Turnover Intention among Talented Lecturers: A Pilot Study

Ida Rosnita Ismail
Norulhuda Tajuddin
Nor Khairunnisa Mat Yunus
Roslina Ali

ABSTRACT

Talent management is an emerging issue in the field of human resources management. Past studies on talent management have shown that organizations are competing for talented employees as an effort in gaining competitive advantage. Thus, retaining talented employees has become an important agenda for human resources management. Our study intends to examine the relationship between turnover intention and its antecedents among talented lecturers. Before pursuing on a large-scale research, we conducted a pilot study on a convenience sample of UiTM Pahang lecturers. The objective of our study is to test the feasibility, reliability, and validity of the turnover intention study. Partial least squares path modeling technique was employed to analyze the data. Findings revealed that most of the measurement criteria evaluations for both reflective and formative constructs were met except indicator reliability and internal consistency reliability. In general, this study shows that there is a need to refine the survey questionnaire by addressing several issues relating to the feasibility, reliability, and validity of the turnover intention study.

Keywords: *talent management, pilot study, feasibility, reliability, validity.*

Introduction

"People" is an important asset of an organization. Through people, an organization may gain competitive advantage in the marketplace. According to McKinsey and Company (2001), people with better talents will separate the winning companies from the rest. The importance of people has led human resources scholars to introduce many new concepts that relate to managing people in organizations. One of these concepts is talent management.

Since its introduction in 1997 (McKinsey & Company, 2001), there is an increasing number of talent management studies in the scholarly database (cf., D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008; Farndale, Scullion, & Sparrow, 2010; Hiltrop, 1999; Lewis & Heckman, 2006). Various aspects of talent management have been examined including its antecedents and consequences. Despite the increasing number of studies on talent management, we found that only a few studies have focused on education sector. Thus, there is a need to examine the issue of talent management in academia given that education sector is a service sector in which its competitive advantage is gained through talented employees.

On the basis of past literature, we found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are two variables that may predict employee retention. Hence, we intend to extend previous findings by testing these two variables on turnover intention among talented lecturers in Malaysia. Also, we add in co-worker support as a moderator to our conceptual framework to explain how these relationships may vary according to the level of co-worker support. As part of this larger study, we also conducted a pilot study to test its reliability, validity, and feasibility using a sample of talented lecturers. In this paper, we present the findings of the pilot study analysis.

Literature Review

Talent management in academic settings

According to Tansley (2011), the value of talent management has been long recognized by practitioners but its development is slow among academic community. As such, it is not surprising that talent management is ill-defined. Nevertheless, a few scholars have attempted to fill the gap by discussing what talent and talent management are (cf., Nilsson & Ellström, 2012; Tansley, 2011). Following Nilsson & Ellström (2012), we define talent management as the process of identifying, securing, developing, and managing talent in meeting the long-term strategic needs of an organization and for short-term productivity.

Although talent management has received significant attention among scholars, much of these works focus on professionals in non-academic settings. A reason that may explain this lack of attention is that faculties are seen as major players in shaping "talent" in students rather than recognizing the faculties as talents. Our literature search found only a few talent management studies that focus on academic settings. These studies consist of both conceptual papers and empirical works.

Davies and Davies (2010) provide a review on talent management in semi-autonomous schools. Their conceptual paper proposes that talent management in academies or semi-autonomous schools may be developed by focusing on talent identification, talent development, and talent culture. An empirical evidence of talent management in academic setting is found in Agrawal (2010) and Lavania, Sharma, and Gupta (2011). Although these two studies investigate factors that may be important in managing talent, Agrawal (2010) found that learning opportunities, working environment, incentives, recognition, and salary are the five factors valued by talented faculties in her study sample whereas Lavania et al. (2011) found that factors that are associated to talent management may be also related to the levels of talent management in higher education (i.e., management level, head of the instructions or director level, and a combination of faculty, technical, and student level). In sum, these three studies indicate that talent management is relevant in academic settings.

A different approach in examining talent management among faculties, however, is taken in our study. We propose that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are two important predictors for retaining talented faculties on the basis of our extensive literature review on talent management. As we intended only to report our pilot study findings, we did not include a full discussion of our literature review in the present study.

The importance of pilot study

Pilot study is a study conducted prior to conducting a main study. It is a "miniature version" of the main study to be conducted by a researcher (Woken, n.d.). It is because much of research requirements are conducted in smaller scale, such as smaller sample size, smaller scope of study, or limited procedures (Woken, n.d.). Scholars have identified several reasons why conducting a pilot study is important. The reasons include but not limited to refining hypotheses and research question, evaluating planned statistical and analytical procedures, evaluating measures, assessing the feasibility of a full-scale study, assessing people's willingness to participate in the study, and testing the adequacy of questionnaire (cf., Woken, n.d.; van Teijlingen, Rennie, Hundley, & Graham, 2001). Given the importance of conducting a pilot study as highlighted in the aforementioned argument, we conducted a pilot study prior to conducting a full-scale study in order to test reliability and validity of the study variables and also to identify feasibility of pursuing with a full-scale study.

Method

Data were collected using a survey questionnaire among a convenience sample of 100 talented lecturers. Following Agrawal (2010), talented lecturers or talents are conceptually defined as lecturers who have served at least three years in their current work institution and have published at least three research papers. The survey questionnaire consists of three sections, (i.e., Section A on demographic variables, section B on organizational commitment, co-worker support, and turnover intention, and section C on job satisfaction). The usable number of returned responses, however, is 30.

Majority of the respondents were female (74%), were Malay (97%), held at least a master degree (87%), and held a lecturer position (70%). Most of the respondents were in their early 30s. The respondents were working for various faculties in the university including academy of linguistic, accountancy, business management, computer science and mathematics, law, applied science, and civil engineering. The results of demographic analysis are presented in Table 1.

The organizational commitment scale, the job satisfaction scale, the co-worker support scale, and the turnover intention scale were adopted and adapted from previous studies. All responses were elicited using a seven point Likert-type scale. Respondents were required to rate their level of agreement ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree for organizational commitment scale, co-worker support scale, and turnover intention scale, and to rate their level of satisfaction ranging from 1 = extremely dissatisfied to 7 = extremely satisfied for the job satisfaction scale. As all instruments were based on summated scale, therefore, the higher the score the higher the level of agreement or satisfaction is.

Table 1: Demographic results

Demographic categories	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	8	26.7
Female	22	73.3
Age		
26 to 30	4	13.3
31 to 35	8	26.7
36 to 40	7	23.3
41 to 45	6	20.0
46 to 50	1	3.3
51 and above	4	13.3
Faculty		
Academy of linguistic	3	10.0
Accounting	4	13.3
Business Management	10	33.3
Computer Science and Mathematics	8	26.7
Law	1	3.3
Applied Science	3	10.0
Civil Engineering	1	3.3
Race		
Malay	29	96.7
Chinese	1	3.3
Level of education		
Master Degree	26	86.7
PhD	4	13.3
Grade		
DM 45/46	21	70.0
DM 51/52	8	26.7
DM 53/54	1	3.3

Organizational commitment was measured using Allen and Meyer's (1990) organizational commitment scale. This measurement scale consists of 24 items that represent three dimensions of commitment, which are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Sample items are "this university has a great deal of personal meaning for me" (affective commitment), "right now, staying in university is a matter of necessity as much as desire" (continuance commitment), and "I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization" (normative commitment). Organizational commitment was treated as a multidimensional zero-order reflective construct. Job satisfaction was measured using eight items adopted from Oshagbemi (1999). The items include teaching, research, administration and management, present pays, promotion, supervisor's behavior, co-worker's behavior, and working facilities. Because all these items form the job satisfaction construct, job satisfaction is a formative construct. Co-worker support was adapted from Ducharme and Martin (2000). This scale consists of ten items that tap into respondent's perception of the likelihood of receiving support from co-worker in time of stress. A sample item is "my co-workers take a personal interest in me". Co-worker support was treated as a reflective construct because the ten items reflect what co-worker support is. The dependent variable, turnover intention, was a reflective construct. To measure turnover intention, three items were adopted from Samad (2006). A sample item is "I often think about quitting".

In addition, background information such as gender, age, faculty, race, level of education, and position grade were sought from the respondents. Respondents were asked to provide demographic information by checking the appropriate option or completing the space provided.

Data Analysis and Results

Data were analyzed using partial least squares path modeling technique. According to Chin and Newsted (1999), partial least squares may be used when the number of sample size is as small as 30. As such, we use partial least squares path modeling technique because our sample size was 30. In addition, we use this technique because internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity may be established through measurement model assessment. Although partial least squares path modeling technique may be used to test the hypotheses, in line with our objective of the present paper we only included the results of the measurement model, which comprise of the reliability and validity results of the study model. To do so, we use SmartPLS 2.0 M3 developed by Ringle, Wende, and Will (2005).

The assessment of a measurement model depends on the type of constructs included in a particular model. In other words, a measurement model may include both reflective and formative constructs, which differ in the criteria of assessment. For a reflective construct, there are four criteria of assessment at the measurement model stage. The criteria are reliability of the indicator loadings, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). On the other hand, only three criteria are used for evaluating a formative construct. Hair, Sarstedt, Ringle, and Mena (2012) suggest reporting indicator weights, significance of the weights, and multicollinearity when assessing a formative construct. We ran partial least squares algorithm using SmartPLS 2.0 M3 to obtain the results for evaluating both reliability and validity of the data.

All constructs in our model except job satisfaction were reflective constructs. The first criterion that we examined was indicator loadings in order to determine its reliability. Hair et al. (2011) suggest that good indicator loading should be 0.70 or higher. They also suggest that any indicator loading that falls below 0.40 should be removed. As shown in Table 2, a majority of items have loadings below than the cut-off value. Specifically, five items each from affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment as well as eight items from co-worker support have values less than 0.40. All items in turnover intention, however, have values greater than 0.70.

Items with low indicator loadings were removed by deleting them one at a time. We checked the construct's composite reliability every time an item was removed. As suggested by Hair et al. (2011), removal of an item with low indicator loading should increase the value of its composite reliability. We continued with removing problematic items until the value of composite reliability remain unchanged or dropped to a lesser value than it was before. Although one item from co-worker support and two items from normative continuance have values less than 0.70, we did not remove them. It is because more variance can be captured by retaining at least three items per construct. Table 3 shows the number of items that were removed for each construct and the number of items that were retained for each construct. Table 4 shows the items for each construct and their respective indicator loadings after removing the problematic items.

The next criterion for reflective construct that we assessed was internal consistency reliability using the remaining items. Hair et al. (2011) suggest the cut-off value of 0.70 for internal consistency reliability. The internal consistency reliability was measured using Cronbach's α and composite reliability. As shown in Table 4, Cronbach's α values for all reflective constructs ranged from 0.53 to 0.88, whereas composite reliability values ranged from 0.75 to 0.93. According to Kline (1999), a reliability value between 0.50 and 0.60 is considered poor, between 0.60 and 0.70 is questionable and between 0.80 and 0.90 is considered good. Out of five constructs, two constructs are considered good, which are affective commitment (i.e., 0.85) and turnover intention (i.e., 0.88). Another two constructs have questionable values; that is continuance commitment with alpha value of 0.67 and co-worker support with alpha value of 0.61. The only construct that had poor internal consistency reliability when measured using Cronbach's alpha was normative commitment with a value of 0.53. Meanwhile, the composite reliability for each constructs exceeds the cut-off value of 0.70 (Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, 2000; Hair et al., 2011), suggesting the adequacy of internal consistency reliability.

Table 2: Indicator loadings before items removal

Indicators	AF_C	CO_C	CWS	NO_C	TOI
AF_C1	-0.86				
AF_C2	-0.22				
AF_C3	0.12				
AF_C4	-0.11				
AF_C5	0.85				
AF_C6	0.81				
AF_C7	-0.28				
AF_C8	0.91				
CO_C1		-0.35			
CO_C2		0.16			
CO_C3		-0.11			
CO_C4		-0.53			
CO_C5		0.67			
CO_C6		0.70			
CO_C7		0.81			
CO_C8		-0.34			
CW1			-0.16		
CW2			-0.37		
CW3			0.53		
CW4			-0.43		
CW5			-0.48		
CW6			-0.10		
CW7			-0.11		
CW8			0.04		
CW9			0.61		
CW10			0.12		
NO_C1				-0.61	
NO_C2				-0.24	
NO_C3				0.22	
NO_C4				0.51	
NO_C5				0.52	
NO_C6				0.75	
NO_C7				0.29	
NO_C8				-0.04	
TOI1					0.80
TOI2					0.96
TOI3					0.94

Note. AF_C = affective commitment, CO_C = continuance commitment, CWS = co-worker support, JS = job satisfaction, NO_C = normative commitment, TOI = turnover intention

Having established both indicator reliability and internal consistency reliability, we continued with assessing the convergent validity of the reflective constructs. Convergent validity, which aims at verifying that a set of indicators represents one and the same underlying construct, was measured using average variance extracted. The suggested cut-off value for average variance extracted is 0.50 (Fornell & Lacker, 1981), which means that at least half of the variance in the indicators is explained by its latent construct (Henseler, Ringle, & Sinkovics, 2009). As shown in Table 4, the values of average variance extracted for all constructs were above the cut-off value of 0.50; thus, this indicates that there is an evidence of convergent validity.

Table 3: Number of item deleted and number of items remain after deletion

Construct	Category	No. of items before deletion	No. of deleted item	No. of items remain after deletion
Affective commitment	Reflective	8	**5** (AF_C1, AF_C2,AF_C3, AF_C4, AF_C7)	3
Continuance commitment	Reflective	8	**5** (CO_C1, CO_C2, CO_C3, CO_C4, CO_C8)	3
Co-worker support	Reflective	10	**7** (CW1, CW2, CW4, CW5, CW6, CW7, CW8)	3
Normative commitment	Reflective	8	**5** (NO_C1, NO_C2, NO_C4, NO_C7, NO_C8)	3
Turnover intention	Reflective	3	None	3

Table 4: Constructs, items, indicator loadings, internal consistency reliability, and average variance extracted.

Construct	Code	Loadings	α	CR	AVE
Affective commitment	AF_C5	0.88	0.85	0.90	0.77
	AF_C6	0.80			
	AF_C8	0.94			
Continuance commitment	CO_C5	0.78	0.67	0.82	0.60
	CO_C6	0.78			
	CO_C7	0.77			
Co-worker support	CW3	0.79	0.61	0.79	0.56
	CW9	0.90			
	CW10	0.52			
Normative commitment	NO_C4	0.62	0.53	0.75	0.50
	NO_C5	0.69			
	NO_C6	0.80			
Turnover intention	TOI1	0.80	0.88	0.93	0.81
	TOI2	0.96			
	TOI3	0.94			

Note. CR = composite reliability, α = Cronbach's alpha, AVE = average variance extracted, AF_C = affective commitment, CO_C = continuance commitment, CWS = co-worker support, JS = job satisfaction, NO_C = normative commitment, TOI = turnover intention

The last criterion of a reflective construct that we evaluated for our measurement model is discriminant validity. According to Henseler et al. (2009), discriminant validity is a complementary concept to convergent validity; that is, there should be sufficient difference between two constructs. Discriminant validity is assessed at two levels, which are at the indicator level and at the construct level. At the indicator level, we examined the indicator loadings and cross-loadings. As shown in Table 5, all the items load highly on its assigned constructs. This indicates that there is an evidence of discriminant validity at the indicator level.

Table 5: Cross-loadings

Items	Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Co-worker support	Normative commitment	Turnover intention
AF_C5	**0.88**	0.35	0.15	-0.44	0.52
AF_C6	**0.80**	0.25	0.40	-0.53	0.30
AF_C8	**0.94**	0.26	0.38	-0.44	0.52
CO_C5	0.40	**0.78**	0.20	-0.11	0.45
CO_C6	0.11	**0.78**	0.44	-0.01	0.29
CO_C7	0.22	**0.77**	0.19	-0.02	0.41
CW10	0.15	0.36	**0.52**	-0.10	0.14
CW3	0.28	0.28	**0.78**	-0.15	0.27
CW9	0.30	0.20	**0.90**	-0.08	0.35
NO_C4	-0.51	0.14	-0.03	**0.62**	-0.14
NO_C5	-0.22	-0.09	0.04	**0.69**	-0.27
NO_C6	-0.45	-0.10	-0.25	**0.80**	-0.31
TO1	0.50	0.49	0.24	-0.23	**0.80**
TO2	0.45	0.44	0.27	-0.39	**0.96**
TO3	0.49	0.46	0.45	-0.34	**0.94**

Note. AF_C = affective commitment; CO_C = continuance commitment, NO_C = normative commitment, CW = co-worker support; TOI = turnover intention.

To assess the discriminant validity at the construct level, we compared the values of the square roots of average variance extracted to the correlations among the constructs. This technique known as the Fornell-Larcker criterion explains that a latent variable should share more variance with its assigned indicators than with any other latent variables (Henseler et al., 2009). The square root of average variance extracted for all the reflective constructs shown in Table 6 were found to be higher than the correlations among the constructs. Hence, it is an indication of discriminant validity at the construct level.

Table 6: Square root of average variance extracted and correlations among constructs

	Constructs	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Affective commitment	**0.88**				
2.	Continuance commitment	0.33	**0.77**			
3.	Co-worker support	0.33	0.33	**0.75**		
4.	Normative commitment	-0.52	-0.07	-0.13	**0.71**	
5.	Turnover intention	0.53	0.51	0.36	-0.36	**0.89**

Note. Diagonals are the square root of average variance extracted whereas the off-diagonals are the correlations among constructs.

Job satisfaction was the only formative construct included in our model. Following Hair et al.'s (2012) suggestion, we evaluated the construct on the following criteria—indicator weights and its significance, and multicollinearity among the indicators. The results of partial least squares bootstrapping for indicator weights and its significance are shown in Table 7. We found that the only significant indicator explaining job satisfaction was teaching with a weight value of 0.97 and significance at 0.1 level. The rest of the indicators were not significant. Therefore, all items except teaching may be questionable.

Table 7: Weights of formative indicator variables and their significance

Indicators in the formative measurement model	Originally predicted values	Mean (bootstrap)	Standard deviation	t-value
Teaching	0.97	0.67	0.58	1.66*
Research	-0.36	-0.16	0.54	0.66
Administration and management	0.40	0.30	0.43	0.93
Present pays	0.35	0.28	0.45	0.77
Promotion	-0.30	-0.24	0.48	0.62
Supervisor's behavior	-0.16	0.00	0.54	0.30
Co-worker's behavior	-0.20	-0.17	0.64	0.31
Working facilities	0.19	0.11	0.41	0.48

Note. $*p < 0.10$

The second criterion that we used to assess job satisfaction was multicollinearity. We ran a multiple regression with teaching as the dependent variable in order to generate tolerance and variance inflation values. Table 8 shows the results of the multiple regression in relation to multicollinearity. The maximum value for the variance inflation is 5 to indicate a serious multicollinearity problem, whereas tolerance values should be bigger than 0.20 (Hair et al., 2012). As shown in Table 8, the highest variance inflation value belongs to supervisor's behaviour with 4.08 and the lowest tolerance value belongs to both co-worker's behaviour and supervisor's behaviour with 0.25. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no problem of multicollinearity.

Table 8: Evaluation of multicollinearity in the formative measurement model

Indicators in the formative measurement models	Tolerance	Variance inflation
Research	0.85	1.18
Administration and management	0.71	1.41
Present pays	0.52	1.94
Promotion	0.44	2.28
Supervisor's behaviour	0.25	4.08
Co-worker's behaviour	0.25	4.07
Working facilities	0.57	1.74

Discussion

In the present work, we intend to evaluate the reliability, validity, and feasibility of our turnover intention study among talented lecturers by conducting a pilot study. Our constructs consist of three reflective constructs (i.e., organizational commitment, co-worker support, and turnover intention) and one formative construct (i.e., job satisfaction). Organizational commitment, however, was treated as a multidimensional zero-order construct. To generate the results for the measurement model, we employed partial least squares path modeling technique using a freeware program, SmartPLS 2.0 M3. In general, we found some support to the constructs' reliability and validity of the pilot study. The following paragraphs discuss the details of the findings.

With a sample size of 30, we found that a majority of the items included in our study did not satisfy the cut-off value of the indicator loadings. Five items from the affective commitment scale were removed due to low indicator loadings. We speculate that the low indicator loadings may associate with our sample characteristics and poor questionnaire constructions. Most of our respondents were Generation X and Generation Y employees who were skeptical to organizations and fun-seeking people. As such, they may find staying in one organization does not make them happy (i.e., AF_C1) and the university's problem is not their problem (i.e., AF_C3). They also may feel that there is no or little attachment to the university (AF_C7). In addition, all except one respondent were Malay. They may find that it is not easy to be attached to other universities that have diverse workforce comprising of different races (i.e., AF_C4). We also found that the other item (i.e., AF_C2) was related to poor questionnaire construction. That is, the question posed was too general. Item AF_C2 that taps into the extent to which the respondent's enjoy discussing about the university with others. Without specifying the

specific issues of discussion- such as working environment, workplace problems, or management efficiency-the respondents may not understand the question fully.

Five items from continuance commitment were also removed. We speculate three reasons why the removed items have low loadings. First, external factor may have influenced the respondents' rating choice. Specifically, the Generation X and Generation Y employees were aware that there is a tight job market. Although they were not loyal to the university and they tend to job hop, they stayed at the university because they may be afraid of losing their jobs and anxious about competing with a high number of job seekers. Therefore, awareness of tight job market may be included as a control variable in the future full-scale study. Item CO_C1 that taps into respondent's decision to quit the job, however, was dropped from the present study because of its low loading. Second, a majority of our sample respondents have been working more than three years. They may feel that they have gained sufficient knowledge and experience that may be useful if they leave the university. Hence, this question (i.e., CO-C2) should be reverse coded if it is to be included in the full-scale study. Also, years of service should be included as a control variable. Third, poor questionnaire construction was associated with our decision to remove the other three items (i.e., CO_C3, CO_C4, and CO_C8). The questions were either not specific or too specific. For example, respondents may interpret "too much in my life", "costly", and "another university" differently. Although these items were dropped on the basis of our findings, they may be included in the full-scale study if they are re-constructed appropriately.

Normative commitment refers to an obligation to maintain employment in an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). It is the organizational commitment component that relates to "ought" to do. A factor that may influence normative commitment is organizational socialization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). As such, our Generation X and Generation Y respondents may not be loyal to the university but their answers may have been influenced by organizational socialization. In particular, their answers may have been influenced by social desirability bias; that is, they tend to provide answers that best reflect what others in the university might have answered for the questions. For example, item NO_C8 was "I do not think that wanting to be a company man or company woman is sensible anymore". Although our respondents may believe that being loyal is not sensible anymore, they may answer it differently so that their answers would reflect the best answer that is expected from other lecturers in the university who differ in generational cohorts. A similar pattern of reasoning was observed for items NO_C1, NO_C2, NO_C4, and NO_C7. Therefore, future full-scale study should consider including social desirability bias as a control variable.

The highest number of items that we removed from the study is from co-worker support scale. Of the ten items included, we removed seven of them. Our theoretical justification for such removal relates to the nature of the respondents' task responsibilities. The respondents' tasks are primarily teaching and marking papers. Given a heavy workload, they may spend their times in completing the task on their own without having to depend so much on their colleagues. Therefore, they may not have enough time to get along with their co-workers or to build up good relationships with their co-workers. We speculate that the remaining items (i.e., CW3, CW9, and CW10) are much associated with either the formal work requirement that calls for employees to work together in accomplishing   goal-directed tasks or the negative behavior of gossiping. The relationships between co-worker support and nature of the tasks and gossiping, however, are yet to be tested.

Having removed the problematic items, we found support for internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. No serious threats were found for all these criteria. The Cronbach's alpha value for normative commitment, however, was poor. A reason that may explain the poor alpha reliability of this construct is that only three items were used to capture its variance and two of these items have low indicator loadings   (i.e., below the suggested cut-off value of 0.70). Hence, we suggest that more refined items should be included for continuance commitment, normative commitment, and co-worker support in the full-scale study. By including more items, more variance may be captured for these variables, which in turn will increase the values of indicator loadings reliability, internal consistency reliability, and average variance extracted.

Our assessment of the formative construct shows that all except one item were not significant. Although all these items were taken from previous study by Oshagbemi (1999), only teaching was found to be significant in explaining what job satisfaction is. A probable reason is that these items were not elaborated in full sentences. Following the findings of Oshagbemi (1999), we included these items in point form. Hence, these items (i.e., research, administration and management, present pays, promotion, supervisor's behavior, co-worker's behavior, and working facilities) should be refined by presenting them in sentences and making them more specific.

In addition, incentives should be given to future participants of the study. As shown in our pilot study, there were only 30 usable returned responses although we sent out to 100 selected participants. As such, we were not able to run an exploratory factor analysis with a sample of 30 responses because of small sample size. As suggested by Bandalos and Finney (2010), a sample of at least 100 is required to run exploratory factor analysis to obtain a communality of .70 for three factors with four variables each. We hope that by giving away incentives we will be able to get more participants to participate in our study and to get more numbers of usable responses.

To ensure that these aims are achieved, we also find that there is a need to send out survey questionnaire to participants at least twice the number of responses required. Nevertheless, this approach is not suitable if our aim is to generalize the study findings to a specific population. It is because generalization requires using a probability sampling. The number of participants that is selected using a probability sampling is exhaustive. That is, we are refrained from sending out more survey questionnaire if the initial return responses are insufficient. This practice is in contrast to the probability sampling theory.

Conclusion

Our pilot study shows that there is a need to refine the survey questionnaire. The problems that we need to address include poor questionnaire construction, sample characteristics, social desirability bias, and inclusion of control variables. Given these problems, we believe that there is also a need to run a pre-test prior to collecting data for full-scale study. The pilot study also indicates that the study on turnover intention among talented lecturers is feasible to be carried out and will be able to contribute to the existing body of knowledge.

References

Agrawal, S. (2010). Talent management model for business schools: Factor analysis. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 45*(3), 481–491.

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*, 1–18.

Bandalos, D. L., & Finney, S. J. (2010). Factor analysis: Exploratory and confirmatory. In Hancock, G. R., & Mueller, R. O. (Eds.), *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences* (pp. 93–114). New York: Routledge.

Chin, W. W., & Newsted, P. R. (1999). Structural equation modeling analysis with small samples using partial least squares. In Hoyle, R. H. (Ed.), *Statistical strategies for small sample research* (pp. 307–341). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

D'Amato, A., & Herzfeldt, R. (2008). Learning orientation, organizational commitment, and talent retention across generations: A study of European managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(8), 929–953.

Davies, B., & Davies, B. J. (2010). Talent management in academies. *International Journal of Educational Management, 24*(5), 418–426.

Ducharme, L. J., & Martin, J. K. (2000). Unrewarding work, co-worker support, and job satisfaction: A test of the buffering hypothesis. *Work and Occupation, 27*(2), 223–243.

Farndale, E., Scullion, H., & Sparrow, P. (2010). The role of the corporate HR function in global talent management. *Journal of World Business, 45*, 161–168.

Fornell, C., & Lacker, D.F. (1981). Evaluation structural equation models with unobserved variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50.

Gefen, D., Straub, D.W., & Boudreau, M.-C. (2000). Structural equation modeling and regression: guidelines for research practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 4*, 1–79.

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19*(2), 139–151.

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40*(3), 414–433.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. In *Advances in International Marketing*, pp. 277-319. Bingley: Emerald.

Hiltrop, J. (1999). The quest for the best: Human resource practices to attract and retain talent. *European Managerial Journal, 17*(4): 422-430.

Kline, P. (1999). *The handbook of psychological testing*. 2nd ed., London: Routledge.
Lavania, D., Sharma, H., & Gupta, N. (2011). Faculty recruitment and retention: A key for managing talent in higher education. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems, 1*(2), 1–14.

Lewis, R. E., & Heckman, R. J. (2010). Talent management: A critical review. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*: 139-154.

McKinsey & Company (2001). The war for talent: Organization and leadership practice. http://autoassembly.mckinsey.com/html/downloads/articles/War_For_Talent.pdf [10 July 2012].

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1): 61-89.

Nilsson, S., & Ellström, P. (2012). Employability and talent management: Challenges for HRD practices. *European Journal of Training and Development, 36*(1), 26–45.

Oshagbemi, T. (1999). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single versus multiple-item measures? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 14*(5), 388–403.

Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Will, A. (2005). SmartPLS (Version 2.0) [Computer software]. Hamburg, Germany: SmartPLS.

Samad, S. (2006). The contribution of demographic variables: Job characteristics and job satisfaction on turnover intentions. *Journal of International Management Studies, 1*(1), 1–12.

Tansley, C. (2011). What do we mean by the term "talent" in talent management?". *Industrial and Commercial Training, 43*(5): 266-274.

van Teijlingen, E. R., Rennie, A., Hundley, V., & Graham, W. (2001). The importance of conducting and reporting pilot studies: the example of Scottish Births Survey. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 34*(3): 289-295.

Woken, M. D. (u.d.). Advantages of a pilot study. Center for Teaching and Learning, University of Illinois at Springfield. http://www.uis.edu/ctl/writing/documents/ctlths7.pdf [10 July 2012].

IDA ROSNITA ISMAIL, NORULHUDA TAJUDDIN, NOR KHAIRUNNISA MAT YUNUS, ROSLINA ALI. Universiti Teknologi MARA Pahang. idarosnita@pahang.uitm.edu.my, alhudatajuddin583@pahang.uitm.edu.my, norkhairunnusa@pahang.uitm.edu.my, roslinaali@pahang.uitm.edu.my