



# Interconnected Dynamics of Teacher Engagement: The Role of Organizational Commitment, Job Stress, Person-Environment Fit, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Higher Education

<sup>1</sup> Jyoti, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Sunita Rani

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, <sup>2</sup>Professor

<sup>1</sup>Haryana School of Business,

<sup>1</sup>Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology,

Hisar, Haryana, India

## Abstract

Teacher engagement and turnover intention in higher education have emerged as critical challenges affecting institutional stability, academic quality, and student outcomes. While prior research has extensively examined teacher retention, fewer studies have explored the interconnectedness of various factors influencing teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. This review paper synthesizes existing literature to investigate the interrelationships among job stress, organizational commitment, person-environment fit (PEF), and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The findings highlight that job stress negatively impacts teacher well-being and engagement, while strong organizational commitment enhances teacher retention. OCB serves as both a facilitator and a potential stressor, enhancing institutional loyalty while also leading to role overload. The intricate relationships among these variables highlight the necessity for higher education administrators to implement integrated retention strategies that balance workload, foster institutional commitment, and enhance teacher well-being. This study emphasizes the importance of a comprehensive approach in addressing reduced teacher engagement by considering the dynamic interactions between these variables. The review provides educational administrators with actionable strategies to improve teacher engagement, mitigate job stress, and create supportive academic environments that enhance institutional effectiveness. Future research should explore longitudinal and cross institutional studies to develop a more nuanced understanding of teacher engagement dynamics in higher education.

**Keywords:** Teacher engagement, organizational commitment, job stress, person-environment fit, organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intentions

## Introduction

The ability to attract and retain outstanding talent is quickly becoming a critical issue in university human resource management (Van den Brink et al., 2013). With globalization and a disruptive corporate landscape, it has become critical to recognize that acquiring and maintaining the right academic talent on board (Gilliot et al., 2002; Marginson, 2011; Baruch, 2013) allows an organization to face severe competition. Higher education institutions worldwide are at risk of losing highly skilled knowledge workers to headhunting by international universities and attractive opportunities in the business sector (Ngobeni & Bezuidenhout, 2011).

This study on educational management is focuses more on the motivational underpinnings of teachers' attitudes as a result of worries about teacher Attrition and the reform movement that emphasizes high standards in Educational Institutions (Craig, 2017; Ford et al., 2019).

This study aims to investigate how organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), job stress, organizational commitment, person-environment fit (PEF), person-organization fit (POF), and person job fit (PJF) are interrelated in affecting teacher retention, teacher engagement, career satisfaction, and turnover intentions in Higher Education Institutions. By identifying key factors that influence teacher wellbeing, engagement, and loyalty, the study anticipates to provide educational administrators with actionable insights and strategies for creating supportive environments that improve teacher performance, reduce attrition, and foster organizational effectiveness.

Literature review

### Higher Education Sector

The significance of higher education has been manifested by our India's first Prime Minister Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru in his words: "A university stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reason, for the adventure of the ideas and the search of truth. It stands for the onward march of the human race towards even higher objectives. If the universities discharge their duties adequately, then it is well with the nation and the people". These lines show that higher education holds a pivotal position in any nation's education system as it affects a country's overall development.

The knowledge economy relies heavily on institutional knowledge (Powell & Snellman, 2004). As a result, Higher Education Institutions must manage knowledge through identification, acquisition, development, transfer, and retention (Probst et al., 2000). Furthermore, these Institutions not only generate highly qualified and enlightened intellectual capital for a country's social change and economic advancement (Shikha, 2012), but they also need skilled human capital for their core business operations, such as Research and Development, in order to provide students with high-quality learning opportunities (Netswera et al., 2006). In this situation, the teaching staff is thought to expand the scope of knowledge that builds the groundwork for enhancing society and the state's progress (Atta & Khan, 2016).

Faculty and staff are key contributors to any institution of higher education. Maintaining skilled employees lowers turnover costs, improves academic services, improves decision-making skills, and improves curriculum programs based on best practices (Kidwell et al., 2000). Retaining the essential human capital that enables higher education to be accessible to all stakeholders, including students and society at large, can therefore help higher education institutions succeed in promoting the socioeconomic development of a nation (Coetzee & Rothman, 2004; Van den Berg et al., 2013). The attitudes and behaviors of employees affect the individual's performance and the performance of the institution as a whole. A qualified and skilled teaching staff is critical to the success of any educational institution (Joolideh & Yeshodhara, 2008). Due to their responsibilities for performing scientific research, advancing knowledge, and training society's leaders, academics are vital to society (Coetzee & Rothmann, 2004).

To attract and retain excellent personnel, higher education institutions must understand the factors that keep individuals employed in their current professions. A comprehensive approach is necessary to comprehend the elements that affect teacher engagement and turnover intentions since they are not separate but rather interconnected, impacting and reinforcing one another in intricate ways.

## Quality of Work Life (QoWL) and job satisfaction

Quality of Work Life is defined as improving employees' working conditions and establishing a work environment that meets not only physical, but also psychological and social needs (Demir, 2011). Furthermore, it has been described as a stress-free working environment and as boosting employee Job Satisfaction through managerial involvement (Sirgy et al., 2001). According to studies, QoWL leads to enhanced work performance, job satisfaction, construction of organizational identity, reduced absenteeism, reduces desire to quit, and a lower risk of burnout. (Donalson, 2000; Pedler et al., 2001; Pfeffer, 2004). Teachers who perform better and are more satisfied with their professions are entitled to a greater quality of work life (Koyuncu et al., 2021).

## Career Satisfaction as a Mediator Between Organizational Commitment and Teacher Engagement

Career Satisfaction refers to an employee's overall contentment with their job and work life over time (Lee et al., 2017). Career satisfaction plays a crucial role in teacher engagement and retention in higher education. It is shaped by both objective factors, such as promotions and institutional support, and subjective factors, including work-life balance and job satisfaction (Park, 2018). A high level of career satisfaction enhances organizational commitment, reducing turnover intentions, whereas dissatisfaction leads to disengagement and attrition (Trivellas et al., 2015). Additionally, job stress and misalignment in person-environment fit negatively impact career satisfaction, further influencing teacher retention (Ishak, 2015; Anees et al., 2021). By fostering a supportive work environment, higher education institutions can enhance engagement, commitment, and overall institutional effectiveness while mitigating turnover risks.

## Turnover Intention

Turnover intention refers to an individual's likelihood of changing jobs within a specific time frame (Sousa-Poza & Henneberger, 2002). Conversely, turnover is a voluntary event where an individual moves across an organization's membership boundary (Price, 2001). According to existing research on employee turnover, the turnover intention is the most significant predictor of actual turnover (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003). Although turnover intention may not necessarily result in actual turnover, it is associated with job search behavior and poor service delivery, both of which have the potential to undermine organizational efficiency (Takawira et al. 2014).

In the Teaching Profession, turnover can be classed into two categories. The first is leaving one

Education Institutions and relocating to another, and teachers who exhibit this conduct are known as "movers". The second option is to leave the Profession entirely; teachers who engage in this behavior are referred to as "leavers" (Grogan & Youngs, 2011).

## Job Stress: A Determinant of Teacher Engagement and Turnover Intention

Job stress, characterized by discomfort, anxiety, and negative thoughts, significantly impacts teachers' physical and mental well-being, leading to reduced job satisfaction and increased turnover intentions (Anees et al., 2021; Puangyoykea et al., 2015; Rizwan et al., 2014). The profession of teaching is thought to be extremely demanding (Kokkinos, 2007; Stoeber & Rennert, 2008; Shkëmbi et al., 2015; Desouky & Allam, 2017) due to the large number of assignments and intense workdays (Lindqvist & Nordänger, 2006). Heavy workloads, position uncertainty, and stressful workdays all contribute to job stress among teachers, causing anxiety, dissatisfaction and a desire to leave the profession (Tschiesner et al., 2014; Colomeischi, 2015; De Simone et al., 2016; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Harmsen et al., 2018). It lowers engagement, performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), while increasing turnover intention (Bragger et al., 2005; Cheung and Cheung, 2013; Cohen and Abedallah, 2015; Uzun, 2018; Salehi & Gholtash, 2011). Consequently, the results have shown how crucial it is to reduce job stress in order to increase teachers' OC and OCB levels (Amin et al., 2020). Research indicates that job stress is a primary driver of faculty attrition, highlighting the need for institutions to implement strategies that enhance organizational commitment and teacher retention (Manurung & Ratnawati, 2014).

## Person-Organisation-Fit (POF)

According to Khaola et.al (2012), POF refers to the compatibility between academics and employers in higher education institutions. It is a type of supplemental fit that relates to the closeness of employees' attitudes, values, and aspirations with organizational culture, demands, and fundamental values (Saether, 2019). B. Schneider (1987) introduced the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) paradigm, a person-based perspective on organizational behavior. The POF notion aligns with the Attraction- Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework, which says that people attract towards appealing organizations and avoid those that are unappealing. The ASA framework suggests that individuals are drawn to organizations that share their interests and values. They are then chosen based on their compatibility with the organization's values and culture. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) discovered in their meta-analysis that a high P-O fit enhances candidates' attraction to the organization, organizations' likelihood of making a job offer, organizations' intent to employ, and candidates' acceptance of the offer. According to Holland's Theory of Career Choice (1985), individuals are happier and more successful when their personalities fit the work environment. The fit between Teachers and Education Institutions is significant because teachers are one of the most important variables in student success (Kane & Staiger, 2008), and the fit between teachers and education Institutions has the potential to be an excellent predictor of Teacher Turnover.

### Person-Organization Fit as a Mediator Between Job Stress, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover intention

One of the possible outcomes of P-O misfit is turnover intention, which is defined as an employee's subjective prediction of the possibility of leaving the organization in the near future or a subjective possibility of changing an employee's job in a certain period of time (SousaPoza & Henneberger, 2002).

According to several studies, the degree to which employees believe their skills meet the requirements of their jobs is directly related to their organizational commitment (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). According to Chen et al. (2016), P-O fit is associated to a variety of work attitudes and behaviors. High P-O fit levels are associated with **higher Job Satisfaction** (Chen et al., 2016; Westerman & Cyr, 2004), **Higher Commitment** (Westerman & Cyr, 2004), **higher Work Efficiency** and **Performance** (Farooquia & Nagendrab, 2014), higher levels of **Organizational Citizenship Behaviors** (Wei, 2015), and lower Work Stress (Mostafa, 2015). Employees with lower P-O fit levels, on the other hand, exhibit a variety of negative work attitudes, are more likely to leave their organizations, and have a higher risk of **actual turnover** (Abdalla et al., 2018; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003; Wei, 2015; Westerman & Cry, 2004).

### Organisational Commitment

The teacher is a key component of an educational system, with various critical liabilities. Teachers, and ultimately, their degree of commitment and satisfaction with their work, are the components that affect the overall effectiveness of educational institutions (Tsui & Cheng, 1999). Organizational commitment is viewed as "a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization" (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Meyer & Allen (1991) conceptualized Organizational Commitment as subsuming three dimensions: Affective, Continuance, And Normative Commitment. According to Meyer and Allen, Affective Commitment is the desire of workers to stay with a company because of their "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization." Employees' desire to stay with their employers because of the perceived costs of doing otherwise is known as Continuity Commitment, while their sense of obligation to the employer, which compels them to stay because of a moral imperative, is known as Normative Commitment.

Examples of factors that have been examined as antecedents of teacher Organizational Commitment include personal traits like age and teaching experience, school background traits like school size and sector, and workplace conditions like job autonomy and organizational fairness (Chan et al., 2008; Dou et al., 2017; Somech & Bogler, 2002).

## **Organizational commitment is positively related to job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors while reducing turnover intentions and absenteeism.**

The literature emphasizes the role of organizational commitment in improving the effectiveness of teaching staff (Park et al., 2005; Allen & Meyer, 1990). Teaching staff's level of organizational commitment reflects their happiness with the institution, which is critical for improving work performance (Malik et al., 2010). The organizational commitment encourages teaching staff to engage in beneficial behaviors that are not dictated by job entitlements, such as being more helpful and respectful to their colleagues. This type of behaviour is not reinforced by the organization's existing incentive structure, but rather linked to the individual's intrinsic motivation, and is commonly referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Biestock et al., 2003). Several research have found that teacher Organizational Commitment is associated with reduced Turnover Intentions (McInerney et al., 2015) and increased teacher effectiveness, job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and student success (Chan et al., 2008; Jing & Zhang, 2014).

### **Organisation Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)**

The phrase Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was initially used in the 1980s, although the idea of people who are prepared to go above and beyond the call of duty or "go the extra mile" has long existed (Organ, 2018). According to Organ (1997) and Somech & Oplatka (2014), organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are voluntary actions that are significant and essential to an organization's existence and development. The term Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) refers to the practice of extra-role activities that are helpful to instructors and improve educational institutions performance as a whole (Oplatka, 2006; Bogler et al., 2019; Göktürk, 2011).

OCB has been recognized as one of the most powerful types of positive organizational behaviors (Göktürk, 2011; Bolino et al., 2002), and numerous organizational contexts and empirical studies demonstrated its positive effects on work-related outcomes.

### **OCB and social exchange theory**

According to a social exchange (Blau, 1964) and social capital perspective (Bolino et al., 2002) on OCB, we contend that teachers' participation in OCB is important to their peers and supervisors, and as such, is more likely to elicit social support and reciprocation. The Social Exchange Theory claims that social support is frequently repaid during interpersonal encounters and that these exchanges are linked to OCBs (Konovsky et al., 1994; Jolly et al., 2020). Teachers who take on extra responsibilities and go above and beyond to assist their colleagues in completing their work will be more likely to receive social support in return from their peers and superiors (Jolly et al., 2020).

Supervisors typically identify OCBs in their staff members and reward them by giving their work a higher value and giving more resources to those who participate in OCBs more frequently rather than less (Podsakoff et al., 2009). OCBs have been referred to as a type of contextual performance (Conway et al., 1999) and workers who participate in them are likely to produce mutually positive social interactions that improve work performance (Blau, 1994). Because task performance and OCB are closely associated, high-task performers also frequently have high levels of OCBs.

### **Effects of OCB on HEI**

Organizations today require employees who work willingly, put up with limited resources and adverse circumstances, avoid negativity, share knowledge, and investigate novel ideas for the organization's improvement (Yucel, 2008). These behaviors, especially those referred to as OCBs, improve organizational performance by enhancing efficiency, boosting productivity and profitability, retaining and satisfying customers, fostering financial and employee performance, cutting costs, and lowering employee absenteeism and turnover (Koys, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2009; Organ, 2018). Teachers' OCBs improve students' academic performance and discipline, instructors' work satisfaction, and the institution's reputation while also assisting in the institution's growth (Oplatka, 2009).

Furthermore, a study found that organizational citizenship behavior is associated with extra-role behavior, such as being willing to attend a class meeting or a lecture on behalf of a colleague with health concerns. It also includes willingness to accomplish additional responsibilities and devotion to the organization (Ertürk, 2007; Ngadiman et al., 2013).

The psychological mechanism known as occupational commitment (OC) (Aranya & Jacobson, 1975; Tett & Meyer, 1993) encourages educators to exhibit OCB (Cohen, 2006; Cohen & Liu, 2011; Ahmad et al., 2014; Imer et al., 2014). Since official in-role job descriptions cannot encompass the whole range of actions required to accomplish Institution's goals, OCBs are crucial (Bogler & Somech, 2005). By allowing teachers to better adjust to changes in their surroundings and freeing up resources for more fruitful uses, OCBs help organizations function more efficiently (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

### **The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment in the Job Stress-OCB**

OC is significantly impacted negatively by job stress, so as job stress increases, teachers' OC levels decrease (Amin et al., 2020). Job stress reduces OC (Jepson & Forrest, 2006; Gilbert et al., 2014; Klassen, et al., 2013) and reduced OC diminishes OCBs among teachers (Cohen, 2006; Cohen & Liu, 2011; Ahmad et al., 2014; Imer et al., 2014). According to earlier research, job stress causes teachers to have unfavorable health issues as well as emotional and behavioral deterioration (Tschiesner et al., 2014; Colomeischi, 2015; De Simone et al., 2016; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017; Harmsen et al., 2018).

According to Oplatka (2009), the results guarantee that OC favorably expects OCB, which supports the favorable outcomes for teachers and students as well as the institution's reputation. This finding is in line with earlier studies that found a positive correlation between OC and OCB (Cohen, 2006; Cohen & Liu, 2011; Ahmad et al., 2014; Imer et al., 2014). This positive correlation suggests that the teacher's OCB is improved by their increasing OC level. (Amin et al., 2020). Teachers must have an inner emotion in order to exhibit OCB; they do not instantly connect with OCBs. According to the current study, OC is a psychological factor that encourages teachers to participate in OCB (Amin et al., 2020).

### **Too much OCB leads to work overload**

According to the conservation of resources approach (Hobfoll, 1989), employees have a limited amount of personal resources at their disposal, and as they perform additional role behaviors, those resources are depleted more quickly, which eventually results in less than ideal job outcomes, stress, and fatigue. According to research, OCB can lead to experienced overload (Bolino et al., 2002; Bergeron et al., 2007) and role conflict may become a burden for employees as a result of the increased demands of both in-role activities and OCBs (Eatough et al., 2011).

Employees who engaged in this conduct more frequently than others saw negative performance impacts from OCB, and their long-term career results were also impacted (Bergeron et al., 2007). Since time is a scarce resource at work, helping others or offering assistance disrupts the ongoing performance episodes (Grant et al., 2011).

Employees must make progress toward their work goals, and as OCB may impede this development, job satisfaction and affective commitment will suffer as a result of the sense of less progress (Maier et al., 2001). When OCB is low, resources are safeguarded but, when it is excessive, it would hinder job advancement and consume resources, resulting in fatigue and low well-being. Teachers may feel overburdened by their roles or that, given the resources at their disposal, they are expected to perform too many tasks or activities. High levels of OCBs among teachers would deplete resources connected to their jobs, lead to fatigue and poor wellbeing (Koopman et al., 2016) and have a detrimental impact on work results.

### **Research Gaps**

Despite substantial research on teacher retention, some gaps exist that require more investigation. This analysis identified a considerable vacuum in the focus on the interaction between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), job stress, and turnover intentions in higher education institutions (HEIs). While previous research has shown that job stress has a detrimental influence on faculty well-being and raises turnover rates, there is limited study on how faculty members' engagement in extra-role activities (OCB) moderates or exacerbates stress-related attrition. Faculty members who frequently engage in OCB may endure excessive workload and emotional exhaustion, but the literature does not clearly identify the threshold at which OCB switches from useful to detrimental.

The relationship between organizational commitment and teacher retention is also a topic that needs additional investigation. While earlier research has highlighted affective, normative, and continuous commitment as significant characteristics impacting teacher involvement, it is unclear how institutional leadership, workplace culture, and administrative support influence various forms of commitment. Furthermore, the effect of work

alienation on teacher turnover intentions has not been thoroughly investigated. Faculty members who feel alienated from their institutions or perceive a lack of control over their professional positions may be more likely to leave, however research in this area is scattered.

Furthermore, while quality of work life (QoWL) has been linked to job satisfaction and performance, there is little empirical evidence on how specific institutional policies addressing work-life balance, autonomy, and professional development affect faculty retention in various academic settings. Comparative studies of public and private HEIs, or research-intensive and teaching-focused institutions, would provide more information about the precise factors that drive faculty attrition.

Finally, while turnover intention is widely recognized as a good predictor of actual turnover, many studies have failed to distinguish between teachers who relocate to another institution ("movers") and those who leave academia entirely ("leavers"). Understanding the causes behind these two types of faculty turnover should help higher education institutions adopt more successful retention efforts.

Addressing these research gaps would allow HEIs to create stronger faculty retention strategies, assuring long-term institutional success and academic excellence. Future study should take an interdisciplinary, empirical approach to better understand the numerous elements that influence faculty engagement, commitment, and retention.

## Conclusion

To achieve a higher standard of Education, teaching professionals should be given improved and flexible working conditions. In other words, it should strive to improve the quality of work life in Institutions in order to facilitate job performance and maintain a low level of stress in the workplace (Subbarayalu et al.,2019). Organizations must focus more on retaining competent workers, keeping them fully engaged, and integrating them into their roles as a result of a greater awareness of changes in the workforce's characteristics (Frank et.al, 2004).

Employees with high levels of Work-life quality, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior may benefit Universities (Koyuncu et.al,2021). In this sense, it is critical to focus on these (Work life, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour) variables in order to improve the educational quality of a University.

Organizational citizenship behavior also influences employees' attitudes toward working with the organization to improve productivity, quality, and customer satisfaction (Noor, 2009). In this sense, extra-role behaviour increases teaching satisfaction services, which adds to the teaching quality of institutions (Lara, 2008). Educational administrators should keep a careful eye on the level of OCB among its staff and be mindful of its negative consequences. Despite the fact that OCB generally appears to support high rather than low levels of teacher performance, educational management should be aware of the negative consequences of increased workload, stress, and burnout that are linked to extensive OCB participation. According to our findings, teachers may experience role overload as a result of high levels of OCB, a complicated element that is seen as a stressor that can both help and hinder them (Gilboa et al.,2008 ; Boswell et al.,2004 ; LePine et al.,2005).

Employee retention is crucial for organizational performance (Barrick & Zimmerman, 2005), because random employee departure interrupts work continuity, raises costs, and diminishes efficiency and morale of stayers (Cardy & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). That is why firms make a concerted effort to hire individuals that perform well and are unlikely to leave the organization (Astakhova, 2016). Identifying the sources of turnover intentions allows organizations to assess whether potential candidates make effective contributions to the organization and are highly dedicated. Those planning to leave the organization will make less substantial contributions than those planning to stay (Christian & Ellis, 2014).

According to research on turnover intentions, P-O fit has a significant detrimental influence (Jin et al., 2018; Tak, 2011; Wang et al., 2011). According to Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001), the rationale for this considerable negative effect is that a good level of fit implies that employee demands and organizational expectations are met to a large extent. As a result of this mutual consent, employees are more devoted to their firms and have less motive to leave them.

In academic institutions, job satisfaction and organizational commitment have a favorable impact on staff retention and reduce the possibility of turnover (Jing & Photchanachan, 2021). Higher levels of employee commitment are associated with lower anticipated turnover intentions, and higher job satisfaction is associated with a lower likelihood of people leaving organizations (Martin & Roodt, 2008). Person-Organization (P-O) fit influences job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance, which in turn enhance work efficiency and reduce job stress, while poor P-O fit leads to negative work attitudes and higher turnover risk.

The conclusion of the paper reiterates the critical importance of improving working conditions for teachers in higher education institutions. It emphasizes that enhancing the quality of work life is vital for fostering better job performance and reducing workplace stress.

The authors advocate for a comprehensive focus on retaining skilled staff by ensuring their engagement and integration within the organization, noting that the dynamics of workforce characteristics are evolving. They highlight that high levels of work-life quality, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior are beneficial for universities, which can lead to improved academic outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Moreover, while organizational citizenship behavior promotes commitment and productivity, it also cautions against its adverse effects, such as increased workload and stress, which could lead to burnout among faculty. The researchers argue that educational administrators should monitor the levels of organizational citizenship behavior to harness its benefits while mitigating its negative consequences. In summary, the paper calls for educational institutions to adopt integrated strategies that focus on enhancing teacher engagement and well-being, balancing workload, and fostering a supportive academic environment, as these factors are crucial for the retention of faculty and the overall quality of education.

## References

1. Abdalla, A., Elsetouhi, A., Negm, A., Abdou, H. (2017). Perceived person-organization fit and turnover intention in medical centers. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 863–881. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2017-0085>
2. Ahmad, M. S., Malik, M. I., Sajjad, M., Hyder, S., Hussain, S., & Ahmed, J. (2014). Linking teacher empowerment with organizational commitment, professional commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Life Science Journal*, 11(4), 105–108. <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>
3. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
4. Amin, R., Hossain, M., & Masud, A. (2020). Job stress and organizational citizenship behavior among university teachers within Bangladesh: mediating influence of occupational commitment. *Management*, 24(2), 107–131. <https://doi.org/10.2478/manment-2019-0049>
5. Anees, R. T., Heidler, P., Cavaliere, L. P. L., & Nordin, N. A. (2021). Brain drain in higher education. The impact of job stress and workload on turnover intention and the mediating role of job satisfaction at universities. *European Journal of Business Management and Research*, 6(3), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.3.849>
6. Anees, R. T., Heidler, P., Cavaliere, L. P. L., & Nordin, N. A. (2021). Brain Drain in Higher Education. The Impact of Job Stress and Workload on Turnover Intention and the Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction at Universities. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.3.849>
7. Aranya, N., & Jacobson, D. (1975). An empirical study of theories of organizational and occupational commitment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 97(1), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1975.9923308>
8. Astakhova, M. N. (2016). Explaining the effects of perceived person-supervisor fit and person-organization fit on organizational commitment in the US and Japan. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), 956–963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.08.039>

9. Atta, M., & Khan, M. J. (2016). Perceived organizational politics, organizational citizenship behavior and job attitudes among university teachers. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26(2), 21-38
10. Barrick, M. R., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2005). Reducing voluntary, avoidable turnover through selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.159>
11. Baruch, Y. (2013). Careers in academe: The academic labour market as an eco-system. *Career Development International*, 18(2), 196-210. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2012-0092>
12. Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1078–1095. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26585791>
13. Bienstock, C. C., DeMoranville, C. W., & Smith, R. K. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality. *JOURNAL OF SERVICES MARKETING*, 17(4), 357–378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040310482775>
14. Bienstock, C. C., DeMoranville, C. W., & Smith, R. K. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(4), 357–378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040310482775>
15. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
16. Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2005). Organizational citizenship behavior in school: How does it relate to participation in decision-making? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(5), 420–438. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230510615215>
17. Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2019). Psychological capital, team resources, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 153(8), 784–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2019.1654119>
18. Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505–522. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.7566023>
19. Boswell, W. R., Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & LePine, M. A. (2004). The relationship between work-related stress and work outcomes: The role of felt challenge and psychological strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 165–181. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00049-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00049-6)
20. Bragger, J. D., Rodriguez-Srednicki, O., Kutcher, E. J., Indovino, L., & Rosner, E. (2005). Work-family conflict, work-family culture, and organizational citizenship behavior among teachers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 303–324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-005-8266-0>
21. Cardy, R. L., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Will they stay or will they go? Exploring a customer-oriented approach to employee retention. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(2), 213–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9223-8>
22. Chan, W., Lau, S., Nie, Y., Lim, S., & Hogan, D. (2008). Organizational and personal predictors of teacher commitment: The mediating role of teacher efficacy and identification with school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 597–630. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208318259>
23. Chen, P., Sparrow, P., & Cooper, C. (2016). The relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(5), 946–959. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-08-2014-0236>
24. Cheung, F. Y., & Cheung, R. Y. (2012). Effect of emotional dissonance on organizational citizenship behavior: Testing the Stressor-Strain-Outcome model. *The Journal of Psychology*, 147(1), 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2012.676576>
25. Chhabra, B. (2015). Person – Job fit: mediating role of job satisfaction & organizational commitment. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(4), 638–651. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24547010.pdf>
26. Christian, J. S., & Ellis, A. P. (2014). The crucial role of turnover intentions in transforming moral disengagement into deviant behavior at work. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(2), 193–208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1631-4>

27. Coetzee, M., & Rothman, S. (2004). An adapted model of burnout for employees at a higher education institution in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 30(3), 29-40
28. Cohen, A. (2006). The relationship between multiple commitments and organizational citizenship behavior in Arab and Jewish culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69(1), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.12.004>
29. Cohen, A., & Abedallah, M. (2015). The mediating role of burnout on the relationship of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy with OCB and performance. *Management Research Review*, 38(1), 2–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-10-2013-0238>
30. Cohen, A., & Liu, Y. (2011). Relationships between in-role performance and individual values, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior among Israeli teachers. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(4), 271–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2010.539613>
31. Colomeischi, A. A. (2015). Teachers Burnout in Relation with Their Emotional Intelligence and Personality Traits. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 1067–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.207>
32. Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance from task performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.3>
33. Craig, C. J. (2017). International teacher attrition: Multiperspective views. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(8), 859-862
34. De Simone, S., Cicotto, G., & Lampis, J. (2016). Occupational stress, job satisfaction and physical health in teachers. *Revue Européenne De Psychologie Appliquée*, 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2016.03.002>
35. Demir, M. (2011). Relationships between Employees' Perceptions of Quality of Work Life, Intent to Remain with the Organization and Employee Absenteeism. *Ege Academic Review*, 11(3), 453-464.
36. Deniz, N., Noyan, A., & Ertosun, Ö. G. (2015). Linking person-job fit to job stress: The mediating effect of perceived person-organization fit. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 369–376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.107>
37. Desouky, D., & Allam, H. (2017). Occupational stress, anxiety and depression among Egyptian teachers. *Journal of Epidemiology and Global Health*, 7(3), 191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jegh.2017.06.002>
38. DiPaola, M. F., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(4), 387–406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268460501500402>
39. Donaldson, S. I. (1999). Health behavior, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness in the lumber industry. *Health Education & Behavior*, 26(4), 579-591. <https://doi.org/10.3316/csi.cs025003>
40. Dou, D., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2016). The relationships between school autonomy gap, principal leadership, teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(6), 959–977. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216653975>
41. Eatough, E. M., Chang, C. H., Miloslavic, S. A., & Johnson, R. E. (2011). Relationships of role stressors with organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 619–632. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021887>
42. Ertürk, A. (2007). Increasing organizational citizenship behavior of Turkish academicians: Mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 257–270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733089>
43. Farooqui, S., & Nagendra, A. (2014). The impact of person organization fit on job satisfaction and performance of the employees. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 11, 122–129. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(14\)00182-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(14)00182-8)
44. Ford, T. G., Olsen, J., Khojasteh, J., Ware, J., & Urick, A. (2019). The effects of leader support for teacher psychological needs on teacher burnout, commitment, and intent to leave. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(6), 615-634

45. Frank, F. D., Finnegan, R. P., & Taylor, C. R. (2004). The race for talent: Retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(3), 12–24.
46. Gilbert, R. B., Adesope, O. O., & Schroeder, N. L. (2014). Efficacy beliefs, job satisfaction, stress, and their influence on the occupational commitment of English-medium content teachers in the Dominican Republic. *Educational Psychology*, 34(7), 876–899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2013.814193>
47. Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. L. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 227–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00113.x>
48. Gilliot, D., Overlaet, B., & Verdin, P. (2002). Managing academic personnel flow at universities. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(4), 277–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2002.9967085>
49. Göktürk, Ş. (2011). Assessment of the quality of an organizational citizenship behavior instrument. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(3), 335–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2011.577078>
50. Grant, A. M., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Role expansion as a persuasion process: The interpersonal influence dynamics of role redefinition. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1(1), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386610384753>
51. Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Different fits satisfy different needs: Linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 465–477. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014671>
52. Grogan, E., Youngs, P., The Education Policy Center, Michigan State University, Grogan, E., & Youngs, P. (2011). Fitting in: person-organization, person-job, and person-group fit as drivers of teacher mobility. In *Association of Education Finance and Policy Annual Meeting* [Conference-proceeding]. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED537160.pdf>
53. Harmsen, R., Helms-Lorenz, M., Maulana, R., Van Veen, K., & Van Veldhoven, M. (2018). Measuring general and specific stress causes and stress responses among beginning secondary school teachers in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 42(1), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727x.2018.1462313>
54. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
55. Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
56. Imer, P. H., Kabasakal, H., & Dastmalchian, A. (2014). Personality and contextual antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior: A study of two occupational groups. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 20(4), 441–462. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2014.44>
57. Ishak, S. (2015). Career success studies: An examination of indicators, approach and underlying theories in literature. *Science Journal of Business and Management*, 3(6), 251–257. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.sjbm.20150306.16>
58. Jepson, E., & Forrest, S. (2006). Individual contributory factors in teacher stress: The role of achievement striving and occupational commitment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(1), 183–197. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905X37299>
59. Jin, M. H., McDonald, B., & Park, J. (2018). Person–organization fit and turnover intention: Exploring the mediating role of employee followership and job satisfaction through conservation of resources theory. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 38(2), 167–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X16658334>
60. Jing, L., & Zhang, D. (2013). Does organizational commitment help to promote university faculty's performance and effectiveness? *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(2), 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0097-6>

61. Jing, Z., & Photchanachan, S. (2021). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intention of Doctoral Lecturers: A Case Study of Universities in Mianyang, China. In Nimit Mai Review, *Nimit Mai Review: Vol. Year 4* (Issue Issue 1, p. 52).
62. Jolly, P. M., Kong, D. T., & Kim, K. Y. (2021). Social support at work: An integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(2), 229–251. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2485>
63. Joolideh, F., & Yeshodhara, K. (2009). Organizational commitment among high school teachers of India and Iran. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(1), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230910928115>
64. Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2008, April). Are teacher-level value-added estimates biased? An experimental validation of non-experimental estimates [Paper presentation]. National Conference on Value-Added Modeling, Madison, WI.
65. Khaola, P. P., Mohapi, T., & Matobo, T. (2012). The influence of person-organisation fit on employee attitudes and turnover intentions: Empirical testing in Lesotho. *Annals of Humanities and Development Studies*, 3(2), 104-115. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ahds.v3i2.104>
66. Kidwell, J. J., Vander Linde, K. M., & Johnson, L. S. (2000). Applying corporate knowledge management practices in higher education. *Educause Quarterly*, 23(4), 28-33
67. Klassen, R. M., Wilson, E., Siu, A. F. Y., Hannok, W., Wong, M. W., Wongsri, N., & Jansem, A. (2013). Preservice teachers' work stress, self-efficacy, and occupational commitment in four countries. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(4), 1289–1309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-012-0166-xohen>
68. Kokkinos, C. M. (2007). Job stressors, personality and burnout in primary school teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1), 229–243. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905X90344>
69. Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656–669. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256704>
70. Koopman, J., Lanaj, K., & Scott, B. A. (2016). Integrating the bright and dark sides of OCB: A daily investigation of the benefits and costs of helping others. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 414–435. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0262>
71. Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00087.x>
72. Koyuncu, D., & Demirhan, G. (2021). Quality of work life, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour of teaching staff in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Governance & Policy*, 2(2), 98-109
73. Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
74. Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
75. Lara, P. Z. M. D. (2008). Fairness, teachers' non-task behavior and alumni satisfaction: The influence of group commitment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(4), 514–538. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810882057>
76. Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person–job and person–organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 454–470. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1807>
77. Lee, C. I. S. G., Bosco, F. A., Steel, P., & Uggerslev, K. L. (2017). A metaBUS-enabled meta-analysis of career satisfaction. *Career Development International*, 22(5), 565-582. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2017-0137>

78. LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 764–775. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.18803921>
79. Lindqvist, P., & Nordänger, U. K. (2006). Who dares to disconnect in the age of uncertainty? Teachers' recesses and 'off-the-clock' work. *Teachers and Teaching*, 12(6), 623–637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600601029637>
80. Maier, G. W., & Brunstein, J. C. (2001). The role of personal work goals in newcomers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 1034–1042. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.1034>
81. Malik, M. E., Nawab, S., Naeem, B., & Danish, R. Q. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of university teachers in public sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n6p17>
82. Marginson, S. (2011). Global perspectives and strategies of Asia-Pacific research universities. In *Paths to a World-Class University*. SensePublishers. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-355-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-355-6_1)
83. Martin, A., & Roodt, G. (2008). Perceptions of organisational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a post-merger South African tertiary institution. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(1), 23–31. <https://www.scielo.org.za/pdf/sajip/v34n1/03.pdf>
84. McInerney, D. M., Ganotice, F. A., King, R. B., Marsh, H. W., & Morin, A. J. (2015). Exploring commitment and turnover intentions among teachers: What we can learn from Hong Kong teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.08.004>
85. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-z)
86. Mostafa, A. M. S. (2015). High-Performance HR Practices, Work Stress and Quit Intentions in the Public Health Sector: Does person–organization fit matter? *Public Management Review*, 18(8), 1218–1237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1100319>
87. Netswera, F. G., Rankumise, E. M., & Mavundla, T. R. (2006). Employee retention factors for South African Higher Education Institutions: A case study. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(2), 36–40
88. Ngadiman, A. E., & Ratmawati, D. (2013). Influence of transformational leadership and organization climate to the work satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior on the educational personnel of Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta. *Educational Research International*, 1(1), 41–66. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544345>
89. Ngobeni, E. K., & Bezuidenhout, A. (2011). Engaging employees for improved retention at a higher education institution in South Africa. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(23), 9961–9970
90. Noor, A. (2009, November 14). Examining OCBs as the outcome of organizational commitment: A study of university teachers of Pakistan. *2nd CBRC Conference*, Lahore, Pakistan.
91. Oplatka, I. (2006). Going beyond role expectations: Toward an understanding of the determinants and components of teacher organizational citizenship behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 385–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X05285987>
92. Oplatka, I. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior in teaching: The consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23(5), 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540910970476>
93. Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 85–97. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1002>
94. Organ, D. W. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: Recent trends and developments. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104536>

95. Organ, D. W. (2018). Organizational citizenship behavior: Recent trends and developments. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104536>
  96. Park, S., Henkin, A. B., & Egley, R. (2005). Teacher team commitment, teamwork and trust: exploring associations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(5), 462–479. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230510615233>
  97. Park, Y. (2018). Empirical investigation on the predictors of career satisfaction. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50(4), 165–171. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-03-2018-0032>
  98. Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J., & Boydell, T. (2001). *The learning company: A strategy for sustainable development*. McGraw-Hill
  99. *Perfectionism in school teachers: Relations with stress appraisals, coping styles, and burnout*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2025, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/10615800701742461?needAccess=true>
  100. Pfeffer, J. (2004). *Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the workforce*. HBS Press.
  101. Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013079>
  102. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
  103. Powell, W. W., & Snellman, K. (2004). The knowledge economy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100037>
  104. Price, J. L. (2001). Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. In *International Journal of Manpower* (Vol. 22, Issue 7, pp. 600–624). <http://www.emerald-library.com/ft>
  105. Probst, Gilbert & Raub, Steffen & Romhardt, K. (2000). *Managing Knowledge: Building Blocks for Success*.
  106. Puangyoykeaw, K., & Nishide, Y. (2015). Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention in Low-Skilled Immigrant Workers in Thailand: An Empirical Assessment of Need Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Overall Life Satisfaction Factors. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(5), 98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v10n5p98>
  107. Rizwan, M., Arshad, M. Q., Munir, H. M. A., Iqbal, Mr. F., & Hussain, Mr. A. (2014). Determinants of Employees Intention to Leave: A Study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 4(3), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v4i3.5871>
  108. Saether, E. A. (2019). Motivational antecedents to high-tech R&D employees' innovative work behavior: Self-determined motivation, person-organization fit, organization support of creativity, and pay justice. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 30(2), 100350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2019.100350>
  109. Salehi, M., & Gholtaash, A. (2011). The relationship between job satisfaction, job burnout and organizational commitment with the organizational citizenship behavior among members of faculty in the Islamic Azad University –first district branches, in order to provide the appropriate model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 306–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.091>
  110. Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3), 437–454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x>
  111. Shikha, V. G. (2012). Talent acquisition and retention issues of faculty in higher education. *Journal of Human Resource Management and Development*, 2(2), 20-31
- Shkëmbi, F., Melonashi, E., & Fanaj, N. (2015). Workplace Stress Among Teachers in Kosovo. *Sage Open*, 5(4), 2158244015614610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015614610>

112. Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241-302
113. Skaalvik, E. M., & Charalvik, S. (2017). Dimensions of teacher burnout: relations with potential stressors at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20(4), 775–790. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9391-0>
114. Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of teacher organizational and professional commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(4), 555–577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316102237672>
115. Somech, A., & Oplatka, I. (2014). *Organizational citizenship behavior in schools: Examining the impact and opportunities within educational systems*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203103207>
116. Sousa-Poza, A., & Henneberger, F. (2004). Analyzing Job Mobility with Job Turnover Intentions: An International Comparative Study. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 38(1), 113–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2004.11506667>
117. Stoeber, J., & Rennert, D. (2008). Perfectionism in school teachers: Relations with stress appraisals, coping styles, and burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800701742461>
118. Subbarayalu, A. V., & Al Kuwaiti, A. (2019). Quality of work life of teaching staff working at a higher education institution in Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 45(4), 530–542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2018.1481173>
119. Tak, J. (2011). Relationships between various person-environment fit types and employee withdrawal behaviors: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 78(2), 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.09.010>
120. Takawira, N., Coetzee, M., & Schreuder, D. (2014). Job embeddedness, work engagement and turnover intention of staff in a higher education institution: An exploratory study. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v12i1.524>
121. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x>
122. Trivellas, P., Kakkos, N., Blanas, N., & Santouridis, I. (2015). The Impact of Career Satisfaction on Job Performance in Accounting Firms. The Mediating Effect of General Competencies. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 33, 468–476. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)01730-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01730-X)
123. Tschiesner, R., Tauber, S., Martina, P., & Farneti, A. (2014). Pupils' interpersonal Problems and Occupational Stress in Teacher. Preliminary Results. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 140, 197–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.409>
124. Tsui, K. T., & Cheng, Y. C. (1999). School Organizational Health and Teacher Commitment: A Contingency Study with Multi-level Analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 249–268. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1076/edre.5.3.249.3883>
125. Ugwu, F. O., & Onyishi, I. E. (2020). The moderating role of person-environment fit on the relationship between perceived workload and work engagement among hospital nurses. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, 13, 100225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2020.100225>
126. Van den Berg, B.A.M., Bakker, A.B., & Ten Cate, T.J. (2013). Key factors in work engagement and job motivation of teaching faculty at a university medical centre. *Perspectives on Medical Education*. 2(5-6): 264–275 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40037-013-0080-1>
127. Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2018). Person-Environment Fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 75–101. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104702>
128. Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 473–489. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791\(02\)00036-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791(02)00036-2)

129. Wang, M. O., Zhan, Y., McCune, E., & Truxillo, D. M. (2011). Understanding newcomers' adaptability and work-related outcomes: Testing the mediating roles of perceived P-E fit variables. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 163–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01205.x>
130. Wei, Y. (2015). Do employees high in general human capital tend to have higher turnover intention? The moderating role of high-performance HR practices and P-O fit. *Personnel Review*, 44(5), 739–756. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-07-2013-0137>
131. Westerman, J. W., & Cyr, L. A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person–organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12(3), 252–261. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279\\_1.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279_1.x)
132. Yucel, C. (2008). Teacher burnout and organizational citizenship behavior in Turkish elementary schools. *Educational Planning*, 17(1), 27–43.

