Contents lists available at Science-Gate

International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences

Journal homepage: https://www.science-gate.com/IJAAS.html

Examining the relationship between job satisfaction dimensions and lecturers' loyalty in higher education: A quantitative study

Dwi Haryanta [1,*], Djojo Dihardjo [2], Adrianto Trimarjono [2]

[1]Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, Indonesia
[2]Faculty of Economics and Business, Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 4 April 2026
Received in revised form
15 September 2026
Accepted 19 October 2026

Keywords:
Job satisfaction
Lecturer loyalty
Higher education
Compensation and welfare
Work environment

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty play an important role in the development of higher education institutions. This study aimed to examine the relationship between six dimensions of job satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was adopted, and data were collected using a questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. The findings showed that the mean scores for lecturers' job satisfaction ranged from 2.60 to 2.81. Based on the measurement scale, compensation and welfare received a mean score of 2.45, indicating dissatisfaction, while the other five dimensions were rated as satisfactory. Lecturers' loyalty was very high, with a mean score of 3.42. The results also revealed weak to moderate positive correlations between five dimensions of job satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty. However, career development was not significantly correlated with loyalty (r = 0.162), and therefore, H5 was rejected. Overall, job satisfaction explained only 6–22% of the variance in lecturers' loyalty, indicating that other factors also contribute to loyalty. The findings suggest that higher education institutions should prioritize improvements in compensation and welfare, the work environment, and lecturers' professional competencies. Furthermore, improvements in job satisfaction alone may not necessarily lead to substantial increases in lecturers' loyalty.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by IASE. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Universities around the world are facing increasing pressure to improve the quality of their lecturers due to rising workloads, competition, and changing pedagogical expectations (He et al., 2026; Li et al., 2026). University reputation is critical to institutional sustainability, competitiveness, and long-term success (Amado Mateus et al., 2024). Reputation serves as an indicator of a university's quality, the competitiveness of its alumni, its institutional image, and its level of global recognition (Mendoza-Villafaina and López-Mosquera, 2024; Purevsuren et al., 2025). University administrators must understand the factors that influence institutional performance to achieve sustainable success (Albaroudi et al., 2025). Job satisfaction and employee loyalty are key determinants of the institution's sustainable development (Haryanta et al., 2025; Trinh et al., 2023).

Lecturers are an essential component of higher education institutions who play a role in transforming, developing, and disseminating knowledge, technology, and the arts, delivering high-quality instruction, and developing curricula (Guterres et al., 2025; Kim and Maijan, 2024; Lie et al., 2024). Lecturers' job satisfaction has been shown to influence improved performance, student achievement, and the quality of education (Zhu et al., 2025). Therefore, university leadership needs to develop strategies to enhance lecturers' job satisfaction so that both lecturers' performance and the university's overall performance improve (Zebon et al., 2025).

Lecturers' loyalty to an institution reflects a commitment and emotional attachment demonstrated through a willingness to contribute to the institution's advancement (Ahmad and Jameel, 2018). Loyal lecturers tend to work more effectively, produce higher-quality work, and ultimately enhance the institution's performance. The loyalty of all stakeholders is a key factor in an institution's success in the face of competition (García-Rodríguez and Gutiérrez-Taño, 2024). Higher job satisfaction

* Corresponding Author.
Email Address: dwi_haryanta@uwks.ac.id (D. Haryanta)
https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2026.10.011
Corresponding author's ORCID profile:
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7360-8119
2313-626X/© 2026 The Authors. Published by IASE.
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

has been shown to reduce lecturers' intention to change jobs (Guyo, 2023).

Lecturers' loyalty is crucial for institutional development. Loyal lecturers tend to be high performers, dedicated, and committed to the institution's goals. Lecturers' loyalty is fostered through increased job satisfaction, effective management support, and the creation of a conducive work environment. The findings of this study can serve as input for higher education institutions in designing effective policies to retain loyal and high-performing lecturers, thereby ensuring that educational goals are achieved. This study aims to analyze the relationship between job satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty, and to identify the factors that influence job satisfaction as a reference for enhancing loyalty to the institution. The research findings will contribute to higher education marketing theory by incorporating lecturers' loyalty into the higher education management system.

2. Literature review

2.1. Lecturers' job satisfaction and loyalty

Job satisfaction reflects an individual's affective evaluation of their work, influenced by compensation, leadership, the work environment, and career development opportunities. In the context of higher education, faculty job satisfaction plays a role in optimizing performance and influences lecturers' decisions to remain at their institutions (Zhu et al., 2025). Job satisfaction mediates and reinforces the strategic value of academic human resource development (Azan et al., 2025; Mohamud et al., 2024; Yingying et al., 2025). Lecturers' satisfaction is associated with lower turnover intentions, reducing the tendency to move to another institution (Kato, 2025). Moreover, satisfaction with the social work environment promotes teaching innovation. Satisfaction with the faculty's social work environment motivates teaching innovation (Ertaş and Pekmezci, 2025).

Managerial effectiveness and organizational support contribute to lecturers' organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2024). Organizational perception and empowerment have a significant effect on lecturers' loyalty (Fitriyana et al., 2023). All components of transformational leadership have a positive effect on lecturers' loyalty to the institution (Alrayes et al., 2021). Servant leadership has a significant effect on lecturers' affective commitment (Cen et al., 2024). Leadership style contributes to lecturers' organizational commitment (Jaenudin et al., 2024). Financial rewards significantly influence job satisfaction and lecturers' affective organizational commitment (Kristanti et al., 2021). Job loyalty is influenced by compensation, bonuses, career advancement, benefits provided, salary, and workload (Mahaputra and Saputra, 2021). Organizational justice has a significant effect on job loyalty (Meilando et al., 2023). The work environment has a significant effect on lecturers' affective commitment (Cen et al., 2024). Career satisfaction contributes to lecturers' organizational commitment (Chen, 2025; Ertaş and Pekmezci, 2025; Mahaputra and Saputra, 2021). Job satisfaction is influenced by career development and can serve as a mediator in the relationship between career development and lecturer loyalty (Athala and Sumastuti, 2024).

Competencies and career development have a positive effect on employee loyalty through job satisfaction. Competency development contributes to lecturers' organizational commitment. Improving emotional intelligence and self-efficacy helps lecturers better cope with work-related stress, thereby increasing organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2024). Lecturers' competencies have a significant effect on lecturers' performance and exert the greatest and most dominant influence compared to the variables of compensation and work environment (Alrayes et al., 2021).

Lecturers' loyalty is defined as the commitment and emotional attachment that reflect a lecturer's willingness to contribute to the institution's advancement and desire to remain there (Ahmad and Jameel, 2018). Loyal lecturers are responsible, actively participate, and maintain relationships to support the achievement of the institution's vision and mission. Career development, the work environment, and job satisfaction collectively influence lecturers' loyalty. Lecturers feel valued and take pride in dedicating themselves to the institution. Trust in the institution's management has a positive effect on lecturers' loyalty.

2.2. Research hypotheses

Based on the literature review, the following six hypotheses were formulated:

H1: There is a relationship between lecturers' satisfaction with Lecturers Management Policies (X1) and lecturers' loyalty to the institution (Y) (Chen et al., 2024; Ertaş and Pekmezci, 2025).
H2: There is a relationship between lecturers' satisfaction with Leadership Commitment (X2) and lecturers' loyalty to the institution (Y) (Alrayes et al., 2021).
H3: There is a relationship between lecturers' satisfaction with Compensation and Welfare (X3) and lecturers' loyalty to the institution (Y) (Kristanti et al., 2021).
H4: There is a relationship between lecturers' satisfaction with the work environment (X4) and their loyalty to the institution (Y) (Alrayes et al., 2021; Cen et al., 2024).
H5: There is a relationship between lecturers' satisfaction with Career Development (X5) and lecturers' loyalty to the institution (Y) (Chen, 2025; Ertaş and Pekmezci, 2025).
H6: There is a relationship between lecturers' satisfaction with Competency Development (X6) and their institutional loyalty (Y) (Alrayes et al., 2021; Ertaş and Pekmezci, 2025).

3. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive-correlational quantitative design. The population comprised 344 permanent lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, across eight faculties. A sample of 88 lecturers was selected using proportionate stratified random sampling.

The research instrument consisted of a questionnaire with seven variables: (X1) satisfaction with lecturers' management policies, (X2) leadership commitment, (X3) compensation and welfare, (X4) work environment, (X5) career development, (X6) competency development, and (Y) lecturers' loyalty. Each item was measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The interpretation of the mean scores is based on the categories in Table 1.

Table 1: Satisfaction level categories based on average indicator scores

Average indicator score	Satisfaction level
1.00 – 1.75	Dissatisfied
> 1.75 – 2.5	Somewhat dissatisfied
> 2.5 – 3.25	Satisfied
> 3.25 – 4.00	Very satisfied

Item validity was tested using Pearson's product-moment correlation, with the criterion that items were categorized as valid when the calculated r value exceeded the critical r-table value. The results indicated that all items across the variables were categorized as valid, with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.594 to 0.735 for X1, 0.665 to 0.824 for X2, 0.522 to 0.729 for X3, 0.570 to 0.760 for X4, 0.632 to 0.871 for X5, 0.618 to 0.860 for X6, and 0.800 to 0.844 for Y1. Variable reliability was assessed using the split-half method and Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.70 or higher indicated acceptable reliability. The reliability test results are presented in Table 2.

Data collection was conducted by distributing an online questionnaire via Google Forms. The collected data were analyzed descriptively to describe the levels of satisfaction and loyalty among the respondents (lecturers). The relationship between job satisfaction and the lecturers' loyalty was measured by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Hypothesis testing of the correlation coefficient was performed using a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ (df = 86; t-table = 2.021). Data analysis was performed using SPSS.

Table 2: Results of the reliability test for research variables

No	Variable	Cronbach's alpha value	Conclusion
1	Lecturers' satisfaction with institutional policies for managing lecturers (human resources)	0.750	Reliable
2	Lecturers' satisfaction with the commitment of university leadership	0.858	Reliable
3	Lecturers' satisfaction with compensation and welfare	0.756	Reliable
4	Lecturers' satisfaction with the work environment	0.873	Reliable
5	Lecturers' satisfaction with career development	0.813	Reliable
6	Lecturers' satisfaction with competency development	0.819	Reliable
7	Lecturers' loyalty to the institution	0.844	Reliable

4. Results

Lecturers' satisfaction data were collected through a questionnaire. Descriptive analysis was conducted to determine the level of lecturers' satisfaction, which was classified according to the score ranges presented in Table 1.

To assess lecturers' satisfaction with institutional policies on lecturers' management, respondents were asked to evaluate several indicators related to personnel regulations, workload, attendance monitoring, and performance evaluation. The average satisfaction scores for each indicator are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Average satisfaction scores of lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya regarding institutional policies on lecturers' management

No	Indicator	Average	Notes
1	There are personnel regulations governing the recruitment, placement, payroll, career development, competency development, rewards, sanctions, and retirement systems.	2.38	Somewhat dissatisfied
2	Civil service regulations are implemented consistently, objectively, fairly, and transparently.	2.24	Not satisfied
3	Working hours are reasonable, as is the case in other agencies/institutions.	2.96	Satisfied
4	The workload assigned to lecturers is appropriate in accordance with applicable regulations.	3.04	Satisfied
5	The existence of lecturers' attendance monitoring activities, the summary of which is used as a reference for lecturers' performance evaluations.	2.67	Satisfied
6	The existence of a lecturers' performance evaluation system, the summary of which is used as a reference for promotion in rank or grade or for assignments to participate in professional development programs.	2.43	Somewhat dissatisfied
	Average	2.62	Satisfied

The lecturers' satisfaction with leadership commitment was assessed based on several indicators, including compliance with personnel regulations, the development of a positive work culture, clarity of job descriptions and workloads, and the monitoring and evaluation of lecturers' performance. The results of the assessment are presented in Table 4.

Lecturers' satisfaction with compensation and welfare was evaluated through indicators covering the payroll system, salary payment, allowances, social security, health benefits, performance incentives, and recognition of outstanding achievements. The average satisfaction scores for these indicators are presented in Table 5.

The assessment of lecturers' satisfaction with the work environment covered various aspects, including workplace communication, openness, cooperation, conflict management, opportunities to perform the three pillars of higher education, institutional collaboration, and the availability of supporting facilities. The results are summarized in

Table 6. Lecturers' satisfaction with career development was assessed based on the perceived objectivity, fairness, and transparency of promotion, academic position, certification, and structural position systems. The average scores for each career development indicator are presented in Table 7.

Table 4: Average satisfaction scores of lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, regarding leadership commitment

No	Indicator	Average	Notes
7	University/faculty/program leaders are committed to complying with applicable personnel regulations.	2.74	Satisfied
8	University/faculty/program leaders set an example in fostering a positive work culture.	2.56	Satisfied
9	University/faculty/program leaders provide clear job descriptions and workloads to each lecturer.	2.71	Satisfied
10	University/faculty/program leaders monitor and evaluate lecturers' work discipline.	2.53	Satisfied
11	University/faculty/program leaders evaluate the performance (fulfillment of lecturers' workload) of each lecturer.	2.71	Satisfied
12	Supervisors/heads of faculties/programs pay attention to and periodically coordinate or supervise lecturers' performance.	2.64	Satisfied
	Average	2.65	Satisfied

Table 5: Average satisfaction scores of lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, regarding compensation and welfare

No	Indicator	Average	Notes
13	The payroll system is fair and structured based on rank, grade, and length of service.	2.87	Satisfied
14	Salaries are paid regularly every month, specifically at the end of each month (between the 26th and 28th of each month).	3.59	Very satisfied
15	Lecturers receive functional allowances, position-based allowances, and welfare allowances, such as family allowances and employment social security.	3.10	Satisfied
16	Lecturers are provided with old-age security allowances in the form of pension funds.	2.32	Somewhat dissatisfied
17	Lecturers are provided with family health benefits.	1.73	Dissatisfied
18	In addition to salaries and allowances, lecturers are also given incentives for achieving targeted performance goals.	1.77	Somewhat dissatisfied
19	Lecturers with outstanding achievements are given awards.	1.80	Somewhat dissatisfied
	Average	2.45	Not satisfied

Table 6: Average satisfaction scores of lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya regarding the work environment

No	Indicator	Average	Notes
20	A conducive work environment, with good (harmonious) communication among supervisors, between supervisors and subordinates, and among coworkers (colleagues).	2.93	Satisfied
21	An atmosphere of openness, in which lecturers are free to provide feedback and express opinions to improve the performance of the institution or work unit.	2.83	Satisfied
22	There are no conflicts—neither among supervisors, between supervisors and subordinates, nor among groups of employees or lecturers.	2.73	Satisfied
23	Lecturers are involved in resolving problems that arise in their work units.	2.80	Satisfied
24	There is good cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between lecturers and administrative staff.	2.99	Satisfied
25	Opportunities for lecturers to carry out the three pillars of higher education (teaching, research, and community service)	3.21	Satisfied
26	University collaboration with other agencies/institutions that facilitate lecturers in carrying out the three pillars of higher education (teaching, research, and community service)	2.74	Satisfied
27	Availability of library facilities, Wi-Fi, and hotspots for accessing library materials	2.87	Satisfied
28	Safety and comfort of the workspace	2.88	Satisfied
29	A clean, beautiful, safe, and comfortable campus environment	2.61	Satisfied
30	Availability of laboratory facilities for practical work, hands-on training, and research	2.61	Satisfied
31	Availability of an e-campus and lecturers' portal	2.53	Satisfied
	Average	2.81	Satisfied

Table 7: Average satisfaction scores of lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya regarding career development

No	Indicator	Average	Description
32	The promotion and classification system has been implemented objectively, fairly, and transparently.	2.56	Satisfied
33	The academic position nomination system has been implemented objectively, fairly, and transparently.	2.65	Satisfied
34	The lecturer certification nomination system has been implemented objectively, fairly, and transparently.	2.91	Satisfied
35	The promotion system for structural positions has been implemented objectively, fairly, and transparently.	2.62	Satisfied
	Average	2.69	Satisfied

Lecturers' satisfaction with skills and competency development was assessed through indicators related to competency standards, training and professional development opportunities, further education, the fairness and transparency of development assignments, and recognition of advanced qualifications. The results of this assessment are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Average satisfaction scores of lecturers at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya regarding skills/competency development

No	Indicator	Average	Notes
36	Standardization of lecturers' competencies; for example, it is stipulated that lecturers must, at a minimum, be proficient in MS Word, PowerPoint, and Excel	2.57	Satisfied
37	Assigning training, refresher courses, workshops, and seminars for lecturers to expand their knowledge	2.67	Satisfied
38	Assignments for lecturers to pursue further studies to enhance their competencies	2.57	Satisfied
39	The assignment of lecturers to attend training sessions, workshops, educational programs, and seminars is conducted objectively, fairly, and transparently	2.74	Satisfied
40	Recognition in the form of credit equivalency for lecturers who have completed advanced studies to enhance their competencies	2.43	Somewhat dissatisfied
	Average	2.60	Satisfied

In general, lecturers were satisfied with all six dimensions of job satisfaction: lecturers' management policies, leadership commitment, compensation and welfare, work environment, career development, and competency development, as reflected by mean scores ranging from 2.45 to 2.81. The complete results are presented in Table 9. In addition to job satisfaction, the study examined

lecturers' loyalty to the institution through indicators reflecting institutional pride, commitment to maintaining the institution's reputation, willingness to recommend the institution to others, and perceptions of the institution's standing. The average loyalty scores for each indicator are presented in Table 10. Based on the score classifications, lecturers were categorized as moderately satisfied and highly loyal to the institution. Although most satisfaction dimensions were significantly associated with lecturers' loyalty, the correlation coefficients were weak ($r < 0.50$), indicating limited relationships. Satisfaction with career development was not significantly related to lecturers' loyalty.

Therefore, all hypotheses were supported except H5, which was rejected. The correlation results are presented in Table 11.

Table 9: Average lecturers' job satisfaction scores at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya

No	Dimensions of satisfaction	Average score	Description	Coefficient of determination for loyalty (r^2)
1	Institutional policies regarding lecturers' management	2.62	Satisfied	15.3%
2	Leadership commitment	2.65	Satisfied	10.3%
3	Compensation and welfare	2.45	Somewhat dissatisfied	6.3%
4	Work environment	2.81	Satisfied	21.4%
5	Career development	2.69	Satisfied	2.6%
6	Skill/competency development	2.60	Satisfied	21.8%

Table 10: Average lecturers' loyalty scores toward the institution

No	Indicator	Average	Notes
41	I am proud to be part of a higher education institution.	3.45	Very high loyalty
42	I will always uphold the good reputation of the higher education institution.	3.73	Very high loyalty
43	I will recommend my family, relatives, and friends to attend my higher education institution.	3.22	High loyalty
44	My higher education institution is a leading university that is well-known, particularly in East Java.	3.25	Very high loyalty
	Average	3.42	Very high loyalty

Table 11: Results of the hypothesis test on the correlation between lecturers' satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty to the institution

H	Correlation coefficient (r)	Calculated t-value	Critical t-value	Decision	Strength of correlation
H_1	0.391	3.940	2.021	Accepted	Weak to moderate
H_2	0.321	3.143	2.021	Accepted	Weak to moderate
H_3	0.251	2.405	2.021	Accepted	Weak
H_4	0.463	4.844	2.021	Accepted	Moderate
H_5	0.162	1.522	2.021	Rejected	Not significant
H_6	0.467	4.898	2.021	Accepted	Moderate

5. Discussion

These findings indicate that lecturers' job satisfaction at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, was categorized as moderate. Five of the six dimensions were categorized as satisfactory, whereas compensation and welfare (M = 2.45) were categorized as unsatisfactory. This finding aligns with the identification of compensation as a key determinant of job satisfaction in the education sector (Shimaneni and Kiley, 2025). Similarly, compensation and benefits significantly influence lecturers' satisfaction and performance (Bui, 2019). However, the present finding contrasts with salary to have the least influence on lecturer satisfaction (Santalia et al., 2024). This discrepancy may be attributable to the context of Indonesian private universities, where compensation, incentives, and social protection benefits are often less competitive than those offered in public institutions. Particular attention should be directed toward family health insurance (M = 1.73), categorized as dissatisfied, and performance incentives (M = 1.77), categorized as somewhat dissatisfied, as these areas warrant immediate improvement.

The correlation coefficients ranged from 0.251 to 0.467, indicating weak relationships between job satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty. Although statistically significant, these correlations have limited practical significance, as the corresponding r^2 values (6%–22%) suggest that job satisfaction explains only a small proportion of the variance in loyalty. This finding contrasts with the stronger contribution of job satisfaction to lecturers' organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2024). The discrepancy may be explained by the institutional context, where lecturers' loyalty at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, is shaped more by affective attachment and professional identity than by material satisfaction alone. This interpretation of professional identity and lecturers' characteristics plays a more substantial role in fostering institutional loyalty than traditional job satisfaction factors (Khan and Siriwardhane, 2021).

The most interesting finding was the rejection of H5: satisfaction with career development was not significantly correlated with lecturers' loyalty ($r = 0.162$; t-calculated = 1.522 < t-table = 2.021). This result contrasts with previous studies that identified career satisfaction as a significant predictor of loyalty and organizational commitment (Chen, 2025; Ertaş and Pekmezci, 2025). A possible explanation is that academic career advancement is often driven more by individual scholarly achievement than by institutional support alone. The promotion to the rank of professor depends largely on fulfilling research and publication requirements, while emphasizing the importance of performance in teaching, research, and community service (Khan and Siriwardhane, 2021; Mantai and Marrone, 2023). Consequently, lecturers may view career progression as a personal professional responsibility rather than a factor that strengthens their loyalty to a particular institution.

Satisfaction with career development does not show a significant correlation with lecturers' loyalty to the institution; this is likely due to: (1) the academic career paths of lecturers in Indonesia (functional positions, certification, lecturers' rank) are directly regulated by central government regulations (Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia). Lecturers may perceive career development as something beyond the institution's control, so satisfaction or dissatisfaction with this aspect does not affect their emotional attachment to the institution; (2) lecturers who already hold established career positions (lecturer, senior lecturer, or full professor) may no longer view career development as a motivator for loyalty; and (3) lecturers whose careers are progressing well exhibit high career mobility and more frequently pursue careers outside their institutions, so this does not positively correlate with loyalty. These findings represent a critical area for further research, and qualitative studies involving in-depth interviews with lecturers are needed to verify these explanations. Lecturers' job satisfaction can be enhanced through grit and affective commitment (Gustari and Widodo, 2021).

The most striking finding is the high level of lecturers' loyalty (average 3.42 = very high) despite only moderate job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in one dimension. This phenomenon is consistent with the findings of Khan and Siriwardhane (2021), who concluded that lecturers will remain and contribute despite dissatisfaction, but may leave the institution if a better offer arises that outweighs their loyalty. Lecturers' loyalty is currently likely driven by factors unrelated to satisfaction, such as a sense of dedication, social bonds with colleagues, a sense of responsibility toward students, and limited options in the job market.

This situation should be interpreted with caution rather than as evidence of effective institutional management. Although lecturers' loyalty was categorized as high, the moderate level of job satisfaction suggests a potential imbalance between attitudinal commitment and workplace experiences. Such loyalty may not be fully sustainable if underlying sources of dissatisfaction remain unaddressed. In particular, compensation and welfare, the only dimension categorized as unsatisfactory, may pose a long-term risk to lecturers' retention and commitment. As competition among higher education institutions intensifies, persistent dissatisfaction with compensation could gradually weaken lecturers' loyalty and increase the attractiveness of alternative employment opportunities (García-Rodríguez and Gutiérrez-Taño, 2024).

The strongest correlations with lecturers' loyalty were found for work environment ($r = 0.463$; $r^2 = 21.4\%$) and competency development ($r = 0.467$; $r^2 = 21.8\%$). These findings highlight the importance of a supportive socio-academic environment in fostering institutional loyalty. In alignment with previous studies, the work environment and opportunities for competency development have been identified as important contributors to lecturers' commitment (Cen et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). Although the effect sizes remain modest, the results suggest that efforts to strengthen lecturers' loyalty should extend beyond compensation and include initiatives that promote a positive work environment, collegial relationships, and continuous professional development.

6. Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between six dimensions of lecturers' job satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty at Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya. Overall, lecturers' job satisfaction was categorized as satisfactory, with mean scores ranging from 2.60 to 2.81, except for the compensation and welfare dimension, which was categorized as unsatisfactory (M = 2.45). Lecturers' loyalty was categorized as very high, with a mean score of 3.42. Positive but weak to moderate correlations were found between five dimensions of job satisfaction, such as lecturers' management policies, leadership commitment, compensation and welfare, work environment, and competency development, and lecturers' loyalty. The coefficients of determination (r^2) ranged from 6% to 22%, indicating that job satisfaction explained only a limited proportion of the variance in lecturers' loyalty. Career development satisfaction was not significantly associated with lecturers' loyalty (H5 rejected; $r = 0.162$), suggesting that lecturers' perceptions of academic career advancement may be shaped more by external regulatory requirements than by institutional policies. Further qualitative research is recommended to explore this phenomenon in greater depth. Although lecturers' loyalty was categorized as very high, its sustainability may depend on improvements in job satisfaction, particularly in compensation and welfare, the only dimension categorized as unsatisfactory.

Based on these findings, higher education institutions are encouraged to: (1) prioritize improvements in compensation and welfare, particularly family health insurance and performance incentives; (2) maintain and strengthen a supportive work environment and continuous competency development programs; (3) conduct qualitative investigations to better understand the absence of a significant relationship between career development satisfaction and lecturers' loyalty; and (4) develop initiatives that enhance lecturers' sense of institutional identity, belonging, and commitment.

Practical implications: The findings highlight the importance of lecturers' job satisfaction as a factor associated with institutional loyalty. However, the relatively weak correlations observed in this study suggest that improvements in job satisfaction alone may not be sufficient to substantially enhance lecturers' loyalty. Higher education institutions

should therefore adopt a multidimensional approach that combines efforts to improve working conditions with strategies that strengthen lecturers' identification with the institution. Particular attention should be directed toward compensation and welfare, which emerged as the only dimension categorized as unsatisfactory. In addition, institutions should continue to invest in supportive work environments and competency development programs, as these dimensions demonstrated the strongest associations with lecturers' loyalty. Efforts to foster a sense of belonging, professional recognition, collegial support, and participation in institutional decision-making may further contribute to sustaining long-term lecturers' commitment.

Theoretical implications: This study makes a significant contribution to the literature on the role of lecturers' performance in supporting the performance and reputation of higher education institutions.

This study has limitations in that its scope is restricted to a single private university. Although the sample size of lecturers was quite large and the findings provide valuable insights, they are not yet robust enough to be generalized to all higher education institutions. Future research should be expanded to include institutions with diverse organizational backgrounds, such as public universities, private universities, religious universities, and others. The analysis of relationships between variables should go beyond simple correlation and be developed using structural equation modeling (SEM).

List of abbreviations

α	Significance level
df	Degrees of freedom
M	Mean
r	Pearson correlation coefficient
r^2	Coefficient of determination
SEM	Structural equation modeling
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
t	t-statistic

Acknowledgment

The authors express gratitude to the Rector of Wijaya Kusuma University, Surabaya, for the funding support provided through the ENIMAS program, as well as for the encouragement to publish scholarly work in reputable international journals.

Compliance with ethical standards

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM), Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Indonesia (Approval No. 269/LPPM/UWKS/XI/2026). Participation was voluntary, and all respondents were informed of the study's objectives before completing the questionnaire. The confidentiality and anonymity of respondents were protected, and the data collected were used solely for academic and research purposes.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Ahmad MAA and Jameel AS (2018). Factors affecting on job satisfaction among academic staff. Polytechnic Journal, 8(2): 119–128. https://doi.org/10.25156/ptj.2018.8.2.161

Albaroudi HB, Altuwaijri AI, Albagieh MN, and Iqbal S (2025). Unlocking university performance: The role of staff commitment and accreditation effectiveness in Saudi universities. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12: 1136. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05533-0

Alrayes NS, Rady YA, and Khatiry AR (2021). An analysis of transformational leadership and organizational loyalty among academics at a Saudi university. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(4): 2403–2418.

Amado Mateus M, Guzmán Rincón A, Juárez Acosta F, Ramos Soler I, and Rodríguez Valero D (2024). Keys to managing university reputation from the students' perspective. Heliyon, 10(21): e39805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39805 **PMid:39553646 PMCid:PMC11564934**

Athala ED and Sumastuti E (2024). Analysis of employee loyalty with job satisfaction as intervening variable. MUTIARA: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin Indonesia, 2(1): 209–223. https://doi.org/10.61404/jimi.v2i1.159

Azan K, Yamin M, and Jamaluddin (2025). The influence of commitment, performance, and job satisfaction of lecturers on their work adjustment at private Islamic religious higher education institutions in Riau Province. International Journal of Social Science and Religion, 6(2): 221–240. https://doi.org/10.53639/ijssr.v6i2.338

Bui NT (2019). Factors affecting job satisfaction of lecturers - evidence from Vietnamese universities. Archives of Business Research, 7(10): 19–40. https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.710.7209

Cen C, Amrizah A, and Kamaluddin K (2024). The influence of service leadership on affective commitment and its implications on the performance of STIE lecturer in Medan City. Jurnal Riset Bisnis dan Manajemen, 17(1): 75–86. https://doi.org/10.23969/jrbm.v17i1.10262

Chen M (2025). Exploring the influencing effect of tertiary teachers' perceived organizational support and teacher self-efficacy on their job satisfaction: The mediating role of teacher work engagement. Frontiers in Psychology, 16: 1609824. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1609824 **PMid:41079868 PMCid:PMC12509069**

Chen S, Abdul Kadir S, and Mohd Sufian Kang EK (2024). Factors influencing lecturers' organizational commitment in higher education: A systematic literature review. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 13(4): 192–208. https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v13n4p192

Ertaş BD and Pekmezci FB (2025). Career motivation and job satisfaction in Türkiye: Mediating role of teacher İnnovativeness and İnstructional practice. The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 34: 193–207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00846-1

Fitriyana F, Astuti HW, Rahman A, Werdiningsih R, and Idrus S (2023). Servant leadership and perceived organizational support for lecturer loyalty through empowerment. Tafkir: Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Education, 4(1): 113–127. https://doi.org/10.31538/tijie.v4i1.318

García-Rodríguez FJ and Gutiérrez-Taño D (2024). Loyalty to higher education institutions and the relationship with reputation: An integrated model with multi-stakeholder approach. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 34(1): 223–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2021.1975185

Gustari I and Widodo W (2021). The power of grit on lecturer's job satisfaction through affective commitment. Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, 9(2): 218–225. https://doi.org/10.29210/163700

Guterres A, Goncalves AS, and Pereira S (2025). The role of lecturer in improving college quality learning. International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 8(2): 1949–1955. https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i2.5586

Guyo AT (2023). The relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions among faculty members in Ethiopian higher education institutions. Indonesian Psychological Research, 5(2): 78–85. https://doi.org/10.29080/ipr.v5i2.954

Haryanta D, Kaswadi, Bahtiar RS, and Amiruddin Hadi W (2025). Employee satisfaction as a support for higher education institutional performance. Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, 13(4): 367–378. https://doi.org/10.29210/1139800 **PMid:36992691**

He P, Aluvalu R, and Tejani GG (2026). Job satisfaction as a catalyst mechanism transforming knowledge competence and intrinsic motivation into sustained lecturer performance in higher education. Scientific Reports, 16: 7915. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-38488-6 **PMid:41663497 PMCid:PMC12953874**

Jaenudin UE, Priadana HMS, and Juniarti AT (2024). The influence of transformational leadership on lecturer commitment which has implications for lecturer performance at private universities in the East Priangan region. Journal of Business Management Education, 9(2): 133–144. https://doi.org/10.17509/jbme.v9i2.74675

Kato M (2025). Institutional mobility intentions and job satisfaction of model minority university faculties in the United States. Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education, 17(5): 29–47. https://doi.org/10.64899/2151-0407.1940

Khan T and Siriwardhane P (2021). Barriers to career progression in the higher education sector: Perceptions of Australian academics. Sustainability, 13(11): 6255. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116255

Kim L and Maijan P (2024). An exploration process on job satisfaction in higher education. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 10: 101097. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101097

Kristanti FT, Prasetio AP, Indiyati D, and Madiawati PN (2021). Turnover intention among lecturers in private higher education: The direct impact of financial rewards and mediation of job satisfaction and effective organizational commitment. Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen, 19(2): 282–295. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2021.019.02.05

Li P, Swatdikun T, Zumitzavan V, Mahadi N, and Prempanichnukul V (2026). Exploring talent management on employee performance in Chinese higher education institutions: The interplay of job engagement and job satisfaction. Frontiers in Education, 11: 1724211. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1724211

Lie D, Romy E, Djurubassa GMP, and Sudirman A (2024). Model analysis of increasing lecturer job satisfaction and its impact on organizational citizenship behavior in the era of Society 5.0. Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research, 5(1): 62–72. https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v5i1.914

Mahaputra MR and Saputra F (2021). Literature review the effect of headmaster leadership on teacher performance, loyalty and motivation. Journal of Accounting and Finance Management, 2(2): 103–113. https://doi.org/10.38035/jafm.v2i2.77

Mantai L and Marrone M (2023). Academic career progression from early career researcher to professor: What can we learn from job ads. Studies in Higher Education, 48(6): 797–812. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2167974

Meilando R, Nurhayati M, and Listyarini S (2023). The influence of servant leadership and organizational justice on teacher performance mediated by teacher job loyalty. International Journal of Management and Digital Business, 2(2): 77–84. https://doi.org/10.54099/ijmdb.v2i2.769

Mendoza-Villafaina J and López-Mosquera N (2024). Educational experience, university satisfaction and institutional reputation: Implications for university sustainability. The International Journal of Management Education, 22(3): 101013. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.101013

Mohamud AH, Barre GM, and Mohamud IH (2024). Factors influencing job satisfaction among academic and nonacademic staff: The case of SIMAD University. International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 11(11): 37–47. https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.11.005

Purevsuren N, Norinpel E, Nugjgar P, Dolgor GO, Lkhagvasuren T, Park H, Altangerel A, and Ravdansuren C (2025). An analysis of factors affecting university reputation: A case study of Mongolian universities. Sustainability, 17(14): 6397. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17146397

Santalia I, Syafaruddin B, and Hasriadi H (2024). The characteristics on career development and loyalty at the higher education: An educational perspective. ETDC: Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review, 3(2): 261–267. https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v3i2.2711

Shimaneni F and Kiley J (2025). Challenges of managing academic staff performance in a Namibian private higher education. Transformation in Higher Education, 10: a442. https://doi.org/10.4102/the.v10i0.442

Trinh HP, Van DH, and Nguyen TK (2023). What determines employees' job satisfaction and loyalty? Evidence from Vietnamese enterprises. International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 10(2): 67–76. https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2023.02.009

Yingying S, Omar MK, and Ismail N (2025). Job stress and burnout among lecturers: A systematic literature review and meta analysis. Frontiers in Psychology, 16: 1673812. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1673812 **PMid:41356022 PMCid:PMC12675191**

Zebon MAH, Sattar A, and Ahamed MS (2025). An empirical study of exploring the predictors of university teachers' job satisfaction in Bangladesh: A structural equation modeling approach. Heliyon, 11(2): e41740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2025.e41740 **PMid:39872453 PMCid:PMC11770486**

Zhu J, Boonphadung S, and Siththada T (2025). Causal factors influencing job satisfaction for universities teachers in Hubei Province. Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology, 9(7): 1410–1423. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i7.8934