

Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Intention to Leave: A Study on Visiting Lecturers in Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM)

¹ *Ismael Abu-Jarad*, ² *Ammar Al-Qolaq* and ³ *David Nibkbin*

¹ Visting Senior Lecturer, School of Business Management, UUM

² PhD Candidate, Graduate School of Business, UUM

³ Independent Researcher, School of Management, USM

Abstract

Employee retention, the opposite of turnover, has been of importance to both researchers and practitioners. This study intended to answer the following questions (1) how satisfied are the visiting lecturers of UUM, (2) how committed are they to UUM, (3) do they have intention to leave in the short or the long run, and (4) do job satisfaction and organizational commitment impact intention to leave?. The study implemented a mixed methodology where both quantitative data and qualitative data were collected. Ninety eight (98) questionnaires were distributed and four interviews were conducted. Out of the 98 questionnaires, only 35 were returned and analysed. The quantitative data results showed that the majority of the visiting lecturers are satisfied (mean=6.2), quite committed (mean=5.7), their intention to stay is also noticeably high (mean5.2), and their intention to leave is quite low (mean3.05). In addition, the qualitative results also showed that the visiting lecturers were satisfied with their job. However, the interviewees showed some concern about the working culture (the absence of integration between local staff and visiting lecturers) and bureaucracy (time wasted to get things done). This study could serve as a reminder to UUM top management that taking care of the working culture and bureaucracy could contribute to more commitment and less turnover intention. It is worth mentioning that satisfying foreign lecturers who came from different cultures and who have different expectations could be a point of concern to UUM top management. It is important to merge the visiting lecturers into the system and make them feel they are part of the family so that they could be more committed and hence deliver more.

Key words: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to leave, visiting lecturers in UUM

Introduction

Job satisfaction is an antecedent to turnover intention. Whereas, employees are most likely to turnover when both their psychological well-being and their job satisfaction are low (Wright and Bonett, 2007), satisfaction with meaningful work and promotion opportunities were significant predictors of turnover intention (Wright and Bonett, 1992). Research results have shown job dissatisfaction to be associated with negative behavioural outcomes such as absenteeism, workplace accidents, and labour turnover (Griffeth, Horn, & Gaertner, 2000; Hellman, 1997; Hellriegel & Slocum, 2004; Newstrom, 2007; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2007).

Organizational commitment refers to an individual's feelings about the organization as a whole. It has become more important than ever in understanding employee behaviour because it is identified as more stable and less subject to daily fluctuations than job satisfaction (Angle and Perry, 1983; Mowday *et al.*, 1982). Organizational commitment can be generally defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification with, and involvement in, an organization (Mowday *et al.*, 1979; Meyer *et al.*, 2002). As an antecedent, it is noted that committed employees are less likely to leave the organization, as well as feel the need to go beyond normal job requirements. Committed employees also make a more significant and personal contribution to the organization, perform better, engage in organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) and are less likely to engage in unproductive or destructive behaviours (Meyer *et al.*, 1993, 2002).

Intention to leave (the attitude) is the turnover variable most often utilized in research (including this research). This is primarily due to turnover intention being the critical antecedent of actual turnover (the behaviour) (Steel and Ovalle, 1984), and because turnover intention is an attitude that can be sampled in the present and in conjunction with factors that are causing the turnover intention, resulting in a more accurate understanding of the causes. Furthermore, since managers can actively influence the factors causing employee's turnover intention, as the employee has not left the organization yet, understanding of turnover intention is of more value for managers. Therefore, studies which contribute to an understanding of the relationships between these variables are not simply of theoretical interest, but are also of considerable practical value to managers who are then able to address these factors in a preventative manner and avoid problems associated with the outcome of actual turnover.

In this study, we look into to what extent the visiting lecturers in UUM are satisfied, to what extent they are committed to UUM, and to what extent they intend to leave. Below are some relevant literature on the main variables of the study.

Job Satisfaction

Currall et al., (2005) found pay satisfaction to be positively related to performance and negatively related to employee turnover intentions. Similarly, the results of another study by Davis (2006) also showed general job satisfaction to be strongly and negatively related to turnover intentions ($r = -.69$). Job satisfaction has been shown to be the main predictor of turnover intention (Larrabee, et al., 2003; Parry, 2008).

According to Ghiselli, Lopa, and Bai (2001), the most important construct in attempting to understand turnover is job satisfaction.

Carayon *et al.* (2006) reported that turnover intention is influenced by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Koberg and Chusmir (1987) study revealed that innovative work climate is positively related to job satisfaction and negatively linked to intention to leave. Lum *et al.* (1998) suggested that job satisfaction has indirect influence on turnover intent while pay satisfaction has both direct and indirect impact, and that organizational commitment has the most direct effect on the rate of turnover.

Most researchers (Lambert *et al.*, 2001; Stone *et al.*, 2006) agreed that demographic characteristics and work environment factors considerably shape employee job satisfaction which accordingly shapes turnover intention. According to Lambert *et al.* (2001, p. 236), "[...] demographic characteristics are commonly included in job satisfaction studies as control variables". They found that age, tenure and education level or academic level shown to be major predictors of turnover, whereas marital status and race reported to be poor predictors of turnover. Thatcher *et al.* (2003) contended that gender and age are negative correlate of turnover. Carayon *et al.* (2006) reported in their study that turnover rate among women in technical sectors is higher than those of women in other fields.

Udo and Tor-Guimaraes (1997) found significant correlations between organizational commitment and intention to stay (correlation of 0,33) amongst 216 plant managers. The correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment also proved to be strong (0,46).

Durkin and Bennett (1999) reported studies where significant negative correlations were found between internalised commitment and turnover, as well as a positive correlation with longer tenure intentions.

Career satisfaction is another major factor that determines turnover. Career satisfaction is commonly assessed as a subjective career success that is defined by the individual's satisfaction with their career

accomplishments (Judge *et al.*, 1995). Significant predictors of career satisfaction include goal-specific environmental supports and resources, which provide social and material supports for employee's personal goals (Barnett and Bradley, 2007).

Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention are ones of the most examined popular subjects in the study of work related attitudes since the importance of organizational factors in affecting attitudes or behaviours of employees has attracted considerable attention on the organizational behaviour area (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1984, 1990; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986). In different studies, many researches and scholars examined the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention to see if there is any difference or not from the other studies, and to compare the differences if so. The majority of the studies suggested that job satisfaction has a significant and positive relationship with all dimensions of organizational commitment (Bagozzi, 1980; Reichers, 1985). Though the why and how question is still in question, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are jointed variables affecting negative outcomes such as turnover intention is clear (Shore and Martin, 1989).

Job satisfaction has been shown to be the main predictor of turnover intention (Larrabee, et al., 2003; Parry, 2008). Ding and Lin (2006) investigated the differences in job satisfaction and turnover intention between Taiwanese and U.S. hospital employees. They found that the negative direct effect of job satisfaction on turnover intentions and the indirect effect through organizational commitment are stronger for U.S. hospital employees than for Taiwanese hospital employees. Job satisfaction has important consequences for both organizations and their employees. Satisfied workers perform their jobs better (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001), are less likely to engage in counterproductive behaviours (Chen & Spector, 1992). Job satisfaction has been shown to be closely related to intentions to leave an organization (Chen & Spector, 1992) and turnover intentions (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983; Coomer & Barriball, 2007). Job satisfaction also was shown to be associated with employee health and psychological well-being. In a meta-analysis, Hellman (1997) showed that the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave was significant and consistently negative. Hellman's findings support those of Price and Mueller, (1981) and Cavanagh and Coffin (1992), that increasing job satisfaction subsequently decreases rates of turnover intentions. Studies show that job satisfaction is related to satisfaction with life in general (Lance, Lautenschlage, Sloan, & Varca 1989).

Organizational commitment

As an outcome, organizational commitment has been found to arise from positive work experiences, job satisfaction, trust in management, and attractive remuneration and rewards (Meyer *et al.*, 2002). Research in this area reports a strong relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, specifically that higher levels of commitment result in lower levels of intention to leave, therefore lower turnover (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Falkenburg and Schyns, 2007; Bentein *et al.*, 2005; Good *et al.*, 1996; Harris and Cameron, 2005; Huselid, 1995; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Organizational commitment is one of the predictors of turnover intention (Arnold and Feldman, 1982; Hollenbeck and Williams, 1986).

Organizational commitment refers to an individual's feelings about the organization as a whole. It has become more important than ever in understanding employee behaviour because it is identified as more stable and less subject to daily fluctuations than job satisfaction (Angle and Perry, 1983; Mowday *et al.*, 1982).

Committed employees also make a more significant and personal contribution to the organization, perform better, engage in organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) and are less

likely to engage in unproductive or destructive behaviours (Meyer *et al.*, 1993, 2002). As an outcome, organizational commitment has been found to arise from positive work experiences, job satisfaction, trust in management, and attractive remuneration and rewards (Meyer *et al.*, 2002). Finally, research has also found relationships between high-commitment human resource policies and positive organizational outcomes, such as overall organizational productivity, quality and profitability (Huselid, 1995; MacDuffie, 1995). As such, organizational commitment is considered an important employee quality for organizations as it is indicative of a more stable, engaged and higher performing employee.

Turnover intention is defined as the mediating factor between attitudes affecting intent to quit and actually quitting an organization (Glissmeyer, Bishop, & Fass, 2008). In a meta-analysis of the antecedents and correlates to employee turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000), intention to quit, job satisfaction, and organizational support were shown to be predictors of employee turnover. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1979) defined organizational commitment as a strong belief in the organization's goals and values and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization. Commitment to organization is linked to very important work-related factors: employee turnover, absenteeism and performance (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Romzek, 1990). Organizational commitment is regularly conceptualized as an affective attachment to an organization as a consequence of an individual sharing the organization's values, their desire to remain in the organization, and their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Previous examinations of commitment reveal that it deals with the individual's identification and involvement with an organization (Porter *et al.*, 1974). When thought of this way, commitment is beyond passive loyalty, it involves an active relationship wherein individuals are willing to give of themselves to contribute to the organization's well-being (Mowday *et al.*, 1979). The most commonly accepted thoughts on commitment are that it is an indicator of employees who are strongly committed to an organization and are least likely to leave, hence it is a psychological state that binds an individual to an organization (Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990). As a psychological state commitment is then characterized as an employees' relationship with the organization and the decision the employee makes to continue membership in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Committed employees are willing to go beyond the minimum requirements of their duties and are more likely to remain with the organization than uncommitted employees (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In 1987, Meyer and Allen developed a commitment model with three measures of commitment that conform to previous researcher's conceptualization of commitment. The components were labeled affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Continuance commitment is so named because the employee feels the need to stay due to the potential loss of things such as benefits if they choose to leave and their lack of alternative employment and they are aware of the costs associated with leaving the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer *et al.*, 1990). Normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to remain with the organization. Employees have been taught through socialization that the organization expects their loyalty (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer *et al.*, 1990). Research indicates employees with a strong sense of normative commitment positively correlate to work behaviours such as job performance, work attendance and organizational citizenship. They may not display the same enthusiasm or involvement as employees with affective commitment; however they may have an important impact on the way in which the work is accomplished (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Research results have shown job dissatisfaction to be associated with negative behavioural outcomes such as absenteeism, workplace accidents, and labour turnover (Griffeth, Horn, & Gaertner, 2000; Hellman, 1997; Hellriegel & Slocum, 2004; Newstrom, 2006; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2007). Currall *et al.*, (2005) found pay satisfaction to be positively related to performance and negatively related to employee turnover intentions

Organizational commitment is regarded as a multi-dimensional construct, consisting of affective, normative and continuance commitment (CC) (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Meyer *et al.*, 2002). A detailed description of these three dimensions and their finer details will not be highlighted here as this has been

done extensively by the aforementioned authors and many others. In brief summary, affective commitment (AC) relates to an attachment based on a sharing of values with other members of the organization, while normative commitment (NC) is a sense of obligation to an organization. CC is based on the perception that an employee has no realistic choice or viable alternatives other than to remain with the organization. In this conceptualization then, organizational commitment is clearly related to choices about remaining with, or planning to leave, an organization.

Turnover Intention

In the field of HRD and OD, career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention are frequently used variables for satisfaction, performance, change, and innovation. Although there are diverse studies exploring the relationships among career satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention (Lambert *et al.*, 2001; Shields and Ward, 2001), little research has been conducted, focusing on the common antecedents of three variables simultaneously to reflect the dynamics in organizations

Research in this area reports a strong relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, specifically that higher levels of commitment result in lower levels of intention to leave, therefore lower turnover (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Falkenburg and Schyns, 2007; Bentein *et al.*, 2005; Good *et al.*, 1996; Harris and Cameron, 2005; Huselid, 1995; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Organizational commitment is one of the predictors of turnover intention (Arnold and Feldman, 1982; Hollenbeck and Williams, 1986).

The antecedents of turnover intention. A number of HRM practices have been suggested as potential solutions for turnover, such as investment in training, offering organizational support, adopting innovative recruitment and selection processes, offering better career opportunities (Cheng and Brown, 1998; Forrier and Sels, 2003; Hinkin and Tracey, 2000; Walsh and Taylor, 2007; Walters and Raybould, 2007) and adopting measures to increase job satisfaction and commitment (Aksu, 2004).

Labour turnover is not only a significant tangible dollar cost but also an intangible or “hidden” cost associated with loss of skills, inefficiency and replacement costs (Lashley and Chaplain, 1999). Lashley (2000) refers to lost investment in training and lost staff expertise as particular examples of turnover costs and opportunity costs. Some scholars point to more intangible transaction “costs” of labour turnover associated with organizational behaviour and related “hygiene factors” such as work reutilization, role conflict, poor job satisfaction, low morale, poor commitment, corrosive supervision/leadership and a lack of career development that impact on employee productivity, effectiveness, quality and hotel service standards (Deery and Iverson, 1994; Davidson *et al.*, 2001a, b, c; O’Connell and Kung, 2007). Empirical evidence has shown that lost productivity resulting from staff turnover may account for more than two-thirds of the total turnover cost (Hinkin and Tracey, 2008).

A reduction in employee turnover would be a significant factor in reducing hotel costs and improving labour productivity. Yet, managing and accounting for turnover remains a vexed question for hotels as there is no single point of accountability within or between departments. There appears to be few successful strategies to achieve improved labour turnover and the hotel accountability structure remains relatively weak. The HRM budget generally covers direct costs of turnover (Davidson *et al.*, 2006). This is most likely because the cost of staff turnover falls outside the conventional accounting practices within hotels. This practice signifies lost accountability and diminished internal organizational visibility for this cost. The lost accountability issue is exacerbated when it is recognised that the cause of the cost originates from a different accountability unit (i.e. the area of the organization where the employee works) to the unit that incurs much of the cost associated with staff turnover (HRM).

Currall et al., (2005) found pay satisfaction to be positively related to performance and negatively related to employee turnover intentions. Similarly, the results of another study by Davis (2006) also showed general job satisfaction to be strongly and negatively related to turnover intentions ($r = -.69$). Job satisfaction has been shown to be the main predictor of turnover intention (Larrabee, et al., 2003; Parry, 2008).

A number of HRM practices have been suggested as potential solutions for turnover, such as investment in training, offering organizational support, adopting innovative recruitment and selection processes, offering better career opportunities (Cheng and Brown, 1998; Forrier and Sels, 2003; Hinkin and Tracey, 2000; Walsh and Taylor, 2007; Walters and Raybould, 2007) and adopting measures to increase job satisfaction and commitment (Aksu, 2004).

Empirical evidence has shown that lost productivity resulting from staff turnover may account for more than two-thirds of the total turnover cost (Hinkin and Tracey, 2008). As turnover increases, service quality may decline as it takes time and resources to “back fill” departing employees, especially at busy hotels (Lynn, 2002).

Methodology

This study looked into the impact of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on intention to leave. This study implemented a mixed methodology where both quantitative and qualitative data were obtained from the visiting lecturers in UUM. As for the quantitative data, a questionnaire was designed to measure the 3 variables. Four items were used to measure each of the 3 variables of the study.

Measurement

Out of the 4 items used to measure job satisfaction, 2 items were adopted from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire by Commann, Fichman, Jekins, and Lesh (1979) and 2 items were adopted from a 3-item scale developed by Friedman and Greenhaus (2001). These items were used to measure global job satisfaction.

Organizational Commitment was measured using Allen and Meyer's (1990,1996) Affective Commitment Scale. Affective commitment was chosen because it refers to the involvement and attachment to the organization/company. That is to say, the employee remains with the company / organization because he or she wants.

In this study, Intention to leave was defined as occurring when ‘ the employee decides to leave the organization at some unspecified point in the future’ (Sager, Griffeth, & Hom, 1998, p.225). This definition is based on a model proposed by Mobley (1977, s cited in Sager et al., 1998), where the construct ‘ thinking of quitting’ is directly related to ‘ intention to search’ , which directly related to ‘ intention to quit’ or intention to leave, which is related to turnover. Three items were used to evaluate thoughts and intention to leave the organization developed by Chapman (1991) e.g. ‘ I would prefer another more ideal job than the one I now work in’). Chapman noted a principle components analysis of the measure yielded one factor. One item was added by Odle-Dusseau (2008) to assess a more behavioral competent of intention to leave. The item was ‘ I am presently seeking to change jobs.

Data Collection

Both quantitative and qualitative data were obtained in this study. As for the quantitative data, out of 98 questionnaire sent by e-mail, 12 were obtained and out of 50 questionnaires that were self-administered, only 23 were obtained. The total number of questionnaires obtained was 35 out of 98, which makes a response rate of 35.71%.

As for the qualitative data, four interviews were held with four visiting lecturers from different countries. All four interviewees were from outside Malaysia.

Results and Data Analysis

Below are the results of the data analysis. Descriptive analysis, reliability analysis, correlation analysis, and regression analysis were used to obtain the results below.

Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was used to ensure that all items used in each variable are free from error, therefore, providing consistent results. The reliabilities of scales used were assessed through determination of Cronbach's alpha. In general, reliabilities of more than 0.7 are good (Hair et al., 2006). The Cronbach's alpha obtained for this current study were conducted job satisfaction, commitment, intention to leave and intention to stay and are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Reliability Coefficients for the Major Variables

| Variable | Number of items | Items dropped | Cronbach Alpha |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Jon Satisfaction | 4 | - | 0.83 |
| Commitment | 4 | - | 0.82 |
| Intention to Leave | 2 | - | 0.68 |
| Intention to Stay | 2 | - | 0.90 |

Correlation Analysis

Table 2 represents the correlation matrix among the operationalized variables in this study. These bivariate correlations allow for preliminary inspection and information regarding hypothesized relationships. In addition to that, correlation matrix gives information regarding test for the presence of multicollinearity. The table shows that no correlations near 1.0 (0.8 or 0.9) were detected, which indicate that multicollinearity is not a significant problem in this particular data set. Hair et al., (2006) highlighted, high correlation (more than 0.8) between variables will lead to multicollinearity problem and is not recommended regression analysis to be performed. Finally, Table 3 proved the existence of the correlation between independent variables and dependent variable.

Table 3
Pearson Correlations of Study Variables

| Variable | Jon Satisfaction | Commitment | Intention to Leave | Intention to Stay |
|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Jon Satisfaction | 1 | | | |
| Commitment | .614** | 1 | | |
| Intention to Leave | -.702** | -.504** | 1 | |
| Intention to Stay | .384* | .325 | -.163 | 1 |

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis was conducted in subsequent to the validation and reliability processes to ascertain the mean scores and standard deviations for the variables. Based on 35 valid cases being analyzed for all the variables namely independent and dependent, the statistic output as depicted in Table 4 was derived.

All the variables were measured using a 7-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree, which is weighted as 1, to strongly agree, weighted as 7. From the result it was found that most of the variables were more on the right scale on the 7-point Likert scale. The close mean score with each construct show each construct is closely related and warrant further statistical testing to understand how these constructs are related to each other.

Table 4
Descriptive for the Major Variables

| Variable | Mean | STD |
|--------------------|------|------|
| Jon Satisfaction | 6.20 | .967 |
| Commitment | 5.71 | 1.02 |
| Intention to Leave | 3.05 | 1.47 |
| Intention to Stay | 5.25 | 1.64 |

As of October 27th, there are 98 visiting lecturers in UUM. Out of these 98 visiting lecturers, 24 are full professors (VK7), but 2 out of the 24 are distinguished visiting professors, 11 of them are associate professors (DS53), 57 of them are visiting senior lecturers (DS51) and 5 of them are senior lecturers (DS52) and only 1 as a lecturer.

Out of the 98 visiting lecturers in UUM, there are only 12 females (12.24%) compared to 86 males (87.75%).

As for the country of origin, the majority of the visiting lecturers came from Indonesia (18.36%). Table 6 below highlights the country of origin of the visiting lecturers.

Hypothesis Testing

As can be seen from table 5 all hypothesized relationships were supported. Hypotheses 1 predicts that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of regression equation testing this relationship show that job satisfaction explained 37 percent of the total variance of organizational commitment and it was positively related. In addition, hypothesis 2 and 3 examining the relationship between commitment and intention to leave and intention to stay were supported as can be seen in table 5. Finally, hypotheses 4 and 5 examining the relationship between job satisfaction and both intention to leave and intention to stay were supported as well. The detailed results of regression analysis are present in table 5.

Table 5
Hypothesis Testing Results

| Path | Description | Hypothesis | Beta Coefficient | t-value | Supported |
|--------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------------|---------|-----------|
| JB→COM | Job Satisfaction→ Commitment | H1 | 0.614 | 4.465 | YES |
| COM→LI | Commitment→ Intention to Leave | H2 | -0.504*** | -3.354 | YES |
| COM→RI | Commitment→ Intention to Stay | H3 | 0.325* | 1.974 | YES |
| JB→LI | Job Satisfaction→ Intention to Leave | H4 | -0.702*** | -5.656 | YES |
| JB→RI | Job Satisfaction → Intention to Stay | H5 | 0.384*** | 2.391 | YES |

Table 6: Country of Origin

| Name of country | Number of visiting lecturers |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Indonesia | 18 |
| India | 14 |
| Nigeria | 10 |
| Yemen | 7 |
| Pakistan | 6 |
| Bangladesh | 6 |
| USA | 6 |
| South Korea | 2 |
| Malaysian | 5 |
| Uganda | 3 |
| The Philippines | 4 |
| Iran | 2 |
| Australia | 2 |
| UK | 2 |
| Japan | 1 |
| Sri Lanka | 1 |
| Palestine | 1 |
| Zimbabwe | 1 |
| Jordan | 1 |
| Egypt | 1 |
| Sweden | 1 |
| Canada | 1 |
| Ieland | 1 |
| Iraq | 1 |
| Singapore | 1 |

Qualitative Data Results

A non-direct question, which was ‘ Please tell us about your experience and how you feel about UUM’ ? Below are the transcripts of the answers to the question mentioned above.

Interviewee 1

Well, by and large, I am happy in UUM. The pay is ok. The people around here are kind. The weather is nice compared to my country; it is warm. The work load is not that bad; however, there are few things that are bothering me. **One of these things is the working culture. People seem not bothering about what you are areas of research are.** I have been here for about a year, no one even asked me or tried to get to know what my areas of expertise are. I felt **as if I am a stranger to others in the school.** Another thing is **bureaucracy** here. It takes too much time to get something settled. I believe UUM top management has got to know something about these few things.

Interviewee 2

I Joined UUM before more than one year. I think it is good to work here. People are kind. They smile to you and the pay is ok, al hamdu lellah. But, the teaching load is heavy. There is no time for research. I am not happy because compared to local lecturers who have many PhD students, I don't have any so far. It is not fair, my colleague has just joined this semester and they appointed him as a second supervisor while I have been here for almost one year, they have not appointed me any. It is unfair. Why is that so? My local colleagues are nice, **but I feel like a stranger.** It could be how I feel, but this is how I feel. Oh, one more thing I don't like is **bureaucracy.** Too **much time is needed for them to settle one thing.** I hope they will take better care of us as visiting lecturers.

Interviewee 3

I Joined UUM about one and a half years ago. There are many facilities around here that you can utilize. I do go swimming, I play soccer, I go cycling. I just love the environment. Some people refer to UUM as a jungle. I always respond by saying ‘ what a beautiful jungle it is’. Well, people are nice though some can just stab you from behind badly if they decide to. I could see that people here are more curious to know about you more than people in KL, for instance. **Unfortunately, they never tried to know what you are doing academically.** They care to know more about your personal life. Nevertheless, I was lucky to be surrounded by caring people, nice ones.

As for the work here, it is good. But there are few things that I hope will improve by time. **I still remember I had to wait for more than 3 months to get my name card. Three months!!! I was wondering why it had to take 3 months to settle a name card.** I went to the main office of the school more than 7 times reminding the officer to get it done. Moreover, as an expatriate (visiting lecturer) here, **I feel I am not part of the family.** There are so many people in the school and faculty who thought I have just joined. We never met. There was no meeting organized for me to get to know other colleagues of mine in the same department even. I was wondering what is wrong ? **Is it the culture?** I did feel a stranger till I decided to break the ice a bit by bit. It is truly hard to get into their circles.

Interviewee 4

I encountered three problems here at UUM.

First, **the leaders and managers isolate themselves from the faculty.** The only interaction is when they demand documents. **The staff and managers treat us like we are custodians. I see no resemblance to a family atmosphere here at UUM.**

Second, UUM has a very complex bureaucracy with many forms. I have trouble finding people who can explain things to me. Everyone acts as if everything is known and easy, but I am a foreigner. I could not even get a straight answer about the end date on my contract. I almost hopped on a plane to flee this nightmare we call UUM.

Third, UUM has evolved into a bureaucratic **nightmare**. Everything requires multiple forms that take the administration weeks to process. Everything from time off, applying for reimbursing, approval to submit research articles, etc.

Discussion and Conclusion

The quantitative results showed that the majority of the visiting lecturers are satisfied (mean=6.2), quite committed (mean=5.7), their intention to stay is also noticeably high (mean5.2), and their intention to leave is quite low (mean3.05). In addition, the qualitative results also showed that the visiting lecturers were satisfied with their job. However, the interviewees showed some concern about the working culture and bureaucracy. This study could serve as a reminder to UUM top management that taking care of the working culture and bureaucracy could contribute to more commitment and less turnover intention. It is worth mentioning that satisfying foreign lecturers who came from different cultures and who have different expectations could be a point of concern to UUM top management. It is important to merge the visiting lecturers into the system and make them feel they are part of the family so that they could be more committed and hence deliver more. In addition, correlation and regression analyses also indicated that there was a relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to leave or stay. This highlights the importance of making sure the visiting lecturers are satisfied so that they become committed and hence likes to stay longer in UUM.

Comparing the quantitative to the qualitative data results, it is seen that there are some similarities in terms of satisfaction. However, the qualitative data results revealed few issues concerning satisfaction and hence intention to leave.

All interviewees stressed the importance of being integrated within the local environment. Four of them shed light on the working culture, which must reflect working with local staff as a family. They were all unhappy about being treated as strangers, as they described it. The other issue they highlighted was bureaucracy and the time wasted to get something settled. This result should serve as a feedback to UUM management so that certain steps are taken to ensure visiting lecturers are more integrated with the local staff, both academic and non-academic.

References

- Aksu, A.A. (2004), "Turnover costs: research among five-star hotels in the city of Antalya, Turkey", *Tourism Analysis*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 207-17.
- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990), "The measurement of antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 1-18.
- Angle, H. and Perry, J. (1983), "Organizational commitment: individual and organizational influences", *Work and Occupations*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 123-46.
- Arnold, H.J. and Feldman, D.C. (1982), "A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 67 No. 3, pp. 350-60.

- Bagozzi, R. P. (1980). Performance and Satisfaction in an Industrial Sales Forces: An Examination of Their Antecedents and Simultaneity. *Journal of Marketing*, 15(4), 65-67.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1249978>
- Barnett, R.B. and Bradley, L. (2007), "The impact of organizational support for career development on career satisfaction", *Career Development International*, Vol. 12 No. 7, pp. 617-36.
- Bell, N.E. and Staw, B.M. (1989), "People as sculptors versus sculpture: the role of personality and personal control in organizations", in Arthur, M.B., Hall, D.T. and Lawrence, B.S. (Eds), *The Handbook of Career Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 232-51.
- Bentein, K., Vandenberg, R., Vandenberghe, C. and Stinglhamber, F. (2005), "The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: a latent growth modeling approach", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 90 No. 3, pp. 468-82.
- Carayon, P., Schoepke, J., Hoonakker, P., Haims, M. and Brunette, M. (2006), "Evaluating causes and consequences of turnover intention among IT workers: the development of a questionnaire survey", *Behaviour & Information Technology*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 381-97.
- Cavanagh, S., & Coffin, D. (1992). Staff turnover among hospital nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 17, 1369-1376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.1992.tb01861.x>
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1991). Negative affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(3), 398-407.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.398>
- Cheng, A. and Brown, A. (1998), "HRM strategies and labour turnover in the hotel industry: a comparative study of Australia and Singapore", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 136-54.
- Coomber, B., & Barriball, K. L. (2007). Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital-based nurses: A review of the research literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44(2), 297-314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.02.004>
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay Satisfaction and Organizational Outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 613-640.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00245.x>
- Davidson, M., Guilding, C. and Timo, N. (2006), "Employment, flexibility and labour market practices of domestic and MNC chain luxury hotels in Australia: where has the accountability gone?", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 193-210.

- Davidson, M., Manning, M. and Timo, N. (2001a), "Are customer satisfaction and performance in hotels influenced by organisational climate?", *Australian Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 41-54.
- Davidson, M., Manning, M., Ryder, P. and Timo, N. (2001b), "Organisational climate, perceived customer satisfaction and revenue per available room in four- to five-star Australian hotels", *Tourism Analysis*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 123-37.
- Davis, P. J. (2006). In search of the common wealth: A service-profit chain for the public sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 55(2), 163-172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17410400610641735>
- Deery, M. and Iverson, R. (1994), "Predicting organizational and union commitment: the effect of industrial relations climate", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 581-97.
- Durkin, M. & Bennett, H. (1999), Employee commitment in retail banking, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 17 (3), pp 124-134
- Egan, T.M., Yang, B. and Bartlett, K.R. (2004), "The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 279-301.
- Falkenburg, K. and Schyns, B. (2007), "Work satisfaction, organizational commitment and withdrawal behaviors", *Management Research News*, Vol. 30 No. 10, pp. 708-23.
- Forrier, A. and Sels, L. (2003), "Flexibility, turnover and training", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 148-68.
- Ghiselli, R.F., La Lopa, J.M. and Bai, B. (2001), "Job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and turnover intent among food-service managers", *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 28-37.
- Glissmeyer, M., Bishop J. W., & Fass, R. D. (2008). Role conflict, role ambiguity and intention to quit the organization: The case of law enforcement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- Good, L.K., Page, T.J.J. and Young, C.E. (1996), "Assessing hierarchical differences in job-related attitudes and turnover among retail managers", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 27-36.
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463-488.

- Harris, G.E. and Cameron, J.E. (2005), "Multiple dimensions of organizational identification and commitment as predictors of turnover intentions and psychological wellbeing", *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 159-69.
- Hellman, C. M. (1997). Job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 137(6), 667-689. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224549709595491>
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (2004). *Organizational behavior*. Thomson, South-Western.
- Hinkin, T. and Tracey, J. (2000), "The cost of turnover: putting a price on the learning curve", *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp.
- Hinkin, T. and Tracey, J. (2008), "Contextual factors and cost profiles associated with employee turnover", *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 12-27.
- Hollenbeck, J. and Williams, C. (1986), "Turnover functionality versus turnover frequency: a note on work attitudes and organisational effectiveness", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71 No. 3, pp. 606-11.
- Huselid, M.A. (1995), "The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 635-72.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
- Judge, T.A. and Bretz, R.D. (1994), "Political influence behavior and career success", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 43-65.
- Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Boudreau, J.W. and Bretz, R.D. (1995), "An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 485-519.
- Koberg, S.C. and Chusmir, H.L. (1987), "Organizational culture relationships with creativity and other job-related variables", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 15, pp. 397-409.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, M. S. (2001). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intent: A Test of a Structural Model Using a National sample of Workers. *The Social Science Journal*, 38(2), 233-250. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319\(01\)00110-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319(01)00110-0)
- Lance, C. E., Lautenschlager, G. T., Sloan, C. E., & Varca, P. E. (1989). A comparison between

- bottom-up, top-down and bi-directional models of relationships between global and life facet satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*, 57, 601-624. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1989.tb00565.x>
- Larrabee, J. H., Janney, M. A., Ostrow, C. L., Withrow, M. L., Hobbs, G. R., & Burant, C. (2003). Predicting registered nurse job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 33, 271-283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200305000-00003>
- Lashley, C. and Chaplain, A. (1999), "Labour turnover: hidden problem – hidden costs", *The Hospitality Review*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 49-54.
- Lashley, C. (2000), *Hospitality Retail Management: A Unit Manager's Handbook*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F. and Sirol, W. (1998), "Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 19, pp. 305-20.
- MacDuffie, J.P. (1995), "Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry", *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 197-221.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61–89.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1984). Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372–378.
- Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Gellatly, I. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 710-20.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. and Smith, C.A. (1993), "Commitment to organizations and occupations: extensions and test of a three-component conceptualization", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 538-51.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnysky, L. (2002), "Affective, continuance,

- and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 61, pp. 20-52.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York : Academic Press.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979), “The measurement of organizational commitment”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 14, pp. 224-47.
- Newstrom, J. W. (2007). *Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work* (12th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- O’Connell, M. and Kung, M.-C. (2007), “The cost of employee turnover”, executive summary, *Industrial Management*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 14-19.
- O’Reilly, C. III., & Chatman, J. (1986). *Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492>
- Parry, J. (2008). *Intention to leave the profession: antecedents and role in nurse turnover*, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 64(2), 157-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04771.x>
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). *Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). *A causal model of turnover for nurses*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 543-563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/255574>
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). *A Review and Reconceptualization of Organizational Commitment*. *Academy of Management*, 10, 465-476.
- Rhoades, L. and Eisenberger, R. (2002), “Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 4, pp. 698-714.
- Romzek, B. (1990). *Employee Investment and Commitment: The Ties that Bind*. *Public Administration Review*, 50, 374-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/976619>
- Rusbult, C., & Farrell, D. (1983). *A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover of variations in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.3.429>

- Shields, M.A. and Ward, M. (2001), "Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: the impact of job satisfaction on intentions to quit", *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 677-701.
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2007). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Labor Turnover by Gender: An Analysis for Switzerland. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(6), 895-913. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2007.01.022>
- Steel, R.P. and Ovalle, N.K. (1984), "A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 69 No. 4, pp. 673-86.
- Stone, W.P., Larson, L.E., Mooney-Kane, C., Janice, X.L. and Susan, W.D. (2006), "Organizational climate and intensive care unit nurses' intention to leave", *Crit. Care Med.*, Vol. 34 No. 7, pp. 1907-12.
- Thatcher, J., Stepina, L. and Boyle, R. (2003), "Turnover of information technology workers: examining empirically the influence of attitudes, job characteristics, and external markets", *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 231-61.
- Udo, G., Guimaraes, T. and Igbaria, M. (1997), "An investigation of the antecedents of turnover intention for manufacturing plant managers", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 17 No. 9, pp. 912-30.
- Walsh, K. and Taylor, M.S. (2007), "Developing in-house careers and retaining management talent: what do hospitality professionals want from their jobs?", *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 163-82.
- Walters, G. and Raybould, M. (2007), "Burnout and perceived organisational support among front-line hospitality employees", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 144-56.
- Wright, T.A. and Bonett, D.G. (1992), "The effect of turnover on work satisfaction and mental health: support for a situational perspective", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 603-15.
- Wright, T.A. and Bonett, D.G. (2007), "Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as nonadditive predictors of workplace turnover", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 141-60.