

Relationship among Organizational Commitment, Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention within Kindergartens: An Empirical Study in Malaysia

Kang-Lin Chao

Assistant Professor, Division of General Education, Yung-Ta Institute of Technology and commerce

Abstract

The stability of kindergarten teachers influences teaching quality and the continued enrollment of students. This study investigated organizational commitment, job characteristics, job satisfaction, and the influence of these variables on turnover intentions in the kindergartens of Malaysia. Multiple regressions and a path analysis were used to explore relationships among variables. The results can be summarized as follows: (1) teacher responses showed little variance when sorted by age and tenure; (2) organizational commitment and job characteristics explained a significant proportion of variance in job satisfaction scores; (3) organizational commitment, job characteristics, and job satisfaction negatively and significantly predicted turnover intention. Kindergarten administrators can use the findings and implications of this study to increase job satisfaction and decrease turnover.

Keywords: organizational commitment, job characteristics, job satisfaction, turnover intention, kindergarten teacher, Malaysia

I . Introduction

Based on job characteristics, jobs with more challenges and changes that give employees greater autonomy will inspire employees, enhancing job satisfaction and reducing resignation rates. Among these, job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment play critically important roles for the success of kindergarten management. With shrinking birth rates amplifying competitive pressure, kindergarten administrators face management issues such as how to improve job characteristics, how to ensure employee job satisfaction, how to increase organizational commitment, and thus lower turnover rates. If employee satisfaction is high and turnover rates are low, kindergarten administrators can create competitive advantages and reach the ultimate goal of establishing a reputable and long-standing educational institution.

Contemporary educational theory holds that one of the pivotal causes of inadequate school performance is the inability of schools to adequately staff classroom with qualified teachers. The theory also holds that these school staffing problems are primarily due to shortages of teachers. Moreover, the data show that the amount of turnover retirement accounts for is relatively minor when compared to turnover associated with other factors, such as job dissatisfaction and pursuing other jobs (Ingersoll, 2001). Concern over teacher shortage has also created the impetus for empirical research on teacher supply and demand. In particular, over the past two decades a substantial body of empirical analysis has focused on teacher turnover: the departure of teachers from their teaching jobs (Grissmer & Kirby, 1987, 1992, 1997; Heyns, 1988; Murnane, 1981; Murnane, 1987; Ingersoll, 2001).

II . Turnover

Employee turnover is especially consequential in organizations that have uncertain and non-routine technologies and production processes requiring extensive interaction among participants. Such organizations are often unusually dependent upon commitment and cohesion among employees and management and, hence, are vulnerable to employee turnover (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Kanter, 1977; Likert, 1967; Porter, Lawler & Hackman, 1975; Turner & Lawrence, 1965; Walton, 1980; Ingersoll, 2001).

Kindergartens are such organizations because both student-teacher and parent-teacher relationships need cohesion. In addition, teaching experience and teaching skill are important

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

because classrooms are dynamic environments: they learning atmosphere changes with each lesson, student, question, and reply (Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, & Wiliam, 2004). Thus high rates of teacher turnover are of concern not only because they may be an outcome indicating underlying problems in how well schools function, but also because they can be disruptive, in and of themselves, to the quality of the school community and the school's educational performance (Ingersoll, 2001).

III . *Turnover Intention*

Turnover intention has been described as the last in a sequence of withdrawal cognitions, a set of cognitions including thinking of quitting and the intent to search for alternative employment (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Teacher turnover possibility factors, including factors tied to organizational characteristics, were investigated and when the characteristics of the working environment satisfied their needs, teachers reported low turnover intentions (Bright, 2008). Ingersoll (2001) suggested that after controlling for the characteristics of both teachers and schools, inadequate support from the school administration, student discipline problems, limited faculty input into school decision-making, and to a lesser extent, low salaries, were all associated with higher rates of turnover.

IV . *Job Satisfaction*

Job satisfaction has been conceptualized as the difference between workers' subjective expectations of task natures, relationships, and environment, and the objective reality of the overall tasks and remuneration (Porter & Lawler, 1968). The developers of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) defined three dimensions of job satisfaction: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and global satisfaction.

Intrinsic satisfaction refers to the task natures (factors) that directly correlate with satisfaction from sense of achievement, self-esteem, autonomy, feedback, and sense of good control. Extrinsic satisfaction refers to the task natures that indirectly correlate with satisfaction from excellent work environment, affirmation and praise from superiors, esprit de corps, good benefits, high pay, and opportunities for advancement. Global satisfaction refers to employees' overall satisfaction towards their job and is measured as the combination of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction.

Job satisfaction also has important economic effects because low employee efficiency will

translate into low productivity for the organization; hours lost equates to money lost (Freeman, 1978). For teachers, low efficiency is manifested in disengaged teaching and less patience with students (Ingersoll, 2001). On the other hand, teachers appear able to integrate professional knowledge (subject matter and pedagogy), interpersonal knowledge (human relationships), and intrapersonal knowledge (ethics and reflective capacity) when they are satisfied with their job (Collinson, 1996; Connell & Ryan, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1989). In addition, low job satisfaction is associated with higher rates of quitting (Freeman, 1978; Gordon and Denisi, 1995; Clark, Georgellis, & Sanfey, 1988; Mohr & Zoghi, 2008) and higher rates of absenteeism (Clegg, 1983; Drago and Wooden, 1992). Thus it is hypothesized that job satisfaction will have a significant negative relationship with turnover intentions (Hypothesis 3a).

V. Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined as a psychological link between the employee and the organization that makes it less likely the employee will voluntarily leave the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Meyer and Allen (1991) empirically synthesized organizational commitment research into a multidimensional model with the three dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment.

Affective commitment is an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in an organization. Affective commitment has been found to be favorable for individual and organizational outcomes in terms of satisfaction (Gautam, Van, Wagner, 2004; Trimble, 2006). Continuance commitment is an employee's perceptions of the costs associated with leaving an organization. Continuance commitment arises from the recognition that one would lose valued benefits, such as pension and insurance premiums, upon leaving the organization (Becker, 1960). Normative commitment is an employee's feelings of obligation to remain in his or her organization. Normative commitment usually denotes a willingness to remain with an organization due to a sense of moral obligation (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wiener, 1982).

That job satisfaction develops from organizational commitment and has received considerable empirical support (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Dossett & Suszko, 1989). Satisfaction can come from learning, problem-solving, inter-group cooperation, and doing a good job. All of these relationships imply that jobs with a high degree of employee involvement increase satisfaction (Mohr & Zoghi,

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

2008). Thus it is assumed that the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment will be positive and significant (Hypothesis 2a).

Commitment to the organization may develop prior to entry or at least may be evident in the early stages of employment, indicating that changes in commitment can be expected to have only indirect influence on turnover (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Thus it is hypothesized that although organizational commitment will have a significantly negative relationship with turnover intentions, the effect will be indirect (Hypothesis 3b).

VI. Job Characteristics

The definition of job characteristics for this study refers to the attributes of a job. Turner and Lawrence (1965) conjectured that employees prefer jobs with high complexity and challenges. Hackman and Oldham (1975) suggested that job characteristics influence personal job performance through individual psychological perceptions. They asserted that jobs differ in the extent to which they involve five core dimensions: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and task feedback.

Skill variety is the degree to which a job allows employees to undertake a wide range of options in their work. Task identity refers to whether a task yields a feeling of completeness and who is recognized for the achievement after a task is done. Task significance is the extent of influence a job's completion has on the employee's life or job. Autonomy is the extent to which employees have a say in scheduling their work and freedom to do what they want on the job. Feedback refers to the extent to which completing a task provides understandable and timely performance feedback.

Regarding the five core characteristics, task significance, autonomy and feedback were found to directly influence job satisfaction (Bhuian, Al-shammari, & Jefri, 1996), while skill variety and task significance merely had significant effects on job satisfaction (Bhuian, Al-shammari, & Jefri, 1996; Reiner & Zhao, 1999). Thus it is hypothesized that job characteristics positively and significantly influence job satisfaction (Hypothesis 2b).

If jobs are designed to increase the presence of these five core characteristics, employees are more likely to experience three critical psychological states: (1) experienced meaningfulness of work, (2) experienced responsibility for work outcomes, and (3) knowledge of the results of work

activities (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). In turn, these three critical psychological states may increase the likelihood of positive personal and work outcomes, which include high internal work motivation, high quality performance, high task-related satisfaction, low absenteeism, and low turnover. Further, when these three critical psychological states are experienced, work motivation and job satisfaction will be high (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Thus it is hypothesized that job characteristics will have a significantly negative influence on turnover intentions (Hypothesis 3c).

VII. Kindergartens in Malaysia

Because the position of kindergarten teacher is not a well-respected position (especially in comparison with full-time primary school and secondary school teachers), the growth-need is expected to be low. During ten years of experience as a kindergarten administrator, the researcher of this study observed that in conservative Asian nations such as Malaysia, employees are afraid to offend their boss and thus rather than try to improve themselves, are satisfied with doing what they're told. Thus, because employees work to obey, there is little consideration for self-improvement, a reflection of growth-need. Moreover, where growth-need is low, associated behaviors—such as high internal work motivation, high quality performance, and high task-related satisfaction—will be moderate at best. Thus it is expected that regardless of age or tenure, there will be little variation among the responses of kindergarten teachers (Hypothesis 1).

Because of low growth-need, however, kindergarten teachers often fail to see merit in staying in one school for too long and turnover rates amongst kindergarten teachers are noticeably high. The stability of teachers, however, has considerable importance on the quality of teaching and the continuing enrollment of students. The longer a teacher stays within a kindergarten, the better relationship that teacher will have with the students and parents.

Schools with good, stable teachers have a competitive edge for two reasons. First, parents feel safer if the same teacher cares for their child for the duration of kindergarten education (usually 3 years). Second, if these same parents are satisfied with the quality of education, they'll recommend their friends' children to the same school (and perhaps even the same teacher) via word-of-mouth advertising. Such advertising is important, especially for privately owned kindergartens, because low birth rates have prompted the necessity for teachers to go out and recruit students. The more students introduced to a kindergarten by satisfied parents, the less after-work hours teachers have to

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

spend outside recruiting new students.

Due to such high rates of turnover amongst kindergarten teachers, it is essential to understand how organizational commitment, job characteristics, and job satisfaction interact and whether they contribute to the prediction of turnover intention. Past studies have rarely considered the relationship of these variables within the kindergartens. This study hopes to inspire further research exploring the relationships among perceived organizational commitment, job characteristics, job satisfaction, and turnover intention for kindergarten teachers in Malaysia.

VIII. Methods

(I) Participants

The subjects of this study are from kindergartens listed in the department of education from Malaysia. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. There were 228 participants, 224 female and 4 male; this is because in Asia, traditionally only females are accepted as applicants for the position of kindergarten teacher. The average age of participants was 37.9 years of age. More than half of the participants were of Malay descent (54.4%; $N = 124$), almost a fourth were Chinese (24.1%; $N = 55$), and the rest were Indian (15.4%; $N = 35$) or responded as “other” (6.1%; $N = 14$). Of the participants, only 5.7% ($N = 13$) had graduated from university with a Bachelor’s degree and another 5.7% ($N = 13$) had finished some college; most participants were high school graduates (62.7%; $N = 143$), and a fourth had not completed high school (25.9%; $N = 59$). The average job tenure was 13.1 years, and more than half of the participants were licensed teachers (53.9%; $N = 123$).

Most participants (69.7%; $N = 159$) worked in privately owned kindergartens, while the rest (30.3%; $N = 69$) worked in public kindergartens. Most participants worked in schools located in urban areas (61.4%; $N = 140$), with the rest working in rural areas (38.6%, $N = 88$). Most participants worked in kindergartens with between 51 and 100 students (40.8%; $N = 93$) followed by kindergartens with between 101 and 150 students (32.0%; $N = 73$), followed by kindergartens with over 200 students (18.0%; $N = 41$), then kindergartens with between 151 and 200 students (5.3%; $N = 12$), and finally kindergartens with less than 50 students (3.9%; $N = 9$). A copy of the survey used to solicit demographic data can be found in Appendix B.

(II) Research Measures

Four questionnaires were used to gather the quantitative data for this study: an organizational commitment scale, a job characteristics scale, a job satisfaction scale, and a turnover intention scale.

(III) *Organizational Commitment Scale.*

This study used an organizational commitment scale adapted from the scale developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993). It has 18 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “*strongly agree*” to “*strongly disagree*”. Each of the three dimension-based subscales (i.e., affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment) has 6 items each. In this study, the scale had a coefficient alpha of .95. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix C.

(IV) *Job Characteristics Scale.*

This study used the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975), which evaluates the five “core” dimensions: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. The JDS has 15 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “*strongly agree*” to “*strongly disagree*”. The five dimension-based subscales have 3 items each. In this study, the scale had a coefficient alpha of .89. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix D.

(V) *Job Satisfaction Scale.*

This study used the briefer version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). This briefer MSQ has 20 items on a 5-point Likert scale (“*strongly agree*” to “*strongly disagree*”) measuring intrinsic satisfaction (11 items), extrinsic satisfaction (9 items), and global satisfaction (all 20 items). In this study, the scale had a coefficient alpha of .93. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix E.

(VI) *Turnover Intention Scale.*

This study used a briefer version of the turnover intention scale designed by Meyer et al. (1993). This scale used in this study has 3 items on a 5-point Likert scale (“*strongly agree*” to “*strongly disagree*”). In this study, the scale had a coefficient alpha of .94. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix F.

IX. *Procedure*

Data was collected data from January 2008 to July 2008. A total of 524 questionnaires were

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

sent to 42 kindergartens randomly selected from the list of registered kindergartens provided by Malaysia's Department of Education. Of the 524 questionnaires sent, 228 were returned and used in the final analysis yielding a response rate of 43.5%.

(I) *Statistical Analysis*

Hypothesis 1.

To assess the variance among scores on the subscales of each research variable (i.e., organizational commitment, job characteristics, job satisfaction, and turnover intention) for different age groups and tenures, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. Because the sample size was different for each sub-population of age and tenure, the Scheffé post hoc criterion for significance was used.

Hypothesis 2.

To assess the predictive strength of both organizational commitment and job characteristics on job satisfaction, two linear regressions were plotted. The first regression plotted organizational commitment as the independent variable and job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The second regression plotted job characteristics as the independent variable and job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.5$) was used for each of the regressions.

Hypothesis 3.

To assess the predictive strength of organizational commitment, job characteristics and job satisfaction on turnover intention, 3 linear regressions and 3 multiple regressions were plotted. The three linear regressions plotted each variable (i.e., organizational commitment, job characteristics and job satisfaction) as independent variables with turnover intention as the dependent variable. The 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.5$) was used for each of the linear regressions.

Regarding the three multiple regressions, the first plotted organizational commitment and job characteristics as independent variables, the second plotted job characteristics and job satisfaction as independent variables, the third plotted organizational commitment and job satisfaction as independent variables, and the fourth plotted organizational commitment, job

characteristics and job satisfaction as independent variables. Turnover intention was the dependent variable for each of the multiple regressions and the 95% confidence interval ($p < 0.5$) was used for all of the multiple regressions.

(II) *Results*

This study sought to investigate age and tenure as two potential influences of participant response variance. This study also sought to investigate job satisfaction and turnover intention as two influential variables in the kindergarten work environment. Descriptive statistics for the research variables and their respective subscales can be found in Table 1.

Hypothesis 1: Response Variance

Age. A one-way between subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare the effect of age on the research variables and their respective subscales. Table 2 provides a summary of the ANOVA and further shows that there was a significant effect of age on the research variables and their respective subscales at the $p < .05$ level. Post hoc analyses were performed using the Scheffé test. Table 3 provides a summary of the Scheffé test results and clearly illustrates that age had minimal influence on participant responding.

Tenure. A one-way between subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare the effect of tenure on the research variables and their respective subscales. Table 2 provides a summary of the ANOVA and further shows that there was a significant effect of tenure on the research variables and their respective subscales at the $p < .05$ level. Post hoc analyses were performed using the Scheffé test. Table 4 provides a summary of the Scheffé test results and clearly illustrates that tenure had minimal influence on participant responding. If there was a significant influence on participant responding, there would have been more subsets—preferably one for each age or tenure subpopulation—rather than just two or three. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported because there was minimal variance among participant responding due to age and tenure.

Hypothesis 2: Predicting Job Satisfaction

The first linear regression failed to support Hypothesis 2a because organizational commitment's prediction of job satisfaction, although positive, was not significant: $\beta = .35$, $t(228) = 5.54$, $p < .00$. Organizational commitment did, however, explain a significant proportion of

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

variance in job satisfaction scores, $R^2 = .12$, $F(1, 226) = 30.64$, $p < .00$. The second linear regression, however, supported Hypothesis 2b because job characteristics positively and significantly predicted job satisfaction: $\beta = .84$, $t(228) = 23.33$, $p < 0.00$. Job characteristics also explained a significant proportion of variance in job satisfaction scores: $R^2 = .71$, $F(1, 226) = 544.26$, $p < .00$. A summary of the results of these two linear regressions can be found in Table 5.

Hypothesis 3: Predicting Turnover Intention

Linear Regressions.

When predicting turnover intention, job satisfaction was the strongest predictor: $\beta = -0.78$, $t(228) = -18.98$, $p < 0.00$; this finding supports Hypothesis 3a because the relationship is both negative and significant. Job satisfaction also explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .62$, $F(1, 226) = 360.37$, $p < .00$. Organizational commitment was not a strong predictor of turnover intention: $\beta = -0.36$, $t(228) = -5.75$, $p < 0.00$; this result only provided mild support for Hypothesis 3b because the relationship, although negative, was not significant. Organizational commitment did, however, explain a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .13$, $F(1, 226) = 33.04$, $p < .00$. Job characteristics was also a strong predictor of turnover intention: $\beta = -0.71$, $t(228) = -15.22$, $p < 0.00$, supporting Hypothesis 3c because the relationship is both negative and significant. Job characteristics also explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .51$, $F(1, 226) = 231.69$, $p < .00$. A summary of these three linear regressions can also be found in Table 5.

Multiple Regressions.

Turnover intention was the dependent variable for all multiple regressions. Table 5 shows a summary of all multiple regressions. The first multiple regression plotted organizational commitment and job characteristics as the independent variables. The prediction was both negative and significant, the total predictive strength $\beta = -0.78$, with organizational commitment: $\beta = -0.10$, $t(228) = -1.87$, $p < 0.06$; and job characteristics: $\beta = -0.68$, $t(228) = -13.37$, $p < 0.00$. Together, organizational commitment and job characteristics explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .51$, $F(1, 225) = 235.20$, $p < .06$.

The second multiple regression plotted job characteristics and job satisfaction as the independent variables. The prediction was both negative and significant, the total predictive

strength $\beta = -0.81$, with job characteristics: $\beta = -0.18$, $t(228) = -2.37$, $p < 0.02$; and job satisfaction: $\beta = -0.63$, $t(228) = -8.39$, $p < 0.00$. Together, job characteristics and job satisfaction explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .62$, $F(1, 225) = 302.15$, $p < .00$.

The third multiple regression plotted organizational commitment and job satisfaction as the independent variables. The prediction was both negative and significant, the total predictive strength $\beta = -0.85$, with organizational commitment: $\beta = -0.10$, $t(228) = -2.25$, $p < 0.03$; and job satisfaction: $\beta = -0.75$, $t(228) = -17.20$, $p < 0.00$. Together, organizational commitment and job satisfaction explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .62$, $F(1, 225) = 328.77$, $p < .00$.

The fourth and final multiple regression plotted organizational commitment, job characteristics, and job satisfaction as the independent variables. The prediction was both negative and significant, the total predictive strength $\beta = -0.86$, with organizational commitment: $\beta = -0.08$, $t(228) = -1.83$, $p < 0.07$; job characteristics: $\beta = -0.15$, $t(228) = -1.98$, $p < 0.05$; and job satisfaction: $\beta = -0.63$, $t(228) = -8.37$, $p < 0.00$. Together, organizational commitment, job characteristics, and job satisfaction explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores: $R^2 = .63$, $F(1, 224) = 304.90$, $p < .00$.

(III) *Discussion*

1. Findings

(1) Influences of Participant Response.

While the initial results of the ANOVA for age and the ANOVA for tenure said that there was significant variance, the ensuing Scheffé test results dispelled all such notions. The Scheffé test results showed that there was little variance on questionnaire items targeting the research variables and their respective subscales.

(2) Predictors of Job Satisfaction.

Organizational commitment was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Organizational commitment did, however, explain a significant proportion of variance (12%) in job satisfaction scores. On the other hand, job characteristics were found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Job characteristics also explained a significantly large proportion of

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

variance (71%) in job satisfaction scores. Thus, job characteristics are a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than organizational commitment.

(3) Predictors of Turnover Intention.

Regardless of single variable predictions or multiple variable predictions, job satisfaction was the single best predictor of turnover intention. In single variable predictions of turnover intention, job satisfaction was the strongest predictor. Job satisfaction also explained a significant proportion of variance (62%) in turnover intention scores. Job characteristics were the second strongest predictor of turnover intention. Job characteristics also explained a significant proportion of variance (51%) in turnover intention scores. Organizational commitment was not a strong predictor of turnover intention. Organizational commitment did, however, explain a significant proportion of variance (13%) in turnover intention scores. Thus when looking at single variable predictors of turnover intention, job satisfaction is the strongest predictor.

When combining multiple variables, all three variables together (i.e., organizational commitment, job characteristics, and job satisfaction) were of course the strongest predictor of turnover intention. However, the difference between the predictive strength of all three variables and the predictive strength of the organizational commitment and job satisfaction pairing is negligible. For example, organizational commitment, job characteristics, and job satisfaction combined explained 63% of variance in turnover intention scores, whereas the pairing of organizational commitment and job satisfaction explained 62% of variance in turnover intention scores. Thus it can be said that when looking at multiple variables, the organizational commitment and job satisfaction pairing is the most significant predictor of turnover intention. It should be noted, however, that organizational commitment's contribution to this prediction is negligible. The job characteristics and job satisfaction pairing was the third best predictor and the organizational commitment and job characteristics pairing was the weakest predictor of the combinations. Nevertheless, all combinations of variables yielded significant and strong predictions of turnover intention and all combinations explained a significant proportion of variance in turnover intention scores.

2. Confounds

There were four potential confounds in this study. First, the questionnaires of this study

were not backwards translated. Thus, there may have been some errors in the translation used that may have misled or confused participants. This may have resulted in the lack of variance amongst responses. Second, teachers may have felt strong social pressure to answer in the manner they did. Because the questionnaires were sent to their respective kindergartens, teachers may have felt pressure from their employers to reply to questionnaire items in a socially desirable way. Third, item 11 on the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was worded incorrectly. On the original form (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), it read: “*I would feel guilty if I left my kindergarten now.*” However, on the questionnaire used in this study, it was mistakenly typed as: “*I do not feel guilty if I left my kindergarten now.*” Finally, reverse scoring on items 2, 10, and 12 of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire may have been statistically misrepresented. These final two confounds may have been the source of significant error and could have potentially influenced the resulting low predictive value of the organizational commitment scale.

3. Limitations

There were two major limitations in this study. First, due to the abovementioned confounds, the low predictive value of organizational commitment cannot be interpreted as concrete evidence that organizational commitment is not an important factor in kindergartens. Rather, it would be wise to suggest that the influence of organizational commitment on other variables needs to undergo further analysis. Second, the demographics of this study limit the external reliability of this study’s findings. Specifically, Due to the uniqueness of the kindergarten teacher population of Malaysia, demographic variables such as race and education may be endemic phenomenon and thus caution should be used when extending this study’s findings to other populations. In addition, the job specifics of a kindergarten teacher may vary with region, government, and culture and so the same caution should be exercised when extending the findings of this study to other occupations.

4. Implications

Because of low variance among participant response, perhaps other measures need to be developed or other methods used to more accurately assess the opinions and values of kindergarten teachers in Asia. Despite potential confounds, organizational commitment was not found to be a statistically significant predictor of either job satisfaction or turnover. This seems

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

to suggest that kindergarten owners and administrators can place less emphasis on encouraging commitment to the school amongst teachers. Rather, owners and administrators should place more emphasis on job characteristics that increase job satisfaction and this because job satisfaction discourages turnover intention.

5. Future Research

Individually, job satisfaction and job characteristics were strong predictors of turnover intention. When combined, however, the predictive strength of job characteristics—but not job satisfaction—failed. Perhaps this is because job characteristics are the strongest predictor of job satisfaction; there may be similar underlying themes that are mitigated when the variables are combined. A factor analysis of the two scales combined could determine if such overlap is present. Specifically, an investigation of which job characteristics subscales influence job satisfaction and which overlap with job satisfaction scale items would be useful in better understanding these two important variables. Further research could also be conducted to re-evaluate the predictive strength of organizational commitment, as well as to investigate the predictive strength of occupational commitment as proposed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993).

6. Conclusion

In closing, it should be noted that although the findings of this study should be interpreted with caution, kindergarten owners and administrators would do well to find ways to improve job characteristics and thus increase job satisfaction.

7. Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Taipei Economic and Cultural office in Malaysia, The United Chinese school teachers association of Malaysia, United Chinese school committees association of Malaysia and Business Scholl of Malaysia, United University, My as well as several reviews for their constructive comments on earlier versions of this article.

X. References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- Bateman, T.S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 95-112.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). "Note on the Concept of Commitment," *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 15-22.
- Bhuiyan, S. N., Al-shammari, E. S., & Jefri, O. A. (1996). Organization commitment, job satisfaction and job characteristics: An empirical study of expatriates in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Commerce & Management*, 6(3), 57-80.
- Bright, L. (2008). Does Public Service Motivation Really Make a Difference on the Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention of Public Employees? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 38(2), 149-166.
- Burns, Tom & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Clark, A., Georgellis, Y. and Sanfey, P. (1988). Job satisfaction, wage changes, and quits: Evidence from Germany. *Research in Labor Economics*, 17, 95-121.
- Clegg, C. W. (1983). "Psychology of Employee Lateness, Absence, and Turnover: A Methodological Critique and an Empirical Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(1), 88-101.
- Collinson, V. (1996). *Reaching students: Teachers ways of knowing*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Connell, J. P. & Ryan, R. M. (1984). A Developmental Theory of Motivation in the classroom. *Teacher Education Quality*, 11, 64-77.
- Dossett, D.L., and Suszko, M. (1989). *Re-examining the causal direction between job satisfaction and organizational commitment*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Miami, FL.
- Drago, R., Estrin, S., and Wooden, M. (1992). "Pay for Performance Incentives and Work Attitudes." *Australian Journal of Management*, 17(2), 217-32.
- Freeman, Richard B. (1978). "Job satisfaction as an economic variable." *American economic review*, 68(2), 135-41.

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

- Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U. (2004). Organizational identification and organizational commitment: Distinct aspects of two related concepts. *Asia Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 301-315.
- Gordon, M. E., and Denisi, A. S. (1995). "A Re-Examination of the Relationship between Union Membership and Job Satisfaction." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 48(2), 222-36.
- Grissmer, D., & Kirby, S. (1987). *Teacher attrition: The uphill climb to staff the nation's schools*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Grissmer, D., & Kirby, S. (1992). *Patterns of attrition among Indiana teachers, 1965-1987*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Grissmer, D., & Kirby, S. (1997). Teacher turnover and teacher quality. *Teachers College Record*, 99, 45-56.
- Hackman J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
- Heyns, B. (1988). Educational defectors: A first look at teacher attrition in the NLS-72. *Educational Researcher*, 17, 24-32.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American educational research journal*. 38(3), 499-534.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York:Harper-Collins.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1988). Links between work experiences and organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 195-209.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., and Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursor of employee turnover, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(4), 408-414.
- Mohr, R. D. & Zoghi, C (2008). High-involvement work design and job satisfaction. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 6(3), 275-296
- Murnane, R. (1981). *Teacher mobility revisited*. *Journal of Human Resources*, 16(1), 3-19.
- Murnane, R. (1987). Understanding teacher attrition. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(2), 177-182.
- Murnane, R., Singer, J., & Willett, J. (1988). The career paths of teachers: Implications for teacher supply and methodological lessons for research. *Educational Researcher*, 17(5), 22-30.

- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial Attitude and Performance*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Porter, L.W., Lawler, E. E (1975). *Managerial Attitude and Performance*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Porter, L.W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). *Behavior in organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Reiner, D. M., & Zhao, J. (1999). The Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among United States Air Force Security Police. *Review of public personnel Administration*, Summer, 5-18.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tett, R. P. & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259-293.
- Trimble, D. E. (2006). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention of missionaries. *Journal of Psychology and Technology*, 34(4), 349-360.
- Turner, A. N., & Lawrence, P. R. (1965). *Industrial jobs and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walton, R. E. (1980). Establishing and maintaining high commitment work systems. In J. Kimberly & R. Miles (Eds.), *The organization life cycle*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.
- Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center.

Submission Date : 2008/10/17

Revision Date : 2009/08/25

Acceptance Date : 2010/03/05

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

Appendix A: Tables and Figures

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables and Subscales (*N* = 228)

Research Variable Subscale	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Org. Commitment	42	67	60.74	7.35	54.09
Affective	14	23	20.85	2.85	8.10
item 3	2	4	3.87	.36	.13
item 6	2	4	3.43	.79	.63
item 8 (R)	2	3	2.92	.27	.07
item10	2	4	3.51	.66	.44
item 12	2	4	3.01	.26	.07
item 16	2	4	2.90	.43	.19
Continuance	14	23	20.85	2.85	8.10
item 1	2	4	3.43	.79	.63
item 4	2	5	3.50	.69	.47
item 7	2	4	3.87	.36	.13
item 9	2	4	3.51	.66	.44
item 14	2	4	3.01	.26	.07
item 17	1	4	3.52	.69	.48
Normative	14	23	20.25	2.50	6.24
item 2	2	4	3.87	.36	.13
item 5	2	4	3.43	.79	.63
item 11	1	4	3.52	.69	.48
item 13	2	4	3.51	.66	.44
item 15	2	4	3.01	.26	.07
item 18	2	4	2.90	.43	.19
Job Characteristics	29	61	48.99	6.98	48.66
Variety	4	12	8.64	2.42	5.86
item 1	2	5	3.52	1.05	1.11
item 6	1	5	2.89	1.03	1.06
item 11	1	4	2.23	.73	.53
Identity	4	15	10.77	1.73	2.99
item 2	1	5	3.73	.71	.51
item 7	1	5	3.57	.73	.54
item 12	2	5	3.47	.64	.41
Significance	7	14	10.58	1.55	2.41
item 3	2	4	3.40	.67	.44
item 8	2	5	3.46	.65	.43
item 13	2	5	3.72	.55	.30
Autonomy	5	13	8.72	2.00	3.99
item 4	1	4	2.54	.91	.82
item 9	1	4	2.69	.95	.90
item 14	2	5	3.49	.55	.30
Feedback	6	13	10.27	1.31	1.72
item 5	2	4	3.21	.51	.26
item 10	2	4	3.21	.51	.26
item 15	2	5	3.85	.60	.37
Job Satisfaction	46	85	66.67	10.15	103.11
Intrinsic	31	54	41.28	5.19	26.97
item 1	2	5	3.32	.62	.39
item 2	1	5	3.15	.94	.89
item 3	1	5	3.13	.75	.56

教育研究學報

item 4	1	5	3.00	.98	.95
item 7	1	4	3.55	.71	.50
item 9	2	5	3.77	.49	.24
item 10	2	5	3.90	.62	.38
item 11	2	5	3.75	.57	.32
item 15	1	4	3.27	.75	.57
item 16	1	5	3.61	.65	.42
item 20	2	5	3.57	1.07	1.14
Extrinsic	11	24	18.48	4.42	19.51
item 5	1	5	2.89	.93	.87
item 6	1	4	3.11	.71	.50
item 8	2	4	3.26	.61	.38
item 12	1	4	3.19	.79	.62
item 13	1	4	2.62	.94	.89
item 14	2	5	3.13	.86	.75
item 17	1	4	3.40	.74	.54
item 18	1	4	3.47	.68	.46
item 19	2	5	3.52	1.02	1.03
Turnover Intention	6	14	8.57	2.69	7.23
item 1	2	5	2.79	.84	.70
item 2	2	5	2.76	.98	.96
item 3	2	5	3.03	1.02	1.03

Note. (R) denotes an item that is reverse scored.

Table 2.

Analysis of Variance for Research Variables and Variable Subscales

Research Variable Subscale	Age			Tenure		
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Org. Commitment	4	105.09	0.00	4	145.49	0.00
Affective	4	99.35	0.00	4	139.62	0.00
Continuance	4	99.35	0.00	4	139.62	0.00
Normative	4	111.41	0.00	4	154.50	0.00
Job Characteristics	4	15.83	0.00	4	13.77	0.00
Variety	4	12.74	0.00	4	12.37	0.00
Identity	4	4.55	0.00	4	5.21	0.00
Significance	4	13.94	0.00	4	11.78	0.00
Autonomy	4	31.71	0.00	4	29.45	0.00
Feedback	4	5.64	0.00	4	6.70	0.00
Job Satisfaction	4	27.21	0.00	4	24.26	0.00
Intrinsic	4	27.03	0.00	4	24.59	0.00
Extrinsic	4	25.82	0.00	4	23.70	0.00
Turnover Intention	4	19.44	0.00	4	18.77	0.00

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

Table 3. Scheffé Post Hoc Tests for Analysis of Variance for Age (in years)

Scheffé Post Hoc Tests for Analysis of Variance for Age (in years)																	
Research Variable	Total (N = 228)		26-30 (N = 41)			31-35 (N = 50)			36-40 (N = 39)			41-45 (N = 41)			46 < (N = 57)		
Subscale	M	SD	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé
Org. Commitment	60.74	7.35	49.71	7.33	I	58.00	3.81	II	63.51	5.73	III	63.54	1.45	III	65.72	1.06	III
Affective	20.85	2.85	16.83	2.73	I	19.48	1.55	II	21.85	2.33	III	22.78	0.69	III	22.86	0.58	III
Continuance	20.85	2.85	16.83	2.73	I	19.48	1.55	II	21.85	2.33	III	22.78	0.69	III	22.86	0.58	III
Normative	20.25	2.50	16.44	2.40	I	19.34	1.29	II	21.23	1.99	III	21.88	0.40	III	21.93	0.26	III
Job Characteristic	48.99	6.98	44.80	6.47	I	46.88	6.69	I,II	47.92	7.04	I,II	49.80	4.90	II	54.00	5.82	III
Variety	8.64	2.42	8.29	1.72	I	7.90	2.06	I	7.82	2.30	I	8.20	2.12	I	10.42	2.58	II
Identity	10.77	1.73	9.85	2.10	I	10.68	1.89	I,II	10.85	2.09	I,II	11.13	1.26	II	11.21	0.90	II
Significance	10.58	1.55	9.68	1.42	I	10.08	1.68	I,II	10.38	1.63	I,II	10.88	1.25	II,III	11.60	1.00	III
Autonomy	8.72	2.00	7.22	1.06	I	8.12	1.29	I,II	8.15	1.68	I,II	8.88	1.38	II	10.61	2.19	III
Feedback	10.27	1.31	9.76	1.64	I	10.10	1.67	I	10.44	1.10	I,II	11.00	1.00	II	10.16	0.68	I
Job Satisfaction	66.61	10.17	61.59	10.10	I	62.44	8.73	I,II	62.74	10.72	I,II	67.15	5.59	II	76.16	6.46	III
Intrinsic	41.28	5.19	38.46	6.01	I	39.30	4.76	I,II	39.59	4.66	I,II	41.32	2.43	II	46.18	3.01	III
Extrinsic	18.48	4.42	16.37	3.73	I	16.92	3.40	I,II	16.33	5.26	I	18.93	3.44	II	22.47	2.59	III
Turnover Intention	8.57	2.69	10.66	2.67	III	9.30	2.60	II,III	8.92	3.40	II	7.83	1.30	I,II	6.74	1.30	I

Note. Results of the Scheffé test are represented by the subset number for $\alpha = 0.05$; ages with the same value for a subset number were not significantly different at $p < 0.05$.

Table 4. Scheffé Post Hoc Tests for Analysis of Variance for Tenure (in years)

Scheffé Post Hoc Tests for Analysis of Variance for Tenure (in years)																	
Research Variable	Total (N = 228)		1-5 (N = 41)			6-10 (N = 43)			11-15 (N = 51)			16-20 (N = 38)			21 < (N = 55)		
Subscale	M	SD	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé	M	SD	Scheffé
Org. Commitment	60.74	7.35	49.12	6.94	I	57.26	1.07	II	63.94	5.11	III	65.58	1.46	III	65.80	0.87	III
Affective	20.85	2.85	16.61	2.58	I	19.12	0.45	II	22.04	2.10	III	22.79	0.74	III	22.91	0.44	III
Continuance	20.85	2.85	16.61	2.58	I	19.12	0.45	II	22.04	2.10	III	22.79	0.74	III	22.91	0.44	III
Normative	20.25	2.50	16.24	2.26	I	19.09	0.43	II	21.37	1.77	III	21.89	0.39	III	21.95	0.23	III
Job Characteristic	48.99	6.98	44.88	6.45	I	47.58	6.96	I,II	47.65	6.75	I,II	49.82	5.28	II,III	53.84	5.85	III
Variety	8.64	2.42	8.41	1.66	I	8.30	1.78	I	7.63	2.44	I	8.08	2.19	I	10.40	2.62	II
Identity	10.77	1.73	9.83	2.08	I	10.49	1.97	I,II	11.14	1.99	II	11.08	1.22	II	11.15	0.76	II
Significance	10.58	1.55	9.71	1.42	I	10.16	1.79	I,II	10.41	1.56	I,II	10.82	1.29	II,III	11.56	1.00	III
Autonomy	8.72	2.00	7.22	1.06	I	8.47	1.03	II	8.10	1.86	I,II	8.74	1.35	II	10.62	2.21	III
Feedback	10.27	1.31	9.71	1.66	I	10.16	1.77	I	10.37	1.00	I,II	11.11	1.03	II	10.11	0.57	I
Job Satisfaction	66.61	10.17	62.34	10.66	I	63.09	8.14	I	62.41	10.33	I	67.16	6.07	I	76.07	6.55	II
Intrinsic	41.28	5.19	38.90	6.47	I	39.42	4.44	I	39.35	4.41	I	41.50	2.70	I	46.15	3.06	II
Extrinsic	18.48	4.42	16.66	3.77	I,II	17.60	2.70	I,II	16.12	5.23	I	18.84	3.61	II	22.44	2.62	III
Turnover Intention	8.57	2.69	10.49	2.68	IV	8.70	2.05	II,III	9.57	3.48	III,IV	7.66	1.32	I,II	6.76	1.32	I

Note. Results of the Scheffé test are represented by the subset number for $\alpha = 0.05$; tenures with the same value for a subset number were not significantly different at $p < 0.05$.

Table 5.
Summary of Regression Analyses for Predicting Job Satisfactions and Turnover Intention

Dependent Variable				
Step	IV(s)	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Job Satisfaction				
	OC	0.48	0.09	0.35
	JC	1.23	0.05	0.84
Turnover Intention				
	OC	-0.13	0.02	-0.36
	JC	-0.27	0.02	-0.71
	JS	-0.21	0.01	-0.78
1	OC+	-0.04	0.02	-0.10
2	JC	-0.26	0.02	-0.68
1	JC+	-0.07	0.03	-0.18
2	JS	-0.17	0.02	-0.63
1	OC+	-0.04	0.02	-0.10
2	JS	-0.20	0.01	-0.75
1	OC+	-0.03	0.02	-0.08
2	JC+	-0.06	0.03	-0.15
3	JS	-0.17	0.02	-0.63

Note. Abbreviations were used for research variables:
OC = organizational commitment, JC = job characteristics, JS = job satisfaction.

TURNOVER IN MALAYSIA KINDERGARTENS

Appendix B: Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

1. It would be very hard for me to leave my kindergarten right now, even if I wanted to. [F5b]
2. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R) [F6a]
3. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this kindergarten. [F4a]
4. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this kindergarten would be the scarcity of available alternatives. [F5f]
5. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my kindergarten. [F6b]
6. I really feel as if this kindergarten's problems are my own. [F4b]
7. Right now, staying with my kindergarten is a matter of necessity as much as desire. [F5a]
8. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my kindergarten.(R) [F4c]
9. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this kindergarten. [F5d]
10. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this kindergarten. (R) [F4d]
11. I do not feel guilty if I left my kindergarten now.
(should be "would," not "do not") [F6c]
12. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my kindergarten. (R) [F4e]
13. The kindergarten deserves my loyalty. [F6d]
14. If I had not already put so much of myself into this kindergarten, I might consider working elsewhere. [F5e]
15. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it. [F6e]
16. This kindergarten has a great deal of personal meaning for me. [F4f]
17. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my kindergarten now.
[F5c]
18. I owe a great deal to my organization. [F6f]

Note: (R) denotes items requiring reverse scoring

Appendix C: Job Characteristics Questionnaire

1. My job provides a lot of variety.
2. My job allows me the opportunity to complete the work I start.
3. My job is one that may affect a lot of other people by how well the work is performed.
4. My job lets me be left on my own to do my own work.
5. My job by itself provides feedback on how well I am performing as I am working.
6. While performing my job I get the opportunity to work on many interesting projects.
7. My job is arranged so that I have a chance and the ability to talk with customers/ clients/end users.
8. My job has the ability to influence decisions that significantly affect the organization.
9. My job provides me the opportunity of self-directed flexibility of work hours.
10. My job provides me with the opportunity to both communicate with my supervisor and to receive recognition from them as well.
11. My job gives me the opportunity to use many new technologies.
12. My job is arranged so that I have an understanding of how it relates to the business mission.
13. My job influences day-to-day company success.
14. I am able to act independently of my supervisor in performing my job function.
15. I receive feedback from my co-workers about my performance on the job.

Scoring for job design questionnaire

The survey is designed to analyze five dimensions of the job:

Skill Variety - Total the scores for questions 1, 6, 11: _____

Task Identity - Total the scores for questions 2, 7, 12: _____

Task Significant - Total the scores for questions 3, 8, 13: _____

Autonomy - Total the scores for questions 4, 9, 14: _____

Feedback About Results - Total the scores for questions 5, 10, 15: _____

Appendix D: Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

On my present job, this is how I feel about...

1. Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. The chance to work alone on the job.
3. The chance to do different things from time to time
4. The chance to be “somebody” in the community.
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.
9. The chance to do things for other people.
10. The chance to tell people what to do.
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
12. The way company policies are put into practice.
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.
14. The chances for advancement on this job.
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
17. The working conditions.
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
19. The praise I get for doing a good job.
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

Appendix E: Turnover Intention Questionnaire

1. In the past few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job.
2. Presently, I'm actively searching for other job.
3. I intend to leave the kindergarten in the near future.

幼稚園教師組織承諾、工作特徵、工作滿意度與離職意圖的關係—以馬來西亞為例

趙康伶

永達技術學院綜合教學部助理教授

摘 要

組織承諾、工作特徵、工作滿意度與離職意圖的概念探討是組織管理常被提及的構念，卻少於幼稚園教師之相關文獻。本研究進行路徑分析探討馬來西亞幼稚園教師之組織承諾、工作特徵、工作滿意度與離職意圖之關係。以問卷調查法進行調查，共寄發 524 份問卷，回收有效樣本 228 份。研究結果發現：1. 幼稚園教師之組織承諾與工作滿意度有顯著正向影響；2. 幼稚園教師之工作特徵與工作滿意度有顯著正向影響；3. 幼稚園教師之工作滿意度對離職傾向有顯著負向影響；4. 幼稚園教師之組織承諾對離職傾向有顯著負向影響；5. 幼稚園教師之工作特徵對離職傾向有顯著負向影響。針對研究結果，本研究亦提出管理意涵並詳加討論。

關鍵字：組織承諾、工作特徵、工作滿意度、離職意圖