future prospects ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.05$, 95% LL= 0.05, 95% UL= 0.16). In addition, results indicated that the direct effect of co-worker support on future prospects is still not significant when controlling for understanding, thus suggesting full mediation. Figure 6.6 and table 6.10 display the results.

![Figure 6.6 Indirect effect of Co-worker Support on Future Prospects through Understanding](image)
Table 6.10 Results of the analysis of Understanding mediation for Co-worker Support influence towards Future Prospects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>CS -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'</td>
<td>CS -&gt; FP</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>CS -&gt; UN</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>UN -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS -&gt; UN -&gt; FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analyses, it is observed that future prospects is influenced indirectly by co-worker support through understanding ($\beta = 0.10$, $t = 3.621$, $p < 0.05$). As a result, H5 is supported; there exists an indirect effect in the relationship between co-worker support and future prospects. The relationship is highly significant ($p < 0.05$) and VAF (Variance Accounted For) = indirect effect/total effect = $0.101/0.149 = 0.678$ or 67.8% (fully mediated), which suggests that the effect of co-worker support is fully mediated by understanding to improve future prospects. The results show that the direct effects of co-worker support on future prospects are insignificant. Hence, in order to influence the future prospects, co-worker support must be strengthened through understanding. As expected, the effect of co-worker support on future prospects was fully mediated by understanding. Therefore, H5 is supported.

### 6.6.2 The Relationship between Organizational Socialization and Organisational Commitment

Results indicate that the path between training and organizational commitment was not statistically significant as well as the path between co-worker support and
organizational commitment. Both training and co-worker support did not have a significant direct effect on organizational commitment, thus rejecting H6a and H6c. The path between understanding and organizational commitment was statistically significant (p < 0.05) and in the hypothesized direction, thus supporting H6b. As anticipated, Understanding has a significant positive influence on organizational commitment (β = 0.34, t = 6.32). As for future prospects, the path between future prospects and organizational commitment was statistically significant (p < 0.05) and in the hypothesized direction, supporting H6d. Organizational commitment was strongly positively influenced by future prospects (β = 0.47, t = 9.74).

Contrary to expectations, two elements of organisational socialization, namely training and co-worker support, did not have a significant influence on organizational commitment. Additionally, future prospects was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment.

### 6.6.3 The Relationship between organizational socialization and Turnover Intention

Results indicate that the paths between training, understanding and co-worker support to turnover intention were all statistically insignificant. Training, understanding and co-worker support did not have a significant direct effect on turnover intention, thus rejecting H7a, H7b and H7c. As for future prospects, the path between future prospects and turnover intention was statistically significant (p < 0.05) and in the hypothesized direction, thus supporting H7d.
Contrary to expectations, training, understanding and co-worker support did not have a significant influence on turnover intention. Similar to organizational commitment, future prospects was the strongest predictor of turnover intention.

6.6.4 The Relationship between Stereotypes and Organizational Socialization

Results indicate that the path between stereotypes about work ethics and training, (Table 6.8), was statistically significant (p < 0.05). The paths between stereotypes about work ethics to co-worker support and future prospects were also statistically significant (p < 0.05). Specifically, local Emiratis perceptions of stereotypes about work ethics were significantly and negatively correlated with training ($\beta = -0.20$, $t = 2.49$), and co-worker support ($\beta = -0.27$, $t = 3.81$), and in the opposite direction for future prospects ($\beta = 0.12$, $t = 2.40$), thus supporting H8a and H8b, but not supporting H8c.

The relationship between stereotypes about skills and competencies and future prospects was not statistically significant, thus H9 was rejected. Local Emiratis perceptions of stereotypes about skills and competencies were not significantly correlated with future prospects.

6.6.5 The Relationship between Stereotypes, Organizational Socialization, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

Hypothesis H10 proposes that stereotypes affect organizational commitment and turnover intention through the mediating variable future prospects.
Hypothesis H10a proposes that the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and both organizational commitment and turnover intention is partially mediated by future prospects. Emiratis who are stereotyped as lacking work ethics are expected to perceive lower future prospects offered by their organization which in turn results in lower organizational commitment and high turnover intention. Figure 6.7 describes the total effect of the stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment and turnover intention, c being the path coefficient of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment and stereotypes about work ethics on turnover intention.

Figure 6.7

First, it was found that stereotypes about work ethics was not significantly associated with organizational commitment. It was also found that stereotypes about work ethics was positively related to future prospects (β = 0.10, p < 0.05). Second, results indicated that the mediator, future prospects, was positively associated with organizational commitment (β = 0.47, p < 0.05). Because both the a-path and b-path were significant, mediation analyses were tested using the bootstrapping method. Results of the mediation analysis confirmed the mediating role of future prospects in the relationship
between stereotypes about work ethics and organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.05$, $p < 0.05$, 95% LL= 0.01, 95% UL= 0.09). In addition, the results indicated that the direct effect of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment is not significance when controlling for future prospects, thus suggesting full mediation. Figure 6.8 and table 6.11 display the results.

Figure 6.8 Indirect effect of Stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment through Understanding Future Prospects

Table 6.11 Results of the analysis of Future Prospects mediation for Stereotypes about Work Ethics influence towards Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model without Mediation Variable</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient ((\beta))</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path c</td>
<td>SWE -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model with Mediation Variable</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient ((\beta))</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path c’</td>
<td>SWE -&gt; OC</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path a</td>
<td>SWE -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path b</td>
<td>FP -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path SWE -&gt; FP -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analyses, it is observed that organizational commitment is influenced indirectly by stereotypes about work ethics through future prospects ($\beta = 0.05$, $t = 2.241$, $p < 0.05$). As a result, H10a is supported for organizational commitment; there exists an indirect effect in the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and
organizational commitment. The relationship is highly significant \((p < 0.05)\) and \(\text{VAF} = \frac{\text{indirect effect}}{\text{total effect}} = \frac{0.05}{0.086} = 0.581\) or 58.1\% (fully mediated), which states that the effect of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment is fully mediated by future prospects. The results show that the direct effects of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment are non-significant. Hence, in order to influence the organizational commitment, the stereotypes about work ethics must be weakened through future prospects.

On the other hand, it was found that stereotypes about work ethics was not significantly associated with turnover intention. It was also found that stereotypes about work ethics was positively related to future prospects \((\beta = 0.10, p < 0.05)\). In addition, results indicated that the mediator, future prospects, was negatively associated with turnover intention \((\beta = -0.64, p < 0.05)\). Because both the a-path and b-path were significant, mediation analyses were tested using the bootstrapping method. Results of the mediation analysis confirmed the mediating role of future prospects in the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and turnover intention \((\beta = -0.06, p < 0.05, 95\% \text{ LL} = -0.12, 95\% \text{ UL} = -0.01)\). In addition, the results indicated that the direct effect of stereotypes about work ethics on turnover intention is still not significant when controlling for future prospects, thus suggesting full mediation. Figure 6.9 and table 6.12 display the results.
Figure 6.9 Indirect effect of Stereotypes about work ethics on Turnover Intention through Understanding Future Prospects

Table 6.12 Results of the analysis of Future Prospects mediation for Stereotypes about Work Ethics influence towards Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model without Mediation Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>SWE -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Model with Mediation Variable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c’</td>
<td>SWE -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>SWE -&gt; FP</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>FP -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.640</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWE -&gt; FP -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnover intention was influenced indirectly by stereotypes about work ethics through future prospects ($β = -0.06$, $t = 2.06$, $p < 0.05$). As a result, H10a was supported for turnover intention; there is an indirect effect in the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and turnover intention. The relationship is highly significant ($p < 0.05$) and VAF = indirect effect/total effect = -0.06/0.106 = 0.566 or 56.6% (fully mediated), which suggest that the effect of stereotypes about work ethics on turnover intention is fully mediated by future prospects. The results show that the direct effect of stereotypes about work ethics on turnover intention are non-significant. Hence, in order
to influence the turnover intention, the stereotypes about work ethics must be weakened through future prospects.

In summary, as expected the effect of stereotypes about work ethics at work on organizational commitment and turnover intention are partially mediated by future prospects. Therefore H10a is supported.

*The mediating role of Local Emirati Future Prospects on relationships between Skills and Competencies Stereotypes and Organizational Commitment/Turnover Intentions*

Hypothesis $H10.b$ proposed that the relationship between stereotypes about skills and competencies and both organizational commitment and turnover intention is partially mediated by future prospects. Emiratis who are stereotyped as lacking skills and competencies are expected to perceive lower future prospects offered by their organization which in turn, results in lower organizational commitment and higher turnover intention. Figure 6.10 describes the total effect of the stereotypes about skills and competencies on organizational commitment and turnover intention, $c$ being the path coefficient of stereotypes about skills and competencies on organizational commitment and stereotypes about skills and competencies on turnover intention.
First, it was found that stereotypes about skills and competencies were not significantly associated with organizational commitment. It was also found that stereotypes about work ethics was not significantly related to future prospects and because a-path is not significant, mediation analyses were not carried out. Figure 6.11 and table 6.12 display the results.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.11 Indirect effect of Stereotypes about skills and competencies on organizational commitment through Understanding Future Prospects**

**Table 6.13 Results of the analysis of Future Prospects mediation for Stereotypes about skills and competencies influence towards Organizational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c’</td>
<td>SSC -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>SSC -&gt; FP</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>FP -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSC -&gt; FP -&gt; OC</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analyses, it is observed that organizational commitment is not influenced indirectly by stereotypes about skills and competencies through future prospects. As a result, hypothesis \( H10b \) is not supported.
With respect to the indirect effect of stereotypes about skills and competencies on turnover intention, it was found that stereotypes about skills and competencies were not significantly associated with turnover intention. Similarly stereotypes about skills and competencies was not significantly related to future prospects and because a-path is not significant, mediation analyses was not carried on. Figure 6.12 displays the results.

Figure 6.12 Indirect effect of Stereotypes about work ethics on Turnover Intention through Understanding Future Prospects

Table 6.14 Results of the analysis of Future Prospects mediation for Stereotypes about skills and competencies influence towards Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient ($\beta$)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model without Mediation Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>SSC -&gt; TI</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model with Mediation Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c'$</td>
<td>SSC -&gt; TI</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>SSC -&gt; FP</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>FP -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.640</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SSC$ -&gt; $FP$ -&gt; $TI$</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the effect of stereotypes about skills and competencies at work on organizational commitment and turnover intention are not mediated by future prospects. Therefore H10b is not supported.
### 6.7 Comparison between public and private sectors

The test of structural means was conducted in order to identify possible differences between the latent variables levels across the two sectors. Accordingly some statistically significant differences were found (Table 6.15). Significant differences were found in the mean scores for all four constructs of organizational socialization. In relation to training, significant differences were found in the mean scores between public versus private (t = -3.928, p < 0.05) with local Emiratis working in the public sector perceiving higher levels of training (M = 3.57; SD = 0.83) when compared to local Emiratis working in the private sector (M = 3.91; SD = 0.83). Furthermore, there was a significant difference in mean scores for understanding (t = -3.675, p < 0.05) with local Emiratis working in the public sector perceiving higher levels of understanding (M = 3.82; SD = 0.74) when compared to local Emiratis working in the private sector (M = 4.06; SD = 0.57). With respect to co-worker support, significant differences were found (t = -2.110, p < 0.05) with local Emiratis working in the public sector perceiving higher levels of co-worker support (M = 3.96; SD = 0.73) when compared to local Emiratis working in the private sector (M = 4.10; SD = 0.58). There was also a significant difference in mean scores for future prospects (t= - 6.413, p < 0.05) with local Emiratis working in the public sector perceiving higher levels of future prospects (M = 3.04; SD = 1.03) when compared to local Emiratis working in the private sector (M = 3.65; SD = 0.84).
Table 6.15 Descriptive Results: Mean Scores of Construct Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Socialization</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Public (n=296) Mean</th>
<th>Public (n=296) SD</th>
<th>Private (n=135) Mean</th>
<th>Private (n=135) SD</th>
<th>T test significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Co-worker support</strong></td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Future Prospects</strong></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Turnover Intention</strong></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Yes (p&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work Ethics</strong></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Skills &amp; Competencies</strong></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale 1-5

Similar tests were conducted with respect to organizational commitment and turnover intention. First in terms of organizational commitment, significant differences were found in the mean scores between public versus private (t = -3.545, p < 0.05). Public sector respondents reported higher levels of organizational commitment (M = 3.67; SD = 0.91) when compared to private sector respondents (M = 3.96; SD = 0.73). Similarly, there was a significant difference in the mean score for turnover intention (t= 3.468, p < 0.05) with local Emiratis working in the public sector perceiving higher levels of turnover intention (M = 3.38; SD = 1.34) when compared to local Emiratis working in the private sector (M = 2.92; SD = 1.25).

Further t-tests were conducted to test for differences in two types of stereotypes. No significant differences were found between the public sector and the private sector local Emiratis in the mean scores for both types of stereotypes.
Furthermore, both the dependent variables had $R^2$ values of 0.68 for organizational commitment and 0.36 for turnover intention in the public sector sample and 0.71 for the organizational commitment and 0.34 for turnover intention in the private sector sample, indicating significant predictiveness of the model.

More specifically, for the public sector, the model explained the following variances in the variables. The variances explained in training ($f^2 = 0.043$) and co-worker support ($f^2 = 0.078$) were small. Large amounts of variance were explained for turnover intention ($f^2 = 0.42$), organizational commitment ($f^2 = 2.1$) and organizational socialization constructs: understanding ($f^2 = 1.65$) and future prospects ($f^2 = 1.2$). In contrast, for the private sector, the model explained the following variances in the variables. The variances explained in training ($f^2 = 0.01$) and co-worker support ($f^2 = .05$) were small. Large amounts of variance were explained for turnover intention ($f^2 = .51$), organizational commitment ($f^2 = 2.44$) and organizational socialization constructs: understanding ($f^2 = 1.95$) and future prospects ($f^2 = 1.15$).

Table 6.16 shows the results of the hypotheses testing, including the path coefficients as well as the t values for the public sector and private sector groups employing the bootstrapping technique in PLS. The variances explained and the t values for the differences between the public sector and the private sector employing Chin’s (2009) procedure are also provided.
### Table 6.16 PLS Results of the hypotheses testing comparing public and private sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Public (n=296)</th>
<th>Private (n=135)</th>
<th>Hypothesis Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>2.73***</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Co-worker Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>3.27***</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Future Prospects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>1.77 ns</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Skills and Competencies</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.09 ns</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.68</td>
<td>R² = 0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>+0.002</td>
<td>0.03 ns</td>
<td>+0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
<td>6.59***</td>
<td>+0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
<td>0.91 ns</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>+0.47</td>
<td>8.17***</td>
<td>+0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.43 ns</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ns</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on Turnover Intentions</strong></td>
<td>R² = 0.36</td>
<td>R² = 0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>+0.14</td>
<td>1.71 ns</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.39 ns</td>
<td>+0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>1.01 ns</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Prospects</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>10.29***</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Work Ethics</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.43 ns</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes Skills &amp; Competencies</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>4.46***</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < .050, *** p < .000, ns: not significant

### 6.7.1 The Relationship between organizational socialization and Organisational Commitment

In terms of organizational socialization constructs and their relationships with organizational commitment, the path between training and organizational commitment was statistically significant (p < 0.05) and in the hypothesized direction for private sector local Emiratis only. Organizational commitment was positively influenced by training for private sector local Emiratis (β = 0.20, t = 2.49) only. The path between
understanding and organizational commitment was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for public sector local Emiratis. Understanding had a significant positive influence on organizational commitment for the public sector ($\beta = 0.39, t = 6.59$) but was not significant for the private sector. Additionally, the path between co-worker support and organizational commitment was not statistically significant for both the public sector and private sector samples, rejecting H11c. As for future prospects, the path between future prospects and organizational commitment was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for both sub-samples, supporting H1d. Organizational commitment is strongly influenced by future prospects for both the public ($\beta = 0.47, t = 8.17$) and the private ($\beta = 0.52, t = 7.92$) sectors.

Interestingly, the influence of training on organizational commitment is statistically significant for public sector sample the influence of understanding on organizational commitment is significantly significant for the private sector sample. Additionally, future prospects was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment for both the public and private sectors.

6.7.2 The Relationship between Organizational Socialization and Turnover Intention

Additionally with respect to organizational socialization constructs and their relationships with turnover intention, the path between training and turnover intention was not statistically significant. Results are similar for the path between co-worker support and turnover intention, thus H12a and H12c are rejected. However, the path between understanding and turnover intention was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) and in the opposite direction for the private sector sample and not significant for the public sector, thus supporting H12b. As for future prospects, the path between future prospects
and turnover intention was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for both public and private sector respondents. Turnover intention was strongly influenced by future prospects for both public ($\beta = -0.63$, $t = 10.29$) and private ($\beta = -0.62$, $t = 5.74$) sector respondents.

Contrary to expectations, one construct of organizational socialization, namely understanding had a positive influence on turnover intention for private sector respondents. Additionally, similar to organizational commitment, future prospects was the strongest predictor of turnover intention for both public and private sectors respondents.

6.7.3 The Relationship between Stereotypes and Organisational Commitment

The path between stereotypes about Emiratis work ethics and organizational commitment was not statistically significant for both the public and private sector samples, thus rejecting H13a. Similarly, the path between stereotypes about Emiratis skills and competencies and organizational commitment was also statistically non-significant, thus H13b was rejected.

6.7.4 The Relationship between Stereotypes and Turnover Intention

The path between stereotypes about Emiratis work ethics and turnover intention was not statistically significant, thus rejecting H14a for both public and private sector samples. However, the path between stereotypes about Emiratis skills and competencies and turnover intention was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) and in the hypothesized direction, thus supporting H14b for the public sector sample only whereas it was not significant for the private sector respondents. Turnover intention was negatively
influenced by stereotypes about skills and competencies for public sector respondents ($\beta = 0.26, t = 4.46$) but had no significant direct effect for the private sector respondents, thus supporting H14b.

### 6.7.5 The Relationship between Stereotypes and Organizational Socialization

The path between stereotypes about work ethics and training, as Table 6.16 illustrates, was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for the public sector sample only. The results indicated that Emiratis' perceptions of stereotypes about work ethics were significantly and negatively correlated with training in the public sector ($\beta = -0.21, t = 2.73$) but non-significant for the private sector respondents. The result is consistent with hypothesis H15a.

The path between stereotypes about work ethics and co-worker support was statistically significant ($p < 0.01$ for public and $p < 0.05$ for private). The results indicated that Emiratis' perceptions of stereotypes about work ethics were significantly and negatively correlated with co-worker support in both public ($\beta = -0.27, t = 3.72$) and private ($\beta = -0.22, t = 2.14$) sectors. H15b is therefore supported.

As for future prospects, the path between stereotypes about work ethics and future prospects was not statistically significant for both public and private sectors, thus rejecting H15c. On the other hand, with respects to the path between stereotypes about skills and competencies and future prospects was statistically significant ($p, 0.05$) for the private sector sample only. The results indicated that Emiratis' perceptions of stereotypes about skills and competencies were significantly and negatively correlated with training in future prospects sector ($\beta = -0.13, t = 2.03$) and not significant for the
public sector. The result is consistent with hypothesis H16 that the negative effect of stereotypes about skills and competencies on future prospects will be different for both sectors. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported.

6.8 Chapter Summary

The key findings of this research are consistent with and without the control variables in the model for the whole sample and both subsamples. However, job classification, salary and age had a statistically significant effect on organizational commitment and turnover intention in the model (p < 0.05). Specifically, younger respondents reported higher levels of organizational commitment and turnover intention in the private sector. Respondents earning higher salaries in the private sector also reported lower levels of turnover intention. In the public sector, respondents with higher job levels had higher organizational commitment.

Even though PLS estimation doesn’t use formal guides to evaluate overall GoF such as CFI, RMSEA and chi-square values, it could be established by strong factor loading scores, high values of $R^2$ joined with the statistically significant and considerable structural paths (Chin 1998a). According to Chin (1998b), standardized paths shouldn’t be less than 0.20 to be considered meaningful. Moreover based on Cohen (1988) categorization of effect sizes, all of these effect sizes appear to be large, with $R^2$ values of 0.68 and 0.39 in the public sector group and 0.71 and 0.38 in the private sector group.

The results can be summarised as follows:

- All of the variable measures had adequate psychometric properties.
- Organizational socialization constructs (training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects) had different effects on organizational commitment or turnover intention in the public and private sectors.
- Future prospects was the strongest predictor of organizational commitment and turnover intention in both sectors.
- Both types of stereotypes were not significantly related to organizational commitment in both the public and private sectors; however, stereotypes about skills and competencies was positively related to turnover intention in the public sector.

The results for research hypotheses are summarized in Table 6.17.

Table 6.17 Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1:</strong> There will be a direct positive relationship between training and understanding.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2:</strong> There will be a direct positive relationship between co-worker support and understanding.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3:</strong> There will be a direct positive relationship between understanding and future prospects.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4:</strong> The effect of training on future prospects will be partially mediated by understanding.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5:</strong> The effect of co-worker support on future prospects will be fully mediated by understanding.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6.</strong> The more favorably employees perceive (a) training, (b) understanding, (c) co-worker support and (d) future prospects in their organizations, the more they will be committed to their organizations.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7.</strong> The more favorably employees perceive (a) training, (b) understanding, (c) co-worker support and (d) future prospects in their organizations, the lower their turnover intention will be.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8.</strong> The higher the extent to which employees experience to be negatively stereotyped about their work ethics at work, the lower their degree of ((a) training, (b) co-worker support and (c) future prospects).</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H9.</strong> The higher the extent to which employees experience to be negatively stereotyped about their skills and competencies at work, the lower their degree of Future Prospects.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H10.</strong> The effect of stereotypes about (a) work ethics and (b) skills and competencies at work on 1) organizational commitment and 2) turnover intention will be partially mediated by future prospects.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H11.</strong> The positive effect of (a) training, (b) understanding, (c) co-worker support and (d) future prospects on organizational commitment will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H12.</strong> The negative effect of (a) training, (b) understanding, (c) co-worker support and (d) future prospects on turnover intention will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H13.</strong> The negative effect of stereotypes about (a) work ethics and (b) skills and competencies on organizational commitment will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H14.</strong> The positive effect of stereotypes about (a) work ethics and (b) skills and competencies on turnover intention will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H15.</strong> The negative effect of stereotypes about work ethics on (a) training, (b) co-worker support and (c) future prospects will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H16.</strong> The negative effect of stereotypes about skills and competencies on future prospects will be different for private sector employees compared to public sector employees.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter offers support from analysis of data collected, outlining the findings concerning the relationships between study variables. The rest of the study is therefore dedicated to discuss this evidence to offer conclusions and recommendations.
Chapter 7 : DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

7.1 Focus

This study investigated the following research questions: (1) What is the influence of stereotypes about Emiratis on organizational commitment and turnover intention? (2) What is the influence of organizational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intention? and (3) Does the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes differ for public or private sectors organizations? In chapter 6, the analysis and results derived from both public and private sector samples were reported. A key objective of this chapter is to present the major findings from the data analysis chapter and offer a detailed interpretation and discussion of the results. This will offer insights into the relationships between organisational socialization, stereotypes, organisational commitment and turnover intention of local Emiratis working in the UAE labor market. A summary of the results with a general discussion of key findings is also presented in this chapter.

7.2 Overview

Attracting and retaining highly qualified and effective individuals is critical to organizational success. It is argued that employee retention is one of the most important subjects in the human resources literature (Gao 2011). Besides, as discussed earlier, retention is a key element in the localization process. However, further empirical investigation is needed to find efficient human resources practices to retain highly qualified employees. Holtom et al. (2008) suggest that researchers have attempted to resolve retention issues by investigating various factors relating to employees’ turnover intention as well as their commitment.
The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention of Emiratis working in the public and private sector within the UAE. The results provide evidence of the significant influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention, which have been examined within this study as indicators of retention.

Furthermore, the study investigates the important area of localization that is much under researched. The UAE has been utilized as a context to study localization with the results providing insights for the localization literature both regionally and internationally. Localization in the UAE is a national dilemma and an issue that is rarely considered in international academic circles. This may be a result of the low percentage of Emiratis in the UAE population, and their high levels of unemployment with more than 5 million expatriates being employed in the UAE labor market. There are only 27 percent Emiratis working in the public sector and about 1.3 percent in the private sector; however, they have a comparatively high unemployment rate (Al-Ali 2008a). Research is now starting to emerge in the UAE and other GCC countries as they deal with similar employment and labor dilemmas (al-Suwaidi 2011, Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010, Godwin 2006, Mellahi 2007b). The findings of this study make an initial contribution to the question concerning the factors that have to be taken into consideration when implementing localization programs, specifically Emiratization programs, particularly with regard to the issue of retention. The potential contribution of this research goes beyond the UAE, as other GCC countries face comparable issues within an arguably similar context in terms of culture, demographic and economy. Theoretical contributions to the localization literature are discussed later in this chapter. Furthermore, the framework proposed in this research makes a scholarly contribution by
examining localization through the combined lens of organizational socialization and stereotypes and how they impact organizational commitment and turnover intention.

7.3 Discussion of the Research Findings

This research investigated localization with a specific emphasis on retention of local employees, which has to date received little attention in the literature. The UAE labor market has been used as a context to study the impact of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention of local Emiratis. A research model was developed and tested using the results from the study. This research has embraced a quantitative method employing a survey questionnaire adopted from the existing literature to collect data from public and private sector organizations in the UAE.

The research question concerned potential relationships between the following variables: organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. As a result, a review of literature in the areas of localization, organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention was conducted. Grounded in this literature, the research model was constructed to consolidate and structure the relationships between the variables in the model. In this research model, organizational socialization and stereotypes are believed to play an important role in affecting organizational commitment and turnover intention. This research studied locals’ job retention, taking into consideration organisational commitment and turnover intention as indicators of retention. Direct and indirect relationships between organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention were ascertained through testing of the proposed model.
The results provide key findings associated with retention issues of the Emiratis in the labor market. Findings of this study suggest that two issues play critical roles in the retention aspect of the localization process: organisational socialization and stereotypes. The proposed model was subjected to empirical testing to verify if the hypothesized relationships hold true. For this purpose, the PLS analysis method was used. The relationships between all the constructs in the model were tested to identify the significant paths that emerged. First, the inter-correlations between organizational socialization constructs were found to be supported as proposed in the hypotheses. Second, the widely accepted idea that there is a relationship between organizational socialization and organizational commitment was supported for some organizational socialization constructs. Third, empirical support for the relationship between some of the organizational socialization constructs and turnover intention were found. Fourth, the relationships between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention were found to be significant for some of the organizational socialization constructs. The details of these findings will be discussed in detail in the next sections.

7.3.1 The inter-correlations between organizational socialization constructs

The organizational socialization model consists of four constructs which basically are the perceptions of individuals about training (by which a person attains relevant job skills), understanding (which helps employees possess a functional level of organizational understanding), co-worker support (by which employees attain supportive social interactions with fellow co-workers) and future prospects (which are the perceptions about employees prospects for a rewarding career in their organization) (Taormina 1997, 2004).
Training and co-worker support were found to have a significant and strong positive influence on understanding. Understanding was also found to have a significant positive influence on future prospects. This indicates that both training and co-worker support contributes to employees understanding. In other words, getting beneficial training (that helps employees to do their jobs well) from the organization and getting support and assistance from fellow co-workers helps employees to gain a better understanding of how to perform their jobs. Moreover, understanding contributes to employees perceptions that they have good future prospects.

In general, findings show that understanding has a mediating role in the relationship of both training and co-worker support with future prospects. It is clear that understanding partially mediates the relationships between training that the local Emiratis receive and their perception of future prospects. Furthermore, understanding fully mediates the relationship between co-worker support that employees receive from their fellow workers and future prospects. The findings suggest that co-worker support does not directly impact future prospects. Individuals have to be socialized through understanding their jobs and organization well before getting the opportunities for future prospects. To be more specific, the higher the employees perceive their understanding of their jobs and organization, the higher their perceived future prospects in terms of employees’ anticipations about continued employment, future assignments and potential rewards attained (Fisher 1986) including recognition, opportunities for promotion and career progression (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). In other words, by developing themselves through training and getting support from fellow co-workers, employees increase their understanding of how to perform their jobs better thus, increasing their chances of getting future development opportunities and career advancement. Training can also give employees a possibility to progress as it can reveal
employees' abilities and open doors to career advancement for promotion and better pay (Miller, Porter & Drummod 1992).

These findings (the intercorrelation between organizational socialization constructs) provide an important contribution to the literature. They not only fill a gap in the literature but also extend the literature of organizational socialization by clearly highlighting the important role understanding plays in the organizational socialization model and identifying the potential indirect effects of training and co-worker support on future prospects through understanding. It seems that understanding is the center point of the model where it links the other socialization constructs together. The effect of both training and co-worker support on future prospects has to come through understanding. Moreover, the results suggest that organizational socialization constructs may follow a particular sequence, with both training and co-worker support increasing understanding and finally future prospects. In other words, employees in an organization first receive training and interact with fellow co-workers which helps them gain a better understanding of their jobs and organization, which in turn increases their chances for career progress within their organization. It is argued that the training and development opportunities offered by the organization improve employees knowledge and capabilities (Harel & Tzafrir 1999, McEvoy 1997) and help them acquire the skills and abilities required to perform their jobs (Storey & Sisson 1993), hence they get a better understanding of their jobs and organization. Samuel and Chipunza (2008) further argue employees perceive training and development as essential to their general career development and Tharenou (1997) suggest that the availability of training and support from organizations for that training help employees in career advancement within their organization.
Furthermore, employees support their fellow co-workers by sharing knowledge and expertise (Zhou & George 2001) to perform their duties and work effectively (Arora 2013, Katz 1988). Chiaburu and Harrison (2008) suggest that co-workers provide task-related and information support which can increase employee’s understanding of their jobs. They further argue that the support employees get from their fellow co-workers can increase their performance by offering critical information related to the firm and job process. They also suggest that co-workers are a significant source of information for individuals looking for advice, instruction or support. The support that employees get from their fellow co-workers helps them to gain a better understanding of how things work in their organization and hence increase opportunities for career growth.

7.3.2 Relationships between Organizational Socialization, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions

Prior research has presented that organisational socialization has an influence on organizational commitment and turnover intention (Cohen 2003, Bauer & Green 1998, Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller 2000). For example, Manzoor and Naeem (2011) suggest that organisational socialization has a strong impact on organizational commitment and turnover intention. The results show a positive relationship between organizational socialization and organizational commitment. Nevertheless, organizational socialization had a negative relationship with turnover intention, in keeping with other research.

Organizational socialization and organizational commitment

The literature shows strong support for a positive relationship between organizational socialization and organisational commitment (Chao et al. 1994, Taormina 1997,
Organizational socialization has been linked to increased organisational commitment (Chao et al. 1994, Taormina 1997). Thus, this study proposed that all four constructs of organizational socialization would be positively related to organisational commitment by Emiratis. The findings of this study were somewhat consistent with the findings in the literature, confirming the established relationships between two organizational socialization constructs and organisational commitment. Understanding and future prospects were positively related to organisational commitment. The paths between both understanding and future prospects, and organizational commitment were significantly positive - that is the greater the opportunities for learning more about the job and organization, and the greater the opportunities for a rewarding career in the organization, the higher the organizational commitment.

Cohen (2003) further suggests that different socialization constructs have variable effects on commitment. As predicted, organizational commitment is positively influenced by understanding. Organizational commitment is strongly influenced by future prospects as well. The effect of understanding on organizational commitment is large ($\beta = 0.34$), confirming that employees with a better understanding of their jobs and organization have higher commitment levels. The effect of perceptions of future prospects on organizational commitment was ($\beta = 0.47$). This is consistent with the findings that employees who are satisfied with the potential opportunities for future prospects are more committed to their organizations (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). Besides, the effect of future prospects on organizational commitment is stronger ($\beta = 0.47$) than the effect of understanding ($\beta = 0.34$). Organizational commitment has been shown to be reduced if there is a perception of unfair approaches in promotion and a lack of career growth opportunities (Mosadeghrad, Ferlie & Rosenberg, 2008b; Al-
Ahmadi 2002). Besides, Hassan et al. (2013) suggest that to improve employee commitment and make them feel that they are important; organizations need to develop career development strategies. This might explain the stronger effect of future prospects on organizational commitment. This also suggests that future prospects is the key organizational socialization construct that affects organizational commitment.

However, training and co-worker support were not significantly related to organizational commitment. The results suggested that there were no significant relationships between training and co-worker support and organizational commitment. These results are surprising because organizational socialization constructs, such as training and co-worker support, are regarded as useful for delivering the message that the firm cares about their employees’ development (Cable & Parsons 2001). This might be because the training programs in the UAE labor market are relatively explicit and fixed, and the support the employees get from their fellow co-workers is not apparent or valuable, and thus the impacts of the training and co-worker support on organizational commitment are not apparent. Limpanitgul, Boonchoo and Photiyarach (2014) in their study comparing Thai employees working in Thai airlines and American airlines to test the effect of co-worker support on organizational commitment. They found that co-worker support was not significantly related to organizational commitment for the American airlines. They argue that this could be due to organizational culture being influenced by the dominant national culture. Moreover, in their research conducted in China, Ashar et al. (2013) justified the unsupported hypothesized relationship between perceived supervisor support and commitment by the difference in culture. They suggest that the Chinese culture is very different. Similarly the UAE culture is different than western culture so this can potentially explain the unsupported hypothesized relationship between co-worker support and organizational commitment.
Organizational socialization is the means of increasing person-job and person-organization fit, thus considerably affecting their commitment levels (Chao et al. 1994, Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982). Other studies found that organizational commitment is related to different constructs of organizational socialization and all four organizational socialization constructs are positively affecting organizational commitment (e.g. Fisher 1986, Bauer & Green 1998, Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller 2000). However in this study the positive relationship was only found between two constructs of organizational socialization (understanding and future prospects) and organizational commitment. The findings of this study provide a more fine-grained understanding of the positive impact of organizational socialization found in other studies, by finding that only two organizational socialization constructs positively influenced organizational commitment. Overall, the results support the role of organizational socialization constructs in organizational commitment. This implies that better understanding and future prospects can help increase organizational commitment, thus increasing Emirati employee’s retention, and as a result increasing the chances that the localization initiative will achieve its goals. Additional evidence comes from Suliman and Al Kathairi (2012) who provide evidence related to the significance of procedural justice and relational justice within organizations to organizational commitment.

Organizational socialization and turnover intention

The literature shows evidence of a negative relationship between organizational socialization and turnover intention (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). Thus, this study proposed that all four constructs of organizational socialization and turnover intention by Emiratis would be negatively related. The findings of this study were not completely consistent with this hypothesis. For instance, in organizational commitment, not all four
constructs of organizational socialization were found to be significant. For turnover intention, it was, in fact only one construct of organizational socialization that had a direct negative influence on turnover intention, as hypothesized. Turnover intention was negatively influenced by future prospects only suggesting that the more employees perceive their future prospects to be beneficial, the less likely they are to leave their organization. Chen (2014) suggests that employees seek career growth and it is a key motivator to continue in their organization.

Contrary to expectations, the other three constructs of organizational socialization, namely training, understanding and co-worker support did not have a significant influence on turnover intention. Fisher (1986) argues that one of the main causes of turnover intention is poor socialization. In the present study, training, understanding and co-worker support among locals did not have a significant negative relationship with turnover intention, as hypothesized; in fact, the results were not significant. This was unexpected, and is contrary to existing literature (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). These results are surprising because as discussed earlier, according to Cable & Parsons (2001) organizational socialization constructs, such as training and understanding are regarded as useful for delivering the message that the firm cares about their employees’ development. Levine (1993) found in his study that there is no negative significant relationship between training and turnover intention. Again as suggested earlier, this could be explained by the possibility that training programs in the UAE labor market is relatively explicit and fixed, and the support the employees get from their fellow co-workers is not apparent or valuable, and thus the impacts of the training, understanding and co-worker support on turnover intention are not apparent.
These results also conflict with much of the research that suggests that higher levels of co-worker support are linked with a tendency to stay in a job (Randall et al. 1999). Further, poor relationships with co-workers are generally perceived to weaken job satisfaction and increase turnover intention (Gunter & Furnham 1996, Ritter & Anker 2002). The literature suggests that employees are more likely to stay in their organizations where they have developed a strong team relationship at the place of work (Clarke 2001, Marchington 2000). However, a growing body of literature suggests that support can influence turnover negatively (e.g. Becker 1992, Maertz et al. 2007). This could be explained by the relevance of co-worker support to an employee’s decision to leave the organization in the UAE labor market context; in this environment, if an employee does not get help from fellow co-workers, they are still likely to stay in their jobs. It seems that employees might give little attention to whether they get help from others or not to perform their jobs and depend on other sources to gain job related information such as training and, therefore, their commitment is not affected. Limpanitgul, Boonchoo and Photiyarach (2014) found that the effect of co-worker support on commitment was not positive and they argue that this shows that getting support from fellow co-workers might not translate into a higher level of commitment, thus decreasing turnover.

Future prospects was the only organizational socialization construct that had a significant effect on turnover intention, as hypothesized. This is consistent with the findings of Gao (2011) who found that employees who are satisfied with their future prospects and perceive that they will have a rewarding future will be less likely to leave their organization (Gao 2011). Urichuk (1999) adds that employee turnover can be due to a lack of reward in the organization. However, one of the most important reasons for employee intention to leave is lack of professional and personal advancement (McCabe
et al. 2008). Overall, the results provide support for the role of future prospects (organizational socialization) in turnover intention. This implies that better future prospects can help reduce turnover intention, which increases local employee retention and as a result improves the likelihood that localization will achieve its goals.

Taken together, the overall results of this study reveal that organizational socialization constructs have some impacts on both organizational commitment and turnover intention, particularly the future prospects construct of organizational socialization. Moreover, the discussion above in general leads to two conclusions. First, Emirati employee’s perceptions of their understanding of their job and organization and their perceptions of future prospects in their organization were positively related to organizational commitment while only Emirati employee’s perceptions of future prospects in their organization was negatively related to turnover intention. To be more explicit, higher levels of organizational socialization in terms of understanding and future prospects are associated with higher levels of organizational commitment, and higher levels of organizational socialization in terms of future prospects are associated with lower levels of turnover intention.

Second, future prospects is the strongest construct affecting both organizational commitment and turnover intention. This indicates that under the availability of adequate career opportunities, employees are in general more likely to feel committed and less likely to leave. These findings are novel and different from findings in the Western context, where all four organizational socialization constructs were found to be positively related to organizational commitment and negatively to turnover intention (Cohen 2003, Bauer & Green 1998, Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller 2000, Manzoor & Naeem 2011).
7.3.3 The Relationship between Stereotypes and Organizational Socialization

Previous research has shown that stereotypes can influence different constructs of organizational socialization (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010; Kary & Shirako 2009). The literature suggests a negative relationship between stereotypes and organizational socialization.

The hypothesized negative effect of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational socialization constructs was only supported for training and co-worker support. The results indicated that local Emiratis’ perceptions of stereotypes about work ethics had a negative effect on training ($\beta = -0.20$) and co-worker support ($\beta = -0.27$). These findings are consistent with those of Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) and Kary and Shirako (2009) who found that stereotypes in the labor market prevent employees’ ability to think of others objectively as co-workers; they might not be offered training and development opportunities and this is especially true in the case of stereotypes about work ethics.

As for perceived future prospects, the hypothesized negative effect of stereotypes about work ethics and skills and competencies on future prospects was not supported by the data analyzed in this study. Contrary to expectations, both types of stereotypes did not have a negative direct effect on future prospects. Stereotypes about work ethics did have a significant direct effect on their perceived future prospects but in the opposite direction ($\beta = 0.12$). This finding runs contrary to studies that claim that there is a negative relationship between stereotypes and future prospects. This was unexpected as
stereotypes was expected to have negative relationship with future prospects, as shown in the literature (Kary & Shirako 2009). This result is surprising because Kary and Shirako (2009) argue that stereotypes are more likely to harm the career progress of certain groups, which in this case is Emiratis. An explanation for this contradictory result could be that the negative stereotypes are not strong enough to affect local Emiratis perceptions about future prospects or Emiratis are aware of these stereotypes but still take the risk despite the fact that these stereotypes might affect their future prospects. This is especially true with regards to the stereotypes about Emiratis work ethics. Kahn (1990) suggests that supportive employees are able to face risks despite the fact that negative consequences may occur.

This negative relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and specific constructs of organizational socialization is consistent with the findings of Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) and Kary and Shirako (2009) but novel that only training and co-worker support were negatively related to stereotypes. The findings of this study offers additional understanding of the negative impact of stereotypes found in other studies, by showing that stereotypes about work ethics have a negative influence on only two constructs of organizational socialization. Overall, the results provide support for the role of stereotypes about work ethics in organizational socialization constructs.

### 7.3.4 Relationships between Stereotypes, Organizational Socialization, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions: Mediation Effects

In this discussion of the findings regarding stereotypes, there is much focus on the few studies that have utilized the stereotypes construct in the context of localization. This small body of literature offers limited opportunity for comparison. Previous research has shown that stereotypes influence organizational commitment and turnover intention
within the context of Emiratization (Al-Ali 2008b; Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). The literature supports a negative relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment and a positive relationship with turnover intention.

In this study, the hypothesized negative effect of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational commitment and positive effect on turnover intention was mediated by future prospects; this was not found for stereotypes about skills and competencies at work. The analyses show that future prospects has a mediating role in the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and both organizational commitment and turnover intention. Thus, the presence of stereotypes about local Emiratis work ethics can reduce the commitment level and increase the turnover intentions of local Emiratis through the unavailability of proper future prospects within the organization. For example, the strong presence of the stereotypes about work ethics will affect the opportunities of local Emiratis getting a rewarding career in the organization which will decrease their commitment and increase their intention to leave the organization. However, future prospects did not have a mediating role in the relationship between stereotypes about skills and competencies and both organizational commitment and turnover intention.

There is little research on the direct relationship among stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention. This research adds to the body of knowledge that suggests that the stereotypes can have an effect on employee’s intention to leave. Prior research (Al-Ali 2008b; Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010) showed that stereotypes has a direct effect on organizational commitment and turnover intention, but the results of the current study revealed that stereotypes also have indirect effect on both organizational commitment and turnover intention through organizational socialization.
That is, the future prospects construct of organizational socialization significantly affected organizational commitment and turnover intention by having a mediating role. Specifically, the future prospects construct of organizational socialization mediated the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and both organizational commitment and turnover intention. In sum, it appears that future prospects help increase employees commitment and reduces turnover intention. This finding is novel and implies that better future prospects can help to reduce turnover intention, thus increasing employee retention and as a result providing better chances for localization to achieve its goals. These findings provide a more fine-grained understanding of the negative impact of stereotypes found in other studies especially in the Western context, by determining that future prospects were responsible for the influence of stereotypes on both organizational commitment and turnover intention.

These results make a contribution to the literature concerned with stereotypes, organizational socialization, organizational commitment and turnover intention by identifying the indirect role that future prospects plays in the relationship between stereotypes and both organizational commitment and turnover intention. Furthermore, the current study opens a new avenue for organizational socialization research. The present empirical research has shown that the organizational socialization constructs affect organizational commitment and turnover intention. Therefore, based on the findings of this research, organizational socialization might be anticipated to be a potential mechanism highlighting why stereotypes affect Emirati employee’s commitment and turnover intention.

7.3.5 Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions
Harhara, Singh and Hussain (2015) suggest that it’s clear in the literature organizational commitment play a key role employees’ intentions to leave their organizations. The literature demonstrates that organisational commitment is negative related to turnover intention (Harhara, Singh & Hussain 2015, Jaramillo, Mulki & Marshall 2005, Lambert & Hogan 2009). In the current study a significant negative relationship was found between organizational commitment and the turnover intention of local Emiratis suggesting that as the level of organizational commitment increases, turnover intention decreases. These findings are consistent with those reported by Van Laar et al. (2007) and Asgari and Dadashi (2011), and Yaghi and Yaghi (2012). This result supports previous research conducted to explain the importance of the organizational commitment in organizations (Ferris & Aranya 1983, O’Reilly & Caldwell 1980, Stumpf & Hartman 1984). This negative relationship is consistent with the findings of Williams and Hazer (1986) who found that organizational commitment has a significant influence on turnover intention.

7.4 Comparison between Public and Private sectors

It is expected that different results will emerge between the public and private sectors with respect to stereotypes and their effects on organizational commitment and turnover intention. As discussed in previous chapters the private sector differs from the public sector in the UAE regarding many aspects (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). Therefore, this research tested the key hypotheses separately for each of the public and private sectors in order to reveal any differences. Empirical support for some of the relationships between stereotypes, organizational socialization, organizational commitment and turnover intention were found. Table 7.1 shows the similarities and
differences between the public and private sectors. The details are discussed in detail in
the next sections.
Table 7.1 Summary of similarities and differences between public and private sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Hypothesis Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H11a</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>training</strong> on organizational commitment</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11b</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>understanding</strong> on organisational commitment</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11c</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>co-worker support</strong> on organisational commitment</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11d</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>future prospects</strong> on organisational commitment</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant and Stronger</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12a</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>training</strong> on turnover intention</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12b</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>understanding</strong> on turnover intention</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Significant but in opposite direction</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12c</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>co-worker support</strong> on turnover intention</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12d</td>
<td>The effect of <strong>future prospects</strong> on turnover intention</td>
<td>Significant and Stronger</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13a</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (work ethics) on organizational commitment</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13b</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (skills &amp; competencies) on organizational commitment</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14a</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (work ethics) on turnover intention</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14b</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (skills &amp; competencies) on turnover intention</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15a</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (work ethics) on <strong>training</strong></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15b</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (work ethics) on <strong>co-worker support</strong></td>
<td>Significant and Stronger</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15c</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (work ethics) on <strong>future prospects</strong></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>The effect of stereotypes (skills &amp; competencies) on <strong>future prospects</strong></td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.1 The Relationship between Stereotypes and Organizational Socialization

Stereotypes are perceived to have a negative influence on organizational socialization constructs (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010; Kary & Shirako 2009) including training, co-worker support and future prospects. It was also hypothesised that stereotypes about skills and competencies at work would have a negative effect on future prospects, but that this would differ among private sector employees and public sector employees. Mixed support was found for these hypotheses.

The results for the relationships between stereotypes and organizational socialization constructs in the public and the private sector samples were mixed: The results suggested that stereotypes about work ethics were not related to the training construct of organizational socialization for the private sector, while this relationship was supported for the public sector. This suggests that stereotypes about work ethics does affect local employees perceptions of training, but not for others. The results indicated that local Emiratis perceptions of stereotypes about work ethics had a significant negative effect on training ($\beta = -0.20$) for public sector employees only. This suggests that organizations in the public sector believe that it will be a waste of resources training and developing local Emiratis as they believe that those Emiratis will be lazy as the literature suggests (Al-Ali 2008b; Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010), will not work properly. The unsupported (non-significant) result for the private sector is surprising as previous research indicated that stereotypes about work ethics has a negative effect on training (Al-Ali 2008b; Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). One potential explanation for this may be that the organizations in the private sector are aware of such stereotypes;
however they do believe in equal opportunities for development opportunities and this will help the employees perform better.

In addition, the results suggested that there is a significant relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and co-worker support for both the public and private sectors. The significant negative effect of co-worker support for the public sector ($\beta = -0.27$) was higher than the private sector ($\beta = -0.22$), consistent with findings specific to local Emiratis (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). As discussed earlier, stereotypes hinder employees’ ability to think of others objectively as co-workers, and as a result of which they might not be offered training opportunities (Kary & Shirako 2009).

Contrary to expectations, for the public sector, both types of stereotypes did not have a negative direct effect on future prospects. This was unexpected as stereotypes was expected to have a negative relationship with future prospects, as suggested by Kary and Shirako (2009) that stereotypes can affect the career. As mentioned earlier, an explanation for this contradictory result could be that the negative stereotypes are not strong enough to affect local Emiratis perceptions or the employing organizations as they treat local Emiratis fairly like other employees and offer equal opportunities for career growth.

Although stereotypes harm career progression (Kary & Shirako 2009), the findings suggest that stereotypes about skills and competencies, on the other hand, did have a significant effect on perceptions of future prospects but only for private sector ($\beta = -0.13$). Stereotypes about skills and competencies in the private sector can have a negative impact on the career progression of local Emiratis by preventing their advancement and chances of getting promotion. Therefore, when stereotypes about
skills and competencies has a negative impact on the career development of employees, it can affect their organizational commitment and turnover intention.

These results are interesting as stereotypes about work ethics seem to influence two of the four organizational socialization constructs. However, these affects are different between the public and private sector. This negative relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and only two constructs; training and co-worker support, is consistent with the findings of Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) and Kary and Shirako (2009), but it is unusual that only these two organizational socialization constructs are significantly related to stereotypes about work ethics. As explained before, the differences in the effects that stereotypes have on organizational socialization constructs highlight the important role different socialization constructs play in the relationship between stereotypes and organizational socialization. It also indicates that different methods can be used to tackle these effects between the public and private sector. The findings of this study extend our understanding of the negative impact of stereotypes found in other studies (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010), by demonstrating that stereotypes about work ethics have a negative influence on only two constructs of organizational socialization. Overall, the results provide insights into the influence of stereotypes about work ethics on organizational socialization constructs.

7.4.2 The Relationship between Organizational Socialization, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

This research hypothesized that organizational socialization constructs would be positively related to organizational commitment and negatively related to turnover intentions, but these relationships will differ between the public and private sectors. Mixed support was found for these relationships.
First, with regards to organizational socialization and organizational commitment, the findings of this study show partial support for relationships between organizational socialization constructs and organisational commitment in the two separate samples of public and private sectors. In other words, several significant positive paths were found between training, understanding and future prospects and organizational commitment for both the public and private sector local Emiratis. However, these results were different between the two sectors (see Table 7.1).

Moreover, although understanding and future prospects were found to be positively related to organizational commitment among public sector local employees, a significant linkage between understanding and organizational commitment did not exist among private sector local employees. Similarly, training and future prospects were found to be positively related to organizational commitment among private sector Emirati employees, and a significant linkage between training and organizational commitment did not exist among public sector local employees. Organizational commitment is positively influenced by training for the private sector local employees and understanding has a significant positive influence on organizational commitment for the public sector. However, co-worker support did not have a significant influence on organizational commitment for both the public and private sectors. As discussed earlier, Limpanitgul, Boonchoo and Photiyarach (2014) suggest that the insignificant relationship between co-worker support and commitment could be because the support employees get from their fellow co-workers might not translate into a higher level of commitment thus decreasing turnover. Organizational commitment was strongly influenced by future prospects for both public and private sector local employees.
Looking at this relationship from the public/private sector perspective, organizational socialization and organizational commitment were shown to have different relationships across both public and private sectors. The results attained stressed differences across the two sectors with regards to the significance and strength of the relationships with the various constructs of organizational socialization. In the public sector sample of local employees, the strongest influence was for future prospects followed by understanding. On the other hand, the influence of organizational socialization constructs on organizational commitment among Emiratis in the private sector showed the strongest influence on organizational commitment as future prospects followed by training.

Interestingly, the influence of future prospects on organizational commitment is stronger for the private sector sample relative to the public sector sample. However, the influence of understanding on organizational commitment is significant for the public sector sample only. Additionally, the influence of training on organizational commitment is statistically significant for the private sector sample. Cohen (2003) suggests that different socialization techniques have different effects on commitment. The effect of training on organizational commitment for the private sector was ($\beta = 0.20$), whereas the effect was not significant for the public sector. This indicates that training plays an important role in Emirati employee’s commitment to the organization, especially those working in the private sector. This is consistent with the findings that suggest that employees were more committed to their work when they perceived that the organization was concerned with the training and development offered to them (Irving & Thomas 1997, Marchington & Wilkinson 1997). Ashar et al. (2013) argue that researchers utilize social exchange theory to prove the positive relationship between perceived training and organizational commitment. Studies conducted by Ahmad and Bakar (2003) and Newman, Thanacoody and Hui (2011) reveals a strong positive
association between perceptions of training and organizational commitment. Al-Emadi and Marquardt (2007) also found a positive correlation between perceptions of training and organizational commitment.

The effect of understanding on organizational commitment for the public sector was (β = 0.39) whereas the effect was not significant for the private sector. This result confirms that public sector employees with a better understanding of their jobs and organization have higher commitment levels. The effect of co-worker support was not significant for both the public and private sectors. This finding is not consistent with the literature that suggests that employees who perform their tasks together as a team tend to feel increasingly committed (Cohen & Bailey 1997, Griffeth et al. 1997, Meyer & Allen 1997). Feldman (1981) suggest that in the socialization process the employees define their relationships with others and hence show increased organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982). Although co-worker support doesn’t directly affect organizational commitment, it does have an indirect affect through understanding. Nevertheless, the findings of the whole sample analysis showed that co-worker support does affect organizational commitment but indirectly through understanding. This suggests that co-worker support increases Emirati employee’s understanding of their jobs and organization which increase their commitment levels. The effect of future prospects was significant and almost the same on organizational commitment for both public (β = 0.47) and private (β = 0.52) sectors. This is consistent with the findings that employees who are satisfied with their future prospects are more committed (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio 2005). Organizational commitment is reduced if there is an awareness of underhanded approaches in promotion and career growth activities (Al-Ahmadi 2002, Mosadeghrad, Ferlie & Rosenberg 2008).
Secondly, with respect to organizational socialization and turnover intention, the findings of this study were not completely consistent with this hypothesis. The negative relationship between future prospects and turnover intention was supported. The data collected from both public and private sectors showed that future prospects was negatively related to turnover intention. Unlike organizational commitment, not all constructs of organizational socialization have direct negative influences on turnover intention. Contrary to expectations, two constructs of organizational socialization, namely training and co-worker support, did not have a significant relationship with turnover intention for both public and private sectors. Further, it is necessary to note that although a significant linkage between understanding and turnover intention did not exist among public sector employees, understanding was unexpectedly found to be positively related with turnover intention among private sector employees. Understanding having a significant positive influence on turnover intention for the private sector was totally unexpected as the literature suggests that there is a positive relationship (Manzoor & Naeem 2011). Moreover, training and co-worker support did not have a significant direct effect on turnover intention for both public and private sectors. Turnover intention is strongly negatively influenced by future prospects for both the public and private sector.

The relationship between organizational socialization and turnover intention was shown to be mixed and varied across the public and private sectors. Fisher (1986) argues that one of the main causes of their turnover intention is poor and unsuccessful socialization. Similar to organizational commitment, future prospects was the most strongly influential construct of organizational socialization on turnover intention for both the
public and private sectors. This is consistent with the findings of Gao (2011) who found that employees who are satisfied with their future prospects and perceive that they will have a rewarding future, will be less likely to leave their organizations (Gao 2011).

On the other hand, understanding had a significant positive influence on turnover intention for the private sector, but a non-significant result for the public sector. The effect of understanding on turnover intention was positive for the private sector ($\beta = 0.27$). This suggests that employees working in the private sector with a better understanding of their jobs and organization have a higher chance of leaving their organizations. In other words, even if employees understand a variety of types of information about their organizations and how those organizations function, they are less likely to develop their loyalty for their organizations, and more likely to leave their organizations. Building on previous studies, understanding was hypothesized to be negatively associated with turnover intention. The literature shows that employees who have a good understanding of their organization and their roles are more dedicated and their turnover intentions are lower (Fisher 1986; Manzoor & Naeem 2011). One reason for the unexpected relationship may be because of the unavailability of future prospects. A potential explanation for this conflicting finding might be because employees develop themselves by knowing their jobs better; however, if there are no future prospects or opportunities for future advancement then the employees will look for those future prospects somewhere else in other jobs. Ashar et al. (2013) suggest three key causes for turnover in organization including job satisfaction, organizational commitment and accessibility of new job opportunities. Development reduces the turnover rate of employees and advancement opportunities increase employee’s commitment and as a result decrease turnover (Deckop et al. 2006). Hassan et al. (2013) argue that lack of training and promotion prospects are a key cause for the employee turnover. Chen
(2014) further argues that employees seek career growth and it is a key motivational reason to continue in their organization. In other words, if the organization is not able to provide good career advancement or development opportunities then their human talent who invested in developing themselves to do their jobs better will eventually leave to find other jobs.

Verhees (2012) claims that different conclusions were reached when exploring the relationship between training and turnover intention in prior research. First, training decreases turnover intention because employees react mutually towards the organization’s investment and thus display increased commitment towards their organization (Leuven et al. 2003). That said, training also results in a better skilled workforce, which is more employable in other organizations (Becker 1962). Verhees (2012) argues that training can positively influence turnover intention. Lockwood (2007) further argues that employees, through training, enhance their knowledge and skills and are more likely to be completely engaged as a result of the increase in their future employability. Similarly when employees gain a better understanding of their jobs through training, they will be more willing to leave their organization.

Neither training nor co-worker support among local Emiratis from both sectors revealed a significant relationship with turnover intention. This was unexpected as a lack of training opportunities (Manzoor & Naeem 2011) and poor relationships with co-workers are generally perceived to weaken job satisfaction and increase turnover intention (Gunter & Furnham 1996, Ritter & Anker 2002). A possible explanation for this finding could be that these two organizational socialization constructs help employees gain better a understanding of their jobs and organization by developing themselves through training and co-worker support; however if they do not perceive future prospects or
opportunities for future advancement, they may choose to just continue without investing further in personal development.

The overall results reveal that organizational socialization constructs have a partial impact on both organizational commitment and turnover intention for both sectors, particularly the future prospects construct of organizational socialization. Moreover, the discussion above in general leads to the conclusion that future prospects is the strongest construct affecting both organizational commitment and turnover intention for both the public and private sectors. As discussed earlier, this indicates that under the availability of adequate career opportunities in both sectors, employees are in general more likely to feel committed and less likely to leave.

These results extend the literature by identifying which different socialization constructs play a more important role in each sector and the role future prospects plays in the relationship between organizational socialization and both organizational commitment and turnover intention is the most interesting as it is the most influencing factor. In this context, future prospects appear to be the key to increasing local Emiratis retention and thus successful localization. This is a novel contribution of this study and extends the literature on the relationships between organizational socialization constructs and both organizational commitment and turnover intentions (Allen and Meyer 1990, Cohen 2003, Fisher 1986, Mowday, Porter and Steers 1982, Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth 1978, Taormina 1997).
7.4.3 Relationships between Stereotypes, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions

Although previous research suggests that negative stereotypes have a major influence on organizational commitment and turnover intention (Al-Ali 2008b; Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010), the findings in this study reveal generally that stereotypes do not have any significant direct effects on organizational commitment and turnover intention. Al-Waqfi and Forstenlechner (2010) argue that negative stereotypes are stronger in the private sector compared to the public sector. Hence it is expected that different results would emerge between the public and private sectors in terms of stereotypes and their effects on organizational commitment and turnover intention. It was hypothesized that the two types of stereotypes would be negatively related to organizational commitment and positively related to turnover intention and the strength of these relationships would be different between public and private sectors. As discussed, support was not found for most of these hypotheses. Only one of the four hypotheses proposed was found to be significant where a stereotype about skills and competencies was found to be positively related to turnover intention for the public sector sample only.

The negative relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment was not supported as the data collected from both public and private showed that the two types of stereotypes were not related to organizational commitment. This is surprising, since researchers such as Al-Ali (2008b) suggest that the negative stereotypes are present in both public and private sectors in the UAE. As for turnover intentions, the hypothesized positive relationship between negative stereotypes and turnover intention was only supported for the public sector and only for stereotypes about skills and competencies. This confirms that employees working in the public sector who are stereotyped as
incompetent and lacking the required skills and knowledge have a higher chance of leaving their organization (Al-Ali 2008b). Stereotypes about work ethics did not have a significant direct effect on turnover intention for both the public and private sectors. Contrary to expectations, both types of stereotypes did not have a significant direct effect on turnover intention for the private sector as expected (Al-Ali 2008b, Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010).

These findings demonstrate contrary results to studies that claim that there is a negative relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment (Al-Ali 2008b). This contradictory result can be explained by the possibility that the presence of stereotypes in the UAE labor market (for both public and private sectors) is not as strong as it was in the past, especially with regards to the stereotypes about local Emiratis work ethic. Emiratis were stereotyped as lacking the skills and competencies to join the labor market (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). They were perceived as lacking various required skills and abilities to perform skilled jobs and compete with expatriates. The government of the UAE has invested a lot in developing and training Emiratis in order to make them acquire the skills and competencies required to join the labor market (Al-Ali 2008b). On the other hand, Emiratis were stereotyped as lacking a good work ethic as they were perceived as lazy and unmotivated (Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010), but this has changed. This may be because Emiratis have been able to change the negative perceptions about them in the labor market and prove their competitiveness and capabilities.

7.5 Overall Discussion

Turnover continues to be an issue that has critical effects on organizations’ success. This research utilizes turnover intentions as an indicator of the behavior of employee
withdrawal from their organization. Employment of local Emiratis in the labor market is important and their turnover is an issue in the labor market due to its effect on the success of localization initiatives (Al-Ali 2008b). The findings of this study imply that retention was developed when employees appreciated the training received, had a good understanding of their role, co-worker support and good future prospects provided by the organization.

The results indicate that employees’ perception of organizational socialization in their organizations significantly affects their retention. To make the localization initiative effective, the focus should be on successful and effective organizational socialization processes in general. This can be achieved by providing local Emiratis with training that develops their skills and capabilities, encouraging moral or emotional sustenance that is offered without financial compensation by other fellow co-workers in the workplace thus enhancing their understanding of their jobs and of the organization and as a result offering rewarding future prospects within the firm. Ashar et al. (2013) and Hassan et al. (2013) suggest that training has a positive effect on employee retention. Many researchers suggest that training programs clearly contribute to the positive growth of Emiratis in organizations and are related to higher retention rates (Forstenlechner 2010, Mellahi 2007b, Rees, Mamman & Braik 2007). Wan (2007) argues that in order for organisations to thoroughly develop their employee’s productivity and improve their retention, they need to utilize their workforce through training and development. Realizing positive relations between managers and employees will support these employees within organizations and offer a discouragement for employees to leave (Taplin & Winterton 2007). The organizations pay special attention to build teamwork and promote their employees to support each other. Eisenberger et al. (2002) suggest that supervisor support ultimately increases employee retention. Organizations also have
to focus on developing future prospects for their employees by providing career development and growth opportunities. Hassan et al. (2013) suggest that career development opportunities are one of the key factors that have an effect on employee retention. It may be stated here that all these developmental opportunities have the potential to increase employee loyalty to the organization, which has been further found to enhance organizational commitment (Ibrahim & Al Falasi 2013).

Findings of this research indicate that organisational socialization and stereotypes have a significant relationship (direct and indirect) with organisational commitment and turnover intention and thus retention. Findings also indicate that organizational socialization constructs are related and stereotypes have a significant impact on these constructs. Based on the research model, it is recommended that the utilization of particular socialization practices, i.e., training, understanding, and especially future prospects that improve Emirati employee commitment as a transitional step to lower turnover intention. Gao (2011) suggests that organizations that offer their staff with effective training and orientation programs and provide supportive work environments could prompt enhanced job performance and reduce turnover intention.

Organizational commitment is perceived as an antecedent of turnover because it is significant to employee retention (Chen 2014). Organizational commitment is found to have a significant effect on turnover intention. In other words, if employees are committed to the organization, they will be less likely to leave which means decreased turnover. Findings of the study show that effective training, functional levels of organizational understanding, supportive co-workers and, most importantly, adequate future prospects will create a strong commitment towards the organization and make it difficult for employees to leave. According to Becker’s (1962) Human Capital theory,
employees who participate in training are more employable in other organizations. Chen (2014) further suggests that training not only builds organizational commitment but makes the employees recognize that their organization is assisting them to realize their career objectives. Tharenou (1997), on the other hand, suggests that the availability of training and support from organizations for that training helps employees in career advancement within their organization. However employees will be encouraged to stay and establish a career path in their organization that provides such opportunities (Samuel & Chipunza 2008). In order to improve employee commitment and make them feel that they are important, organizations need to develop career development strategies and train their employees and as a result this will help in employee retention (Hassan et al. 2013). So if organizations offer their employees adequate opportunities for career growth, then ultimately they are going to remain in their organizations.

Private sector organisations have to focus more on providing training and development opportunities to local Emiratis to acquire skills as the findings of this research show that, while public sector organisations need to focus more on enhancing the understanding of local Emiratis of their jobs. These will increase local Emiratis’ commitment to their organization; a factor that affects employees’ turnover intention thus enhancing retention and ultimately making the localization a success. The relationship between the organizational socialization constructs with both organizational commitment and turnover intention were different across the public and private sectors. For example, in the public sector even though employee’s perceived training received as significant, they were less committed to the organization. One plausible explanation can be that training enhances employee’s skills and makes them more employable by other organizations. Verhees (2012) argue that commitment can be negatively affected by training since training results in better skilled employees, who are willing to leave the
Nevertheless, the relationships between organizational socialization, organizational commitment and turnover intentions may require further investigation particularly across public and private sector organizations. Moreover, the availability of future prospects will also provide local Emiratis with the motive to enhance their learning and understanding of their jobs and organization and hence decrease their turnover intention especially in the case of local Emiratis working in the private sector as this study suggests. The public and private sector organisations differ with respect to their local Emiratis perception of the future prospects. Local Emiratis in the private sector are more satisfied with the future prospects offered by their organizations than employees in the public sector. Nevertheless, both sectors need to pay attention to the career progression plans for the local Emiratis that enhance their commitment and decrease their intentions to leave.

Future prospects seems to be the key in increasing local Emiratis retention, and thus successful localization. As suggested earlier, researchers argue that availability of opportunities for career development is one of the factors that have an effect on employee retention (Hassan et al. 2013). Chen (2014) also argues that career growth is a key motivational reason for employees to stay with their organization. Future prospects added a unique variance to the results relating to organisational commitment and turnover intention. The results of this study clearly show that future prospects is significantly related to organisational commitment and turnover intention, and that in turn affects the retention aspect of localization. Future prospects in terms of future assignments and career development lead to the retention of local Emiratis. Future prospects are crucial in prompting and strengthening behaviors that aid organisational strategy and have a significant positive impact on organizational commitment or a negative effect on employees’ turnover intention (Balkin & Gomez-Mejia 1990). This
confirms the need for organizations to focus on career development of their local Emiratis and offer growth opportunities for their progression in order to retain their talents.

Stereotypes on the other hand, play an important role in Emirati employee’s retention as it affects both organizational commitment and turnover intention. The literature suggests that local Emiratis are stereotyped for lack of skills and work ethics (Al-Ali 2008b; Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner 2010). The results of this study show that stereotypes not only have a significant relationship with organisational socialization, but also with organisational commitment and turnover intention through future prospects. Future prospects was the organizational socialization construct that had the strongest influence on both organizational commitment and turnover intention. Employees are more likely to quit their jobs if they feel that negative stereotypes control how they are treated (Kary & Shirako 2009). The results of the current study suggest that stereotypes about skills and competencies increase turnover intention directly especially in the public sector. However, stereotypes about work ethics have an indirect effect on organizational commitment and turnover intention through future prospects.

The literature shows that negative stereotypes decrease organizational commitment (Riaz, Anjum & Anwar 2016), and increase intention to turnover (Podsakoff, LePine & LePine 2007, von Hippel et al. 2011). The results of this study suggest that employees’ perceptions of negative stereotypes are associated with lower levels of organizational commitment and higher levels of intention to quit - however those effects come through future prospects. This suggests that organizations need to offer future prospects such as having adequate career progression opportunities, in order to minimize the negative effect stereotypes can have on employees commitment and increase their turnover.
Furthermore, the results show that when stereotypes in the labor market are strongly negative, the positive impact of organizational socialization generally and future prospects specifically, is lowered and, as a result, the effect of organizational socialization on commitment and turnover intention is weakened. The results also show that stereotypes about their work ethic are negatively related to training and co-worker support.

The results suggest that the presence of stereotypes in the public sector especially with regards to work ethic can affect local Emiratis chances of getting proper training opportunities. Organizations need to ensure that the provision of equal and proper training is not affected by negative stereotypes. Moreover, the negative effect of stereotypes about work ethics on co-worker support was higher for the public sector than the private sector. This suggests that local Emiratis are more likely to be influenced by stereotypes about work ethic in terms of lack of co-worker support in the public sector than the private sector. This issue can be tackled by increasing the awareness between employees about the negative effects of stereotypes and encourage teamwork and co-operation between them. The results also suggest that if local Emiratis are perceived as lacking proper skills and competencies, then their chances of advancing their career with the organization can be harmed. The results of this study clearly show the negative effect that stereotypes can have, not only on organizational socialization but also organization commitment and turnover intention, and thus local Emiratis retention. According to Kramer et al. (1996), greater attention has to be paid to the empowerment of local Emiratis as a way of maximizing organisational commitment and developing trust.
There is little research on the relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention. This research adds to the body of knowledge which suggests that negative stereotypes can have an effect on Emirati employee’s intention to leave. These results add to the body of knowledge related to organizational socialization (Van Maanen & Schein 1979, Fisher 1986, Taormina 1997) and stereotypes (Al-Ali 2008b, Forstenlechner et al. 2012, Page 2007, Shallal 2011) in addition to the literature on organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982, Allen and Meyer 1990, Joo 2010, Klein, Molloy & Cooper 2009), turnover intention (Cohen 2003, Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth 1978) and local employee’s retention as a second key aspect of localization by identifying which socialization constructs are the most influential and what roles stereotypes play. The findings not only fill a gap in literature but also extend the literature of organizational socialization by clearly highlighting the important role future prospects play in the relationship between organizational socialization and both organizational commitment and turnover intention. Future prospects can be the key in increasing local Emiratis retention and thus successful localization.

In summary, effective organizational socialization and a workplace free from negative stereotypes will assist to establish a strong commitment among the Emiratis towards their organization. Such findings provide an indication that the research model has significant analytical capability for future research.

### 7.6 Chapter Summary

A key objective of this chapter was to review the key findings from the study and offer a detailed discussion and interpretation. This research offers empirical support for the relationship between organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intentions in a localization context. The findings add to the
literature on these themes, and open avenues for further research to conclusively
determine the relationships shown in this study. In the subsequent chapter, a summary
of the study, contributions to knowledge and implications (both managerial and policy),
as well as limitations and future research are provided.
Chapter 8 : CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Focus

This chapter begins with an overview of the study and the research chapters comprising the thesis. This is followed by a summary of the study’s results. In addition, the implications derived of the research findings and the theoretical and practical contributions of the thesis are discussed. Finally, the limitations of the study, recommendations for further research and final conclusions are provided.

8.2 Research Overview

The success of localization initiatives seems to be affected by the appropriate combination of components rather than relying on a direct linear relationship with distinct components of the scheme. It is challenging to claim, for instance, that retention efforts inevitably result in successful localization initiatives without the support of all parties involved.

Both organizational socialization and stereotypes were hypothesized to be related to organizational commitment based on earlier research. In terms of organizational commitment, organizational socialization was proposed to be positively related while stereotypes was expected to show a negative relationship. With respect to turnover intention, organizational socialization was proposed to be negatively related while stereotypes was proposed to show a positive relationship. Mixed support was found for these relationships. The paths between organizational socialization constructs and
organizational commitment were significant and positive while the paths between stereotypes and organizational commitment were not significant.

The UAE is now facing serious challenges that could have concerns not only for the economy but for the country as a whole (Al-Ali 2008b). Increased participation in the workforce by UAE locals is essential to the nation’s growth. Employment of UAE locals in both the public and private sectors is always the desired aim of the UAE government. Also, there are many unemployed UAE locals who can’t find suitable jobs that match their qualifications and aspirations.

8.3 Review of the Objectives of the Research and Results

This section revisits the research objectives and summarizes the main findings, contributions, implications, limitations and suggestions for future research. The key objective of the present research was to determine the extent to which organizational socialization and stereotypes influence organizational commitment and turnover intention among local employees and whether these influences differ between the public and private sectors. In brief, the objective was to test the applicability of the organizational socialization model in a localization context where it has not been traditionally applied. An addition to this model was the inclusion of stereotypes as an important variable with regards to localization. As highlighted in Chapter 3, Literature Review, numerous studies have shown that organizational socialization has a strong relationship to turnover intention.

Moreover, the theories on turnover propose that it occurs as a result of lack of organizational commitment (Jaramillo, Mulki & Marshall 2005, Lambert & Hogan 2009). Thus, it was hypothesized that organizational socialization would be positively
related to organizational commitment and negatively to turnover intention among local employees.

The results of the data analysis revealed that organizational socialization has a direct relationship with organizational commitment and an inverse relationship with turnover intention especially when it comes to future prospects. This finding proposes that the more an employee is committed, the less likely he/she is going to leave the firm.

Looking at these relationships from a public/private sector perspective shown different findings. In public and private sector results, organizational socialization and stereotypes were associated with organizational commitment and turnover intention to different levels. The strengths of influence were different to those found for the whole sample. Across all three sample groups (whole sample, private sector and public sector), future prospects had a stronger influence than other organizational socialization constructs on both organizational commitment and turnover intention.

*The Role of Organisational Socialization* illustrated that organisational socialization, represented by its four aspects (training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects) can affect organisational commitment and turnover intention.

The research further investigated the extent to which understanding mediates the relationships between training and future prospects and co-worker support and future prospects. The mediational analysis conducted on organizational socialization constructs showed that understanding partially mediates the relationships between training and future prospects and fully mediates the relationship between co-worker support and future prospects. Another key objective of this research was to investigate the mediating effect of future prospects in the relationship between stereotypes and both
organisational commitment and turnover intention. The findings shown that future prospects partially mediates the relationship between stereotypes about work ethics and both organizational commitment and turnover intention.

**8.4 Contributions to Current Knowledge**

This study makes six main contributions which are as follows. First, this research expands the conceptualization of localization to consider retention as a key aspect along with recruitment. Second, the study proposes a comprehensive model that integrates constructs of organizational socialization and stereotypes with organizational commitment and turnover intentions as representing the retention dimension of localization. Third, this research offers a novel insight of when stereotypes influence organizational commitment and turnover intention by suggesting that organizational socialization constructs serve as mediators to compensate the effects of stereotypes on both organizational commitment and turnover intention. Fourth, this research determines future prospects construct of organizational socialization as the strongest predictor of both organizational commitment and turnover intention. Fifth, this research is considered among one of the first studies to conduct a detailed comparison between public and private sectors with respect to the effect of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention. Sixth, this research enriches the socialization literature by providing evidence to suggest that the four organizational socialization constructs are correlated.

The key purpose of this research was to propose a comprehensive model that integrates aspects of organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intentions to evaluate the retention aspect of localization. To date, a framework has not been established to investigate the patterns of relationships between these
constructs especially when it comes to localization. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this is the first study to develop a theoretical framework of the retention aspect of localization. This research systematically developed a measurement scale to evaluate retention.

This research offers further support to the body of knowledge that proposes that there are relationships between organizational socialization, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Two constructs of organizational socialization showed significant relationships with both organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Future prospects showed the strongest relationship with organizational commitment and turnover intention.

By far the most interesting results were found in testing the structural path between components of organizational socialization and the indirect paths between stereotypes and both organizational commitment and turnover intention through organizational socialization. Up till now, from the review of the extant literature it seems there is no published empirical research that tests these relationships. Stereotypes not only impact organizational socialization but also play an important role in the relationship between organizational socialization and organizational commitment and turnover intention. Stereotypes about skills and competencies is established as having a small direct influence on turnover intention in the public sector only. However, stereotypes about work ethics has indirect effects on both organizational commitment and turnover intention through future prospects.
Table 8.1 Summary of Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Theoretical/ Empirical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This research expands the conceptualization of localization to consider retention as a key aspect along with recruitment.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study proposes a comprehensive model that integrates constructs of organizational socialization and stereotypes with organizational commitment and turnover intentions as representing the retention dimension of localization.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This research furthers theoretical research on localization influences by examining localization through the lens of organizational socialization.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the organizational socialization literature by discussing the influences of each organizational socialization constructs on stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining that the future prospects construct of organizational socialization is the strongest predictor of both organizational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering a novel insight of when stereotypes influence organizational commitment and turnover intention by suggesting that organizational socialization constructs serve as mediators to compensate the effects of stereotypes on both organizational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching the socialization literature by providing evidence to suggest that the four organizational socialization constructs are correlated.</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study reveals the theoretical relevance to stereotypes literature by identifying the roles different stereotypes play.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This research is considered among one of the first studies to conduct a detailed comparison between public and private sectors with respect to the effect of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the findings of this study extend the literature in several ways. First, the current research is considered the first empirical study to investigate the influences of different organizational socialization constructs on organizational commitment and turnover intention in UAE context. It has suggested that the future prospects construct of socialization is the strongest predictor of both organizational commitment and turnover intention, compared with the other socialization constructs. Besides, this study not only develops and extends the socialization literature, but also holds the theoretical relevance to stereotypes literature by identifying the roles different stereotypes play.
Furthermore, this research represents the theoretical investigation related to the antecedents and consequences of organizational socialization in the UAE labor market. In spite of the fact that organizational socialization is a key factor as a key necessity for the productive functioning of firms (Greenberg 1990), there have been few empirical studies of organizational socialization in the UAE. As anticipated, this research has shown the significance and influence of organizational socialization and enhanced our understanding of the socialization programs to work-related outcomes such as organizational commitment and turnover intention. Thus, this research serves as a basis for labor market researchers in the region to further investigate the relationships among these constructs.

Moreover, this research utilizes turnover intention as an indicator of the behavior of employee withdrawal. Employment of locals in labor markets is significant for the governments, because they will contribute to their nation’s development and the success of government organizations. Specifically, Emiratis turnover is principally significant in the labor market due to its effect on success of the Emiratization initiative (Al-Ali 2008b). In this respect, this research has implications for local employee’s turnover research in the local labor market by offering significant supporting empirical evidence for those relationships that have been presented in previous research (Manzoor & Naeem 2011; Gao 2011). That is, turnover intentions were functional when employees appreciated training received, understanding of their role, co-worker support and future prospects provided by the organization. However the relationships between these factors with turnover intention were significantly different between the public and private sectors. For example, in the public sector, even though employees perceived training received as significant, they were less likely committed to the organization.
Further, the findings of this research provide managers with insights into the formations of effective socialization strategies. The results of this research reveal that organizational socialization has a strong influence on employees' organizational commitment and turnover intentions, while stereotypes only has a moderate effect on turnover intentions.

Nevertheless, many Emiratis in the labor market are underemployed. If Emiratis are encouraged to learn new skills, take more responsibility and become more productive, then turnover can be reduced. Training can enhance local employee morale and organizational commitment. Also, when employees gain more understanding of their jobs by knowing what their supervisors expect from them, they tend to be more committed with their jobs.

The following section outlines some implications of the research for practitioners.

8.5 Implication of the Research

The study offers a number of recommendations, the recognition of which can positively affect the probability for successful localization in terms of local employee’s retention. This can result in aiding effective localization supporting both the organization and the local employee by offering locals with appropriate jobs. The results of this research offer both theoretical and practical implications.

Managerial Implications

This research is beneficial for the managers, researchers investigating the localization issues and the policy makers. It is a key obligation of the organization to control the turnover intentions as much as possible as it is related to the cost (Schyns, Torka &
Holtom et al. (2008, p. 236) suggest that no profit or loss statements that could handle the “cost of voluntary turnover”. This could be realized if the organization offers a supportive environment and pays attention to local employee’s well beings.

There are many implications of the findings of this research for the labor markets and the governments striving to have effective localization programs. The results presented permit managers to design and improve organizational socialization strategies. The other findings, as previously explained in this research, highlight the significance of minimizing the effects of stereotypes. This research extends the established knowledge concerning the relationship between organizational socialization and organizational commitment and turnover intention by suggesting that organizational socialization play important role in the relationship between stereotypes and organizational commitment and turnover intention.

This research has many implications. First of all, organizational commitment is a significant element of positive workplace outcomes. In order for the organizations to improve employee’s commitment levels, they need to manage the experiences offered. Organizational commitment is key for the steadiness of jobs and accordingly for the success of localization (Yaghi & Yaghi 2014). Practitioners are required to take into account organizational realities that might arise because of poor organizational commitment which can result in quitting or changing jobs (Yousef 2002). Organizational commitment is a key antecedent of employee retention which is highly related to actual turnover. The proposed effect of organizational socialization and stereotypes on the development of organizational commitment can have practical implications for workplaces. As a practice, organizations could incorporate socialization
procedures based on future prospects thought to prompt high levels of organizational commitment.

These include lost organizational knowledge, costs related to employment and exit, and training and development. The results of this study exhibit that in order for organizations to have lower rates of turnover, they need to implement practices, for instance offering employees the chance to contribute, stressing career development and providing opportunities for promotion. In addition, organizational commitment is also thought to increase costs because of its association with actual withdrawal and turnover. As a matter of fact, choosing those employees who are more likely to be committed to their organizations can reduce these costs. Additionally, organizational commitment is not only associated with turnover but with many other positive organizational outcomes such as productivity. Ensuring that we have a more committed labor force can possibly reduce many costs suffered by firms because of workers leaving and enhance those positive behaviors that are supposed to increase revenue.

The results of this study indicate that localization can be realized more efficiently by effective socialization strategies including beneficial training programs and career management schemes. Forstenlechner (2010) and Williams, Bhanugopan and Fish (2011) claim that human resources practices such as career management and effective training improvement that continually monitors and offers guidance to Emiratis and a high degree of job security are reasons for most efficient realization of localization.

This research stresses the urgency to improve the socialization practices for Emiratis so that they can have inspiration to do their work more effectively. Hence, management has to care more about developing the work life for employees so that local employees feel encouraged to remain in their organizations (Yaghi & Yaghi 2014). The extent to
which the organizations helped their employees attain the functional skills and abilities required to perform their particular jobs is very significant. Moreover, the better understanding of employees of a variety of types of information about their organization and their jobs is important as well. This enables them to know what their organizations do, how things work in their organizations and why things are performed in specific ways. Furthermore, the acceptance by fellow co-workers and the level to which they offer support during the day-to-day activities at work is a very critical aspect of the socialization programs required. Finally and more importantly the expectation of employees receiving a rewarding career in their organization was the most significant aspect of organizational socialization.

The managerial implications of the findings of this research are significant. Principally, the effect of future prospects on both organizational commitment and turnover intention is shown to be strong. Hence, activities to enhance future prospects have to be an imperative managerial consideration. Besides understanding how the firm functions and how the job is performed, prospects have a positive influence on both organizational commitment and turnover intention.

A major implication of the current research findings is that the more firms improve their socialization strategies in the organization, the less likely employees think of leaving the organization. Prior research provides support to this conclusion as many researchers argue that turnover was related to their sense of wellness in the organization (Ziauddin et al. 2010; Lawler 1982). The importance of training, understanding, co-worker support and future prospects was specified as important to employees’ intention to leave the organization. The relationship between employees at work and their fellow co-workers is critical not only to the success of performing job duties but also to establishing
constructive work environment. This research suggests that the more employees build acceptable relationships with their fellow co-workers, the better they perceive themselves prepared to perform on high standards. These claims are in line with those of McClelland (1978) who proposes the significance of organizational relationships to employees’ performance.

Additionally, the findings propose that the government of the UAE should focus on ensuring successful organizational socialization and minimizing stereotypes. The findings of this research suggest that Emirati employees expect to have good future prospects in their organizations. The government, hence, should consider in cooperation with the labor market, how to ensure career prospects for local employees in the organizations. Moreover, the government can request employing organizations to fulfill particular conditions, such as quality training, development opportunities, career development, supportive work environment and opportunities for enhancing local employee’s knowledge about their jobs.

**Policy Implications**

One of the essential tenants of localization is designing and implementing organizational socialization strategies that are focused on the retention of local employees. To inform localization policies, this study provides conceptual framework to examine local employee’s retention. In terms of strategically managing local employee’s turnover, this research has several recommendations:

Turnover rates must be monitored to identify the extent of undesirable turnover. A typical strategy is to evaluate local employee’s turnover against other employee’s turnover in the same organizations and other similar industries. This type of analysis is
informative about local trends as it provides relevant information for decision makers, organization and researchers. Although there is not a clear comprehensive local employee’s retention issue, undoubtedly high turnover among local employees is a significant issue facing localization. Hence, local employee’s retention levels have continued to be monitored; though stronger efforts need to be made to control this issue.

Prior to beginning a particular analysis, it is useful to study the relationships between the requirements of local employees, the reasons for their turnover, and particular local employee’s retention strategies. This research framed local employees retention as a response to factors related to organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

The results from this research indicate retention strategies can target two broad areas for supporting local employees in their work, that is, developing effective socialization strategies, minimizing stereotypes and enhancing commitment. Determinants found to be significant in this research with local employee’s retention signal each of these solution sets as potential areas to target when designing localization policies especially with respect to retention. Improvements to local employee’s retention can be realized by socialization strategies, which can be used to integrate local employees effectively in the workplace. An example of a socialization process for local employees is being on a cooperative staff who values the opportunity to work collaboratively with their colleagues. Being part of a supportive work group can build commitment and minimize turnover intention, and in turn, retention.

On the other hand, Emiratization has to be implemented progressively and the government should start paying attention to local employee’s retention. Emiratization policy needs to be evaluated on a regular basis to ensure that the goals set by the government are being met. In addition, training of Emirati employees and improving
their relationship with their fellow co-workers as well as the availability of career opportunities are essential aspects to the success of Emiratization.

With regards to Emiratization, a complete review of the initiative is needed to be considered. Forstenlechner (2008) stressed that Emiratization concerning decisions should be based on dependable data instead of simply taking impression-based decisions. A countrywide statistical database should be created about all positions and the status of Emiratis in each establishment with regards to positions, salaries, training received and so forth. Forstenlechner (2009) stressed the necessity for governments to engage in efforts that support localization.

Stereotypes about skills and competencies have a negative impact as they increase the rate of turnover intention especially for public sector employees. This indicates that the workplace environment in the public sector needs an enhanced strategic scheme to help minimize or even eliminate these types of stereotyping.

Effective socialization strategies and an environment free from stereotypes can help in creating a strong bonding between local employees and their organizations. Such an environment will make local employees feel more committed to the firm and it will be hard for them to leave. Each of these strategies can be used to aim significant factors influencing local employee’s retention, essentially by providing effective socialization strategies. Nevertheless, these are broad guidelines not specific programs. Evidence from a single self-reported survey does not provide adequate information to develop retention programs. Decision makers and stakeholders can use these recommendations to start to address local employee’s retention issues.
The difference found in the effects of both organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention for both the public and private sectors can have different implications for localization especially in the UAE. This can help identify which socialization strategies to focus on for each sector and how to address issues related to stereotypes differently for each sector as well. Additionally this will help identifying the commitment levels and turnover intentions from local employees working in both sectors so that the government can initiate programs to address this more effectively.

This section has explained selected managerial contributions and the policy recommendations of this research. The limitations of this research are now presented in the next section before prospects for future research are outlined.

**Table 8.2 Summary of the Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implication</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging activities to enhance future prospects have to be an imperative managerial consideration as the effect of future prospects on both organizational commitment and turnover intention is shown to be strong</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research will help practitioners understand organizational socialization and stereotypes and their influence on commitment and turnover intention within the context of localization.</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This research will assist organizations from both public and private sectors to evaluate and establish the suitable organisational socialization strategies and organizational practices that result in the highest levels of employee retention specifically within the context of localization.</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current research is considered as the first empirical study to investigate the influences of different organizational socialization constructs on organizational commitment and turnover intention in UAE context</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study represents the theoretical research related to the antecedents and consequences of organizational socialization in the UAE labor market</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The findings propose that the government of UAE should focus on ensuring successful organizational socialization and minimizing stereotypes</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government should request employing organizations to satisfy certain needs</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conditions, such as quality training, development opportunities, career development, supportive work environment and opportunities for enhancing local employee’s knowledge about their jobs

| As a practice, organizations could incorporate socialization procedures based on future prospects thought to prompt high levels of organizational commitment. | Managerial |
| The findings of this research provide managers with insights into the formations of effective socialization strategies. | Managerial |
| Determinants found to be significant in this research with local employee’s retention signal each of these solution sets as potential areas to target when designing localization policies especially with respect to retention. | Policy |
| Improvements to local employee’s retention can be realized by socialization strategies, which can be used to integrate local employees effectively in the workplace. | Policy |
| Emiratization needs to be implemented progressively and government should pay attention to local employee’s retention. | Policy |
| Emiratization policy needs to be evaluated on a regular base to ensure that the goals set by the government are being met. | Policy |
| The work environment in UAE labor market is requires a better strategic framework to help minimize or even eliminate different types of stereotyping | Policy |
| Effective socialization strategies and an environment free from stereotypes can help in creating a strong bonding between local employees and their organizations. | Policy |

### 8.6 Limitations and Recommendation for Future Research

Although the research findings integrate two lines of research and propose introducing new relationships between organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intention, as is the case with most empirical studies, the current study has limitations. The limitations of the current study and directions for future research have to be recognized. In terms of methodology, the sample responses were from nine organizations operating in two emirates only; Abu Dhabi and Dubai only, and as a result generalization might be an issue. Inclusion of more sample organizations especially from other emirates would have been representative. Besides, further research in different emirates can bring more generalized conclusions. Furthermore, although the study had an exploratory research approach, it was beneficial
to start with a priori qualitative work. Nevertheless, it is obvious that merely quantitative data analysis is not adequate to generalize findings of the study and few case studies could have been conducted to triangulate the results.

Another limitation of this study is that it employed a field study. While utilizing this technique offered results that provided insights into the relationships between the main constructs, it is not without drawbacks. The correlational design by its nature inhibits the inference of causality. Besides, the natural setting and lack of manipulated variables also inhibited establishing causation. Lastly, other constructs that are recognized to have had an effect on the measured constructs, such as job satisfaction, were not controlled for in this research and hence would provide another explanation for the significant relationships.

Furthermore, though localization is a gradual process, this research work is cross-sectional and merely evaluates the average level of localization at a particular point in time. Therefore the direction of causality cannot be identified, since data were gathered at a single point in time. In other words, the causality relationship between the predictors and dependent variables cannot be established. For example, it might be concluded that, over time, organizational socialization does have a strong effect on organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The proposed relationship between organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intentions would be best tested utilizing a longitudinal research design to account for the required temporal elements in developing these relationships. Literature suggests that socialization is best studied using longitudinal research in order for all phases of socialization to be captured and uncover richer results.
This research employed self-report measures which have a number of limitations. Self-report measures are believed to be subjective and can be influenced by social desirability bias. Levels of constructs assumed to be further socially desirable by the workplace, such as organizational commitment, can be inflated. On the contrary, levels of constructs assumed to be less desirable by the workplace can be attenuated, such as organizational socialization. Another limitation is the utilization of self-report questionnaires for data collection purposes and since the data were gathered using this technique, single method variance could have affected the results of the study.

Additionally, since the respondents were Emiratis, the research instrument was translated into the Arabic. Even though the back translation technique was performed to address and amend inconsistencies between the Arabic and English versions, some invalid responses might have been gathered from respondents.

These were some of the key limitations of the research. In the next sections, some of the most challenging issues the researcher faced are stressed and discussed to inform future research. There are various beneficial areas from this study which can be employed for future search. Localization is likely to be adopted more widely and better understanding of its features, dynamics, and effects is thus crucial. This study is long overdue. This research is by no means a comprehensive antecedent list and offers merely a clue of the numerous prospects for future research. This research offers a conceptual foundation for localization. An enriched understanding of the antecedent of localization especially with respect to retention led to an enhanced understanding of the organizational socialization aspects fundamental to employees' job-related behaviors, mainly organizational commitment and turnover intentions. There are no detailed studies found in relation to the practices related to the socialization of local employees, hence it is suggested to
investigate this phenomenon in more depth, principally to understand the best means of controlling the outcomes of such practices.

Researchers are urged to investigate other antecedents both organizational commitment and turnover intention (e.g., job satisfaction). Further realization of the antecedents of organizational socialization (e.g., pre-socialization factors such as employer attractiveness and anticipated person-job-fit) is necessary. Antecedents of turnover and how they consequently contribute employee retention are required to be investigated as well.

Moreover, although a cross-sectional research design was used; inter-organizational issues are active and alter over time. Consequently, as suggested earlier, future research can measure the variables investigated at different points of time, taking into consideration the dynamics to form the different stages of organizational socialization. The aim of longitudinal research is to inspect the continuity of the responses and to identify changes that happen over time (Zikmund 2003). A longitudinal study can produce a richer data source, where various patterns of localization over time can be recognized. Employees’ perceptions of socialization might be variable with regards to their relationships to other organizational behaviors. Hence, a longitudinal study may be suggested for future research.

On the other hand, as suggested by Gao (2011), future research can recognize other measures of HR practices and the proposed research model can be verified in other industries and countries. The relationships between the organizational socialization aspects with turnover intention were significantly different between the public and private sectors. For instance, in the public sector even though local employee’s perceived training received as significant, they were less likely to be committed to the
organization. Therefore, the relationships between organizational socialization, organizational commitment and turnover intentions may require further research particularly in different industries. Future research should be undertaken more widely across the country in order to explore the nature and success of localization within different sectors of the labor market. Moreover, similar comparative research can be extended to other regional or international countries facing localization issues similar to the UAE such as GCC countries. Also similar studies can be conducted to compare the success of localization initiatives to other countries.

As suggested by Williams, Bhanugopan and Fish (2011), there are different perceptions between locals and non-nationals about what localization is and how successful it is or will be in the future. Therefore further research into the success of localization is warranted on industry and business specific levels. This study emphasized the views of local employees with regards to the constructed being investigated. Other studies are recommended to assess the views of other non-national professionals with regards to the retention aspect of localization. A comprehensive study is recommended to get a better understanding of localization in the UAE, specifically in other emirates than Abu Dhabi and Dubai. Statistics are needed to decide how successful localization is and how could it be enhanced. Information about the actual organizational commitment and turnover rates of local employees is essential. Moreover, the current research was conducted during a stage where the government of UAE is re-evaluating localization and launching several related initiatives to improve the outcomes. Thus it can be beneficial to conduct a similar study after some time, when the current localization initiative is in its advanced stage as this will offer additional suggestions on whether there has been progress or not.
8.7 Conclusion

Integrating locals into the labor market is critical and essential for Governments in the immediate and long-term future. This research contributes to the literature on localization in general, and the Emiratization in the UAE in particular. By conducting a rigorous empirical investigation on how organizational socialization and stereotypes affect organizational commitment and turnover intention as associated with the extent of the retention aspect of localization of in UAE, the findings confirm the key role these factors play in the localization process.

Although there are still several unanswered questions, this research tried to offer further insights into the nature of local employee’s retention by merging research from turnover, organizational socialization and stereotypes literature. The end result is a conceptual model to inspect local employees retention that signals attention required to support locals at their workplace, suggesting that local employee’s retention may be more effective by aiming at factors that not only improve organizational socialization, but that also simultaneously minimize stereotypes. Ultimately, the essence of localization is about the link between local’s retention and recruitment at the same time. Successful localization means ensuring that there is a sufficient supply of properly qualified locals to take their place in the workplace but at the same time ensuring that the already employed local employees remain employed.

Localization initiatives could be successful if their implementation was carried out differently with more focus on retention. The issue with the current localization implementation is that the focus is merely on the recruitment aspect, where the key purpose was to simply employ as many local employees as possible. There was also a lack of consideration given to the other critical part, that is, the retention of current
employed locals. Scholars such as Selmer (2004b) and Forstenlechner (2010) found that the success of localization depends on the recruitment and retention of suitable local employee’s. Other researchers argue that the heart of successful localization lies in the retention of local talent (Fryxell, Butler & Choi 2004). Merely considering localization as the filling of quotas (Al-Enezi 2002; Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011) with no sufficient attention to employees’ integration into organizations can have unfavorable effects in the long run. Ensuring that already employed locals remain in their jobs is the key to localization success.

The implementation of effective human resources practices to support localization is absolutely a crucial factor of its success (Williams, Bhanugopan & Fish 2011). Effective organisational socialization strategies including beneficial training programs and career management schemes can help localization achieve its goal to retain local employees. Forstenlechner (2010) and Williams, Bhanugopan and Fish (2011) suggest that human resources practices such as career management and effective training improvement are reasons for the efficient realization of localization.

Reducing Emiratis’ turnover in the labor market is critical due to its effect on the success of the localization initiative (Al-Ali 2008b). Research shows that the expenditure on hiring new employees is double that of retaining the old ones. It is necessary to recognize the causes of turnover in organizations and then devise programs that will address this issue.

The findings of this thesis complement and extend the existing body of knowledge on the influence of organizational socialization and stereotypes on organizational commitment and turnover intention in general. This generally supports the conclusion adopted within this research that organizational socialization impacts organizational
commitment and turnover intention. The effect of organizational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intention in this study was found to be strong especially with respect to future prospects which was found to have the strongest effect.

The importance of organizational socialization as shown in the literature justifies the relevance of organizational socialization to localization. An effective organizational socialization process positively influences organizational commitment (Chao et al. 1994; Taormina 1997) which is associated with lower turnover intention. Further, it is argued that unsuccessful socialization leads to employee turnover (Fisher 1986). The literature suggests that the significance of organizational socialization lies in its impact on increasing commitment and as a result decreasing turnover. The findings of this study indicate that organizational commitment is a result of effective socialization strategies including appropriate future prospects in particular. Organizational socialization does affect localization in terms of retention of local employees in the workplace and it cannot be overlooked in the context of local employees’ commitment and turnover.

The results support the theoretical model presented in Chapter Four. Organizational socialization, stereotypes, commitment and turnover intention of employees are established as highly interrelated concepts in the context of localization. Socialization practices are essential in developing employees’ commitment to their organization and in supporting retention. The more effective the organizational socialization is, the lower the prospects those employees will leave.

The extent to which the organizations help their employees attain the functional skills and abilities required to perform their particular jobs is very important. Moreover, the better understanding that employees have about their organization and their jobs is also
important as this enables them to know what their organizations do, how things work in their organizations and why things are performed in specific ways. Furthermore, the acceptance by fellow co-workers and the level to which they offer support during the day-to-day activities (co-worker support) is a key aspect of socialization programs. Finally, and more importantly the expectation of employees that they will have a rewarding career in their organization turns out to be the most significant aspect of organizational socialization.

The results of this research offer significant insights into the employees' perceptions of organizational socialization that promote employees' retention. This research offers empirical support for the relationship between organizational socialization, stereotypes, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. This thesis has now successfully explored the influence of organizational socialization on organizational commitment and turnover intention. The test of the model shows that organizational socialization makes a contribution to organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The results also indicate that the four aspects of organizational socialization are interrelated. This study offers recommendations to support managers to make better decisions about how to increase organizational commitment and reduce local employee turnover.

Furthermore, the findings add significant knowledge to the literature on this matter and propose that additional research is required to conclusively determine these relationships. This research also strengthens support to the literature that proposes that stereotypes do not play a key role in the development of organizational commitment. Based on the outcomes of the current research, it appears that localization is the key to strategy implementation and has to be considered much earlier in the decision making process. To make localization more effective and efficient in the future, firms are
expected to be challenged to identify the current skills and abilities of their local employees and specify gaps in knowledge. These procedures can form the foundation for a comprehensive plan for recruitment and selection, retention, employee training, performance monitoring and benchmarking. Organizations should review their organizational structures and make suitable modifications that facilitate change management for the purpose of implementing localization effectively.

With regards to the UAE, it appears that localization in the country is, to a large extent, a confusing dilemma, where the government focuses on finding suitable jobs for the unemployed locals and at the same time many employed locals quit their jobs for various reasons. All parties involved in the UAE need to somehow pay close attention to the successful socialization of the local employees and create a stereotypes free environment. Currently, localization in UAE is neither achieving the preferred outcomes nor is it acceptable among decision-makers. Thus, this study has major significance for the public policies of the country. This research will be conducted in accordance with the UAE’s initiative to develop Emiratization policies. As such, this investigation is committed to helping decision makers improve Emiratization strategies across the country. The outcomes of this research may benefit neighboring countries to improve their localization efforts. Hence, it will inform improvements in strategies and policies into localization projects. Moreover, in order to maintain development of local workforce, it may be advantageous for organizations to employ locals starting at entry level posts and work their way throughout the hierarchy. Therefore, when locals reach higher management levels, they will have obtained considerable experience and a more systematic understanding of the organization's businesses and practices. For example, the present reality is that educated Emiratis think that after just one or two years of working for an organization, they should get promoted to senior positions. Nevertheless,
this doesn’t sufficiently prepare those Emiratis for top management roles. Thus Emiratization can be counterproductive as knowledge and experience also need to be developed in parallel.

In conclusion, this research makes a preliminary effort to examine localization, an understudied phenomenon of great importance to both researchers and business managers. The key aim of this research was to develop and test a model that investigates the relationship between organizational socialization and stereotypes with organizational commitment and turnover intention. The findings of this research propose that realizing the advantages of localization obliges substantial support from not only the government but also the industry including both public and private sectors, which have to be proactive in communicating the significance of the initiative to all the concerned parties and take part in regular support efforts. Additionally, localization schemes can advance more efficiently the level that local employees perceive the organization members as trusting them. Undoubtedly, successful localization is challenging and hard to realize and cannot merely be bought by attractive compensation packages.
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Appendix A
Survey Instrument Questionnaire
Survey

Investigating the Enhancement of Emiratisation in the UAE Labor Market

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to investigate the enhancement of Emiratisation in the UAE labor market. The information provided to us will explain the role of employers on the extent of assistance with respect to increasing the participation of Emiratis in the work in their country.

INVESTIGATORS

1. Abdulaziz Mustafa Karam (PI)
   DBA candidate, Faculty of Business
   University of Wollongong in Dubai
   as972@uowmail.edu.au

2. Dr. Payyazhi Jayashree (Co-PI)
   Associate Professor, Faculty of Business
   University of Wollongong in Dubai
   Block 15, Dubai Knowledge Village
   P.O. Box 20183, Dubai, UAE
   payyazhijayashree@uowdubai.ac.ae

3. Dr. Valerie Lindsay (Co-PI)
   Associate Professor, Faculty of Business
   University of Wollongong in Dubai
   Block 15, Dubai Knowledge Village
   P.O. Box 20183, Dubai, UAE
   valerielindsay@uowdubai.ac.ae

METHOD AND DEMANDS ON PARTICIPANTS

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to spare up to 30 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. This questionnaire will require you to state your opinion on a number of important issues related to obstacles that Emiratis face with regard to fully participating in workforce as well as in relation to the Emiratisation practice.
POSSIBLE RISKS, INCONVENIENCES & DISCOMFORTS

Apart from 30 minutes of your time, we can foresee no risks for you. Your involvement in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time during the survey without your responses being recorded. Once you have completed the survey your responses will be recorded and will not be able to be withdrawn. Should you decide not to participate in this study your decision will not influence your relationship with the University of Wollongong in Dubai and/or the researchers. Your survey responses will be anonymous and confidential and you will not be identified in any part of the research. Findings and results from the study will be published in scholarly journals. No identifying information will be published.

ETHICS REVIEW AND COMPLAINTS

This study has been reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee (Social Science, humanities and Behavioral science) of the University of Wollongong, Australia. If you have any concerns or complaints regarding the way this research has been conducted, you can contact the UoW Ethics Officer through phone at (02) 4221 4457 or by mail at rso-ethic@uow.edu.au

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

1) Please answer all the survey questions to the best of your ability.
2) The written answers have been numbered opposite to each of the statements contained in the questionnaire by using the numbers from 1 to 5; kindly complete the questionnaire by choosing the number of the answer that suits each statement.
3) By completing this survey you consent to participate in this research.

DEFINITIONS

1) **Emiratisation** is an initiative by the government of the UAE to employ Emiratis in an efficient & meaningful manner in both the private and government sectors.
2) **Stereotypes** are beliefs and perceptions about the characteristics, attributes and behaviors of members of certain groups.
3) **Internal human mobility** is population flows between regions, states, or cities within a country.
4) **Northern Emirates** include Ajman, Ras Al Khaimah, Umm Al Quwain, Fujairah and Eastern Region of the Emirate of Sharjah (Kalba, Khalfakan and Dibba Al Hisn)

Please ensure you answer all questions...
Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with all the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization has provided excellent job training for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know very well how to get things done in my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other workers have helped me on the job in various ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many chances for a good career with my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training in my company has enabled me to do my job very well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a full understanding of my duties within my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers are usually willing to offer their assistance or advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with the rewards offered by my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization offers thorough training to improve employee job skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of my organization have been made very explicit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my co-workers have accepted me as a member of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for advancement in this organization are available to almost everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions given by my supervisor have been valuable in helping me do better work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good knowledge of the way this organization operates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers have done a great deal to help me adjust to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can readily anticipate my prospects for promotion in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The type of job training given by my organization is highly effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization’s objectives are understood by almost everyone who works here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationships with other workers in this organization are very good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect that this organization will continue to employ me for many more years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section relates to *your experiences after* you joined this organization.

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5=Strongly agree
This section relates to your employment in this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help my organization be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>I talk up my organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>I find that my values and this organization’s values are very similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>I really care about the fate of my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>I probably look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>I will likely actively look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>I often think about quitting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section relates to your perceptions about Emiratis in the workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>Emirati graduates are hard to motivate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>Emirati graduates are hard working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td>Emirati graduates lack communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td>Emirati graduates need additional technical/functional training before they are ready to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td>Emirati employees lack conflict solving skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td>Emirati graduates lack practical experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td>Emiratis are lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td>Emirati graduates lack work ethics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part D: Demographic Information

Finally, we would like to know just a little about you so we can see how different types of people feel about the issues we have been examining. Confidentiality is assured, and you will not be identified in any part of the research. No identifying information will be recorded or published.

1. Gender
   a) Male
   b) Female

2. Your age
   a) Less than 20 years
   b) 20 - 25 years
   c) 26 - 30 years
   d) 31 - 40 years
   e) 41 - 50 years
   f) 51 - 60 years
   g) Above 60 years

3. Job classification
   a) Top management (CEO, General Manager or equivalent)
   b) Middle management (Department Manager, Section Head or equivalent)
   c) First level management (supervisor or equivalent)
   d) Non-managerial (No supervisory responsibilities)

4. Education level
   a) No formal education
   b) Primary school
   c) Secondary/technical school
   d) Diploma
   e) Higher Diploma
   f) Bachelor degree
   g) Postgraduate degree
   h) Others (Please specify): ........................................

5. In what range is your monthly salary In UAE Currency (Dirham)?
   a) Less than 3,000
   b) 3,000 - 5,999
   c) 6,000 - 9,999
   d) 10,000 - 14,999
   e) 15,000 - 19,999
   f) 20,000 - 24,999
   g) 25,000 - 34,999
   h) 35,000 - 44,999
   i) 45,000 - 54,999
   j) 55,000 and above

1. الجنس
   a) ذكر
   b) أنثى

2. عمرك
   a) أقل من 20 سنة
   b) 20 - 25 سنة
   c) 26 - 30 سنة
   d) 31 - 40 سنة
   e) 41 - 50 سنة
   f) 51 - 60 سنة
   g) أكثر من 60 سنة

3. المستوى/التصنيف الوظيفي
   a) الإدارة العليا (رئيس تنفيذي، مدير عام أو ما يعادلها)
   b) الإدارة الوسطى (مدير إدارة، رئيس قسم أو ما يعادلها)
   c) الإدارة الدنيا - إدارة المستوى الأول (مدير أو ما يعادلها)
   d) غير إدارية - موظف (لا مسؤوليات إشرافية)

4. المستوى التعليمي
   a) لا يتم الالتحاق بالتعليم الرسمي
   b) المدرسة الإبتدائية
   c) المدرسة الثانوية / الفنية
   d) دبلوم
   e) دبلوم عالي
   f) درجة البكالوريوس
   g) دراسات عليا
   h) أخرى (يرجى التحديد): ........................................

5. ما هو متوسط الراتب الشهري الذي تقضاه بالدرهم الإماراتي؟
   a) أقل من 3,000
   b) 3,000 - 5,999
   c) 6,000 - 9,999
   d) 10,000 - 14,999
   e) 15,000 - 19,999
   f) 20,000 - 24,999
   g) 25,000 - 34,999
   h) 35,000 - 44,999
   i) 45,000 - 54,999
   j) 55,000 and above
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6. To what Emirate do you belong (the Emirate of your passports issued from)?
   a) Abu Dhabi
   b) Dubai
   c) Sharjah
   d) Sharjah (Kalba, Khorfakan)
   e) Ajman
   f) Ras Al Khaimah
   g) Umm Al Quwain
   h) Fujairah

7. Which Emirate you are working in?
   a) Abu Dhabi
   b) Dubai

8. How many total employees are working in your company?
   a) 500 – 1000
   b) 1001 – 5000
   c) 5001 – 10000
   d) More than 10000

9. Number of years the organization has been in existence?
   a) Less than 10 years
   b) 10 - 20 years
   c) More than 20 years

10. Indicate the industry that best reflects your company’s operation?
    a) Government Entity
    b) Airlines/Aviation
    c) Mining and Metals
    d) Oil and Energy
    e) Other (Please specify): ...........................................

11. Your years of work experience in general?
    a) 1 year to below 5 years
    b) 5 years to below 10 years
    c) 10 years to below 15 years
    d) 15 years to below 20 years
    e) 20 years to below 25 years
    f) 25 years or more

12. Your years of work experience in this organization?
    a) 1 year to below 5 years
    b) 5 years to below 10 years
    c) 10 years to below 15 years
    d) 15 years to below 20 years
    e) 20 years to below 25 years
    f) 25 years or more
13. Have you been promoted since being hired by your organization?
   a) Yes
   b) No

14. How long ago did you receive your last promotion?
   a) Never
   b) Less than 1 year
   c) 1 - 2 years
   d) 3 - 4 years
   e) 5 - 6 years
   f) 7 years or more

15. Do you see yourself leaving this organization?
   a) In the next 6 months
   b) In the next year
   c) Within the next 5 years
   d) Other
   e) Never

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Your help in providing this information is greatly appreciated. If there is anything else you would like to tell us about please do so in the space provided below.

If you have any questions or comments on this research, please feel free to contact me on my email as972@uowmail.edu.au

If you have any questions or comments on this research, please feel free to contact me on my email as972@uowmail.edu.au
Appendix B
Descriptive Statistics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS1_TR</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>-.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS2_UN</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>-1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS3_CS</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>-1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS4_FP</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>-.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS5_TR</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>-.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS6_UN</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>-1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS7_CS</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>-1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS8_FP</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>-.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS9_TR</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>-.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS10_UN</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>-1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS11_CS</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>-1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS12_FP</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>-.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS13_TR</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>-.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS14_UN</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>-1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS15_CS</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>-.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS16_FP</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS17_TR</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>-.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS18_UN</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>-.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS19_CS</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>-1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS20_FP</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1.647</td>
<td>-.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom1</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>-1.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom2</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>-.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom3</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>-.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom4</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>-.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom5</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>-.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom6</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>-.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom7</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCom8</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>-.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrnOvr1</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>-.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrnOvr2</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>-.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrnOvr3</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>2.065</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str1_WE</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str2_WE</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str3_SC</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str4_SC</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>-.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str5_SC</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str6_SC</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>-.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str7_WE</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>1.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str8_WE</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Harman's one-factor test
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.450</td>
<td>37.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.309</td>
<td>8.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.015</td>
<td>7.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>4.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>3.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>2.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>2.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>2.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>2.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>1.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>1.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>1.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>1.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>1.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>1.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>1.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>