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Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to explore (1) the effect of the relationship among role stress (role conflict, role ambiguity, role novelty and role overload) on job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions; and (2) the situational relationships among job satisfaction, job performance, employee commitment to organizations and employee turnover intentions through a case analysis on college of management and technology (CMT) one of the Arab academy for science and technology and maritime transport. A structured questionnaire was developed. The hypotheses were simultaneously tested on a sample of 65 out of 100 employees distributed, giving a response rate of 65 per cent. Several analytical techniques were used to evaluate the relationships among the variables under investigation such as Pearson correlation, and chi-square. Hierarchical regression was used to evaluate the mediating role.

The findings of this study have shown significant relationships among the variables under investigation as well as they have shown contribution as a moderator. It is imperative to better understand how a CMT skilled staff member can effectively and efficiently cope and manage with role stress and reducing or eliminating to a certain extent its negative effect on performance, satisfaction and commitment used in a way not to influence their intention to leave. This investigation is both timely and important within the Egyptian culture context.

The research was limited to one college of the Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport in Egypt. Also the use of cross-sectional design restricts inferences being drawn regarding casualty. Although job satisfaction has been the focus of many academic papers, it is rarely defined in a systematic way. The present study contributes to the literature not only by providing empirical support for the frequently hypothesized contributions in adding to the body of knowledge regarding the relationship between role stress (role conflict, role ambiguity, role novelty and role overload) on job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions within the Egyptian context.

Introduction
Organizations nowadays in Egypt are facing extremely severe complex competition, dynamic demanding and uncertainty due to continuous and rapidly changing technology in the marketplace arising from globalization (Shipley, 1994; Sohi, 1996; Prager, 2003; Jones et al., 2000, 2005, 2007). Nevertheless, the Egyptian revolution played a central role in reshaping the organizations' role. Consequently, organizations realized that they should develop unique and different position that enables a sustainable competitive edge over their rivals in the market (Kim et al., 2003; Prince and Simon, 2009; Alniacik et al., 2011; Chianga and Birtch, 2011). Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport possess a remarkable reputation and image in the Arab world, not only attracting affluent students and talented instructors and staff members but, also very difficult to imitate (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Alniacik et al., 2011). The research is limited to college of management and technology
(CMT) which is one of the four colleges of the Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport.

Staffs in CMT engage in a variety of service encounters in their role as boundary spanners (Kim et al., 2009). Inevitably staff experience work-related stress in their work environment (Kahn et al., 1964; Moncrief et al., 1997). Role stress has attained substantial research attention (Brown and Peterson, 1993). Role theory provides an understanding of the behaviour of individuals in organizations. Role theory states that individuals are social actors who learn behaviours' appropriate to the positions they occupy in society (Katz and Kahn, 1978). For instance, a staff member has expectations about the appropriate behaviours of a colleague, student or customer (e.g., having appropriate documentation for transactions and answering questions in a complete and honest manner). The other party also has expectations about the staff member behaviour (Slatten, 2008). Deviations by either party from these learned expectations affect personal evaluations and the staff member-colleague, student or customer relationship. Katz and Kahn (1978: 219) stated that role concepts are "the major means for linking the individual and organizational levels of research and theory; it is once the building block of social systems and the summation of the requirements with which such systems confront their members as individuals".

Understanding job stress has received considerable attention in the western as well as non-western literature (Moncrief et al., 1997). A major challenge for any organization or company is to enhance internal service quality and keeping their staff members satisfied. Removing the obstacle of role stress not only increase performance and commitment but also decreases turnover intentions (Boshoff and Mels, 1995; Paulin et al., 2006; Cho et al., 2012). Rasch (1991, p.38) stated that "long-term productivity is affected not only by hiring the best qualified personnel, but keeping them in the organization for a long period of time". Job satisfaction and organizational commitment play a very important and critical role in affecting employee turnover intentions (Igbaria et al., 1994; Maertz and Griffeth, 2004; LeRouge et al., 2006). "Service with a smile" must become a part of the staff members' nature. The desire to satisfy colleagues, students or customers must not only be seen but felt (Rogers et al., 1994).

Role Stressors

Stress in the workplace has been of growing concern for researchers and practitioners alike. The terms "stress", "stressor", and "strain" are commonly used in occupational stress research, although they sometimes have different meanings to different researchers. In this study, the word stress is considered a generic term referring to an area of work or study that includes stressors and strains (Beehr and Franz, 1987). Role stress is defined as an enduring state of mental taxation resulting in the potential for negative psychological strains outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction, organizational commitment); psycho-social and behavioural strains outcomes (i.e. job performance, turnover) (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1996; Munro et al., 1998; LeRouge et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2009; Aghdasi et al., 2011). Role stress research in marketing shares its conceptualization with the work of khan et al. (1964). There has been little published research isolating the effect of role overload and role novelty on job attitudes such as job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The most commonly studied stressors in the literature have been role ambiguity and role conflict. Ultimately, the researchers were motivated to characterized role stressors in this study in terms of role conflict, role ambiguity (which is the opposite of role clarity), role novelty, and role overload.

The first research on role stress dates back to 1964 when Kahn and colleagues published their findings around organizational stress and specifically focused on role ambiguity and role conflict. It is apparently that the basic definitions of role conflict and role ambiguity stem from both Kahn et al. (1964) and Rizzo et al. (1970).

Role Conflict

A staff member is often put in the position of balancing CMT expectations, student expectations, colleagues' expectations, customer expectations and his and/or her personal expectations. Role conflicts arise when the demand of time and effort demanded for certain roles become incompatible with each
other and overwhelming — that is, participation in one role sacrifices the other one that make it difficult or even impossible to participate in another (Duxbury and Higgins, 2001; LeRouge et al., 2006; Jones et al., 2007). Role conflict results from incompatibility between the demands and communicated expectations of certain job requirements and the demands and communicated expectations of other job requirements and that he/she is unable to satisfy all the demands (Kahn et al., 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970; Walker et al., 1975; Miles and Perreault, 1976; Behrmen and Perreault, 1984; Mengüç, 1996; Karatepe et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2009). Kahn et al. (1964: 56) has defined “role conflict” as “The simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressure [such] that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other”. Rizzo et al. (1970: 155) define role conflict as: “in terms of the dimensions of congruency-in congruency or compatibility-incompatibility in the requirements of the role, where congruency or compatibility is judged relative to a set of standards or conditions, which impinge upon role performance”.

Role Ambiguity

Role ambiguity is defined as being uncertain about the task requirements of a certain job due to lack of information, unclear company directives and unclear goals and responsibilities (Rizzo et al., 1970; Walker et al., 1975; Schuler, 1979; Behrmen and Perreault, 1984; Mengüç, 1996; Karatepe et al., 2006; Jones et al., 2007). Katz and Kahn (1978:206) define role ambiguity as “uncertainty about what the occupant of a particular office is supposed to do”. Moreover, House and Rizzo (1972) have defined role ambiguity as a “lack of clarity and predictability of the outcomes of one’s behavior”. Also, Rizzo et al. (1970: 155-156) have defined role ambiguity: “... in terms of (1) the predictability of the outcome or responses to one’s behaviour, and (2) the existence or clarity of behavioral requirements, often in terms of inputs from the environment, which would serve to guide behavior and provide knowledge that the behavior is appropriate”.

Role Overload

The 1990s was the decade when the occurrence of role overload became more evident. Coping and managing with greater work demands overloaded staff members which obliged them to take work home and use their personal time to accommodate work demands (Duxbury and Higgins, 2001). Role overload is conceptually distinct from two other role stressors, role conflict and role ambiguity (Jones et al., 2007). It is a form of person-role conflict, such as boundary-spanning roles played by instructors; frequently viewed in a form of inter-sender conflict, in which individuals are expected to meet expectations of multiple role senders (Kahn et al., 1964; Singh et al., 1994; Singh, 2000; Jones et al., 2007).

Reilly (1982) and Jones et al. (2007) stated that role overload is the degree to which the staff member found him/herself in a position of time pressure because of the number of tasks and responsibilities one has in life. Organizations suffer many persistent negative effects of role overload such as absenteeism, lower performance, lower enthusiasm and satisfaction for the job, lower organizational commitment, higher intention to leave and ultimately lower organization’s overall profitability (Ivancevich et al., 1985; Duxbury and Higgins, 2001; Jones et al., 2007).

There has been little published research isolating the effect of role overload as researchers tend to substitute role overload by role conflict and role ambiguity (Singh, 1998; Jones et al., 2007).

Role Novelty

Black (1988), Morley and Flynn (2003) defined role novelty as the difference between the past role and the new one. They stated that if the new role is substantially different to the new one the staff member may experience greater feelings of unfamiliarity with the new role, uncertainty and unpredictability with the result that it may be more difficult to understand which behaviors are appropriate for the new situation.

Furthermore Pinder and Schroeder (1987) and Morley and Flynn (2003) stated that entail moving from one functional area to another, such as promotion to another position with greater responsibility than before will probably be more stressful, decreasing in job performance and feelings of lack of
confidence especially if the new role demands are sufficiently different from those they left behind. On the other hand, staff member may experience success and high learning curves (Morley and Flynn, 2003).

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was initially proposed by Hoppock in 1935 (Tsai et al., 2007). The concept of job satisfaction is considered to be a subjective term, defined in various ways based on the research interest (Vakola and Bouradas, 2005; Wan, 2007; Sahinidis and Bouris, 2008; Fitcher and Cipolla, 2010; Cho et al., 2012; Pantik et al., 2012; Yucel and Bektas, 2012). Locke (1976: 1297) defined job satisfaction as “a positive relationship characterized by pleasurable or positive state of mind resulting from the job experience”.

Various researchers generally agreed that job satisfaction is considered as a set of evaluative feelings positive or negative that staff members' have toward his/her job (Locke 1969, 1976; Skinner et al., 1984; Odom et al., 1990; Mengüç, 1996; Spector, 1997; Buitendach and De Witte, 2005; Kim et al., 2005; Wright, 2005; Chen, 2006; Le Rouge et al., 2006; Wegge et al., 2007; Arnold et al., 2009; Alniacik et al., 2011; Cho et al., 2012; Pantik et al., 2012; Yamaguchi, 2012; Yucel and Bektas, 2012).

Job satisfaction is critical for any organization. It is considered an important indicator of how staff members' feel about their job commitment to their organization and a predictor of turnover (Spector, 1997; Mount, 2006; Yucel and Bektas, 2012).

Organizational commitment

The major thrust of organizational commitment is a psychological state that reflects a high sense of belonging, acceptance, identity, loyalty, support, passion and pride feelings towards the College of Management and Technology (CMT) (Sverke and Sjöberg, 1994; Lee et al., 1999; Kim et al., 2005; Le Rouge et al., 2006; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Cho et al., 2012). Furthermore, committed staff member are less likely to leave and dedicate themselves to offer their best knowledge, skills, experience and effort for their college’s well-being (Porter et al., 1974; Mowday et al., 1979; Mowday et al., 1982; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1991; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Riketta, 2002; Golden and Veiga, 2008; Yang and Chang, 2008; Alniacik et al., 2011; Yamaguchi, 2012; Yucel and Bektas, 2012).

Porter et al. (1974: 604) defined organizational commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization". Mowday et al. (1979: 226) defined organizational commitment as "an active relationship with the organization such that individuals are willing to give something of themselves in order to contribute to the organization's well-being".

Job performance

Many studies have addressed the use of job performance as an outcome to measure empirical research, relatively little effort has been spent on clarifying the performance concept (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Babin and Boles, 1996; Munro et al., 1998; Mackenzie et al., 1998; Bhuian and Mengue, 2002; Kim et al., 2005; Le Rouge et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2009; Yang, 2010; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Yucel and Bektas, 2012). Campbell et al. (1993: 40) defined performance as “Performance is what the organization hires one to do, and do well”. Thus Job performance is what a staff member does in the job situation. It is commonly accepted that organizations need and value staff member who perform well, and these high performers are considered a valuable asset for the organization (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Babin and Boles, 1996; Munro et al., 1998; Mackenzie et al., 1998; Bhuian and Mengue, 2002; Kim et al., 2005; Le Rouge et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2009; Yang, 2010; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Yucel and Bektas, 2012). Organizations need highly performing staff members in order to meet their goals, to deliver excellent services, and finally to achieve competitive advantage. Performance is also important for the staff members as it can be a source of satisfaction, with feelings of pleasure and pride. Furthermore, high recognized job performance often rewarded by financial and/or other benefits such as getting promoted more easily and having better career opportunities. On the other hand, low job performance might lead to job dissatisfaction or even as a personal failure (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Babin and Boles, 1996; Munro et al., 1998; Mackenzie et al.,
The relationship between role stressors and job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intention

Kahn et al. (1964) first argued that both role ambiguity and role conflict would cause job dissatisfaction. Various research studies reported significant negative relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict and job satisfaction (Kahn et al., 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970; Walker et al., 1977; Behrman and Perreault, 1984; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Mathieu, 1990; Brown and Peterson, 1993, 1994; Singh, 1993; Boles and Babin, 1996, 1998; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Mengüç, 1996; Tubre and Collins, 2000; Youssef, 2000a, b, 2002; Low et al., 2001; Morley and Flynn, 2003; Kouvelios et al., 2004; Karatepe et al., 2006; Zeplin and McLoughlin, 2006; Kalbers and Cenker, 2007; Kim et al., 2009; Aghdasi et al., 2011). Abdalla (1991) reported that role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload are negatively correlated with job satisfaction. Surprisingly, Montagomery et al. (1996) in his study reported that neither role conflict nor role ambiguity had a significant effect on job stress, per se. However, several studies found that role conflict seems to have a stronger effect on job satisfaction than role ambiguity does (Bagozzi, 1978; Mengüç, 1996; Netemeyer et al., 1997). Furthermore, Brown and Peterson (1994) provided evidence that role ambiguity did not have significant direct negative effect on job satisfaction. Along with these lines, there is an argument suggesting that role conflict influences job satisfaction more strongly than role ambiguity (Bagozzi, 1978; Netemeyer et al., 1991; Brown and Peterson, 1993, 1994; Mengüç, 1996). Also, Rogers et al. (1994) found that role ambiguity did not have the significant direct negative, meaning the higher the role conflict, the lower the job satisfaction and the higher the role clarity (less role ambiguity), the lower the job satisfaction. Moreover, Moncrief et al. (1997) found a weak relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction. The underlying logic is that ambiguity in the job will lead to the perception of role conflict by the employees. This may be because of the complex environment in which they work (Chung and Schneider, 2002). Teas (1983) concluded a path analysis of leader behaviour, role ambiguity and role conflict, and job satisfaction for industrial salespeople. He found that role ambiguity and role conflict are significant variables of job satisfaction for industrial salespeople, and they are mediating variables between leader behaviour and job satisfaction as well. Kouvelios et al. (2004) conducted a study to examine the extent to which role conflict and role ambiguity predicts job satisfaction with six aspects of their job: working conditions, pay, promotion, job itself, supervision and organization as a whole among Greek physical education teachers. They found that role conflict and role ambiguity are significant predictors of job satisfaction. Furthermore, Leat and El-Kot (2007) found that in Egypt employees are unlikely to be comfortable with uncertainty, ambiguity or conflicting expectations and that role conflict and ambiguity were likely to be perceived negatively. Additionally, Slatten (2008) conducted a study to examine the relationship between four role stressors (role ambiguity, role conflict, role overload, and work-family conflict) and employees’ satisfaction; and employee-perceived service quality. Slatten found that three role stressors (role overload, role conflict, and work-family conflict) were negatively related to employee's satisfaction. The findings indicate that role stressors have a direct effect on the employees’ satisfaction and an indirect effect on employee-perceived service quality. To sum up, clear job roles minimize conflicts among employees, between employees and management, and between employees and customers.
customers. The effect of role novelty and role overload on job satisfaction is under-researched (Antonio et al., 2003; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2007) thus, we hypothesize that:

H1: Role Stressors will be negatively correlated to job satisfaction.
H1a: Role conflict will be negatively correlated to job satisfaction.
H1b: Role ambiguity will be negatively correlated to job satisfaction.
H1c: Role overload will be negatively correlated to job satisfaction.
H1d: Role novelty will be negatively correlated to job satisfaction.

Various research studies reported significant negative relationships between role stressors and job performance (Singh et al., 1994; Babin and Boles, 1996; Jones et al., 2007; Kim et al., 2009). Role overload reduce the staffs’ ability to control their work, thus reducing their efficiency and effectiveness (Fried et al., 1998; Jones et al., 2007). The effect of role novelty and role overload on job performance is under-researched (Antonio et al., 2003; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2007) thus, we hypothesize that:

H2: Role Stressors will be negatively correlated to job performance.
H2a: Role conflict will be negatively correlated to job performance.
H2b: Role ambiguity will be negatively correlated to job performance.
H2c: Role overload will be negatively correlated to job performance.
H2d: Role novelty will be negatively correlated to job performance.

Various research studies reported significant negative relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict and organizational commitment (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Mathieu, 1990; Aghdasi et al., 2011). Furthermore, various research studies reported significant negative relationships between role overload and organizational commitment (Singh et al., 1994; Jones et al., 2007). Surprisingly, Singh (1998) found a significant positive relationship between role overload and organizational commitment. To our knowledge, no other researchers did. The effect of role novelty and role overload on job satisfaction is under-researched (Antonio et al., 2003; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2007) thus, we hypothesize that:

H3: Role Stressors will be negatively correlated to organizational commitment.
H3a: Role conflict will be negatively correlated to organizational commitment.
H3b: Role ambiguity will be negatively correlated to organizational commitment.
H3c: Role overload will be negatively correlated to organizational commitment.
H3d: Role novelty will be negatively correlated to organizational commitment.

Various research studies reported a positive relationship between role stressors and turnover intentions (Babin and Boles, 1998; Jones et al., 2007; Kim et al., 2009). In general, any human being can adopt either problem focused or emotion focused or both to some degree as a strategy for coping with stress (Jones et al., 2007). Problem-focused coping strategy involves identifying the source(s) of stress and dealing with it. On the other hand, emotion-focused coping strategy involves disconnecting and avoiding stress (Jones et al., 2007), coping with stress could lead to turnover intentions, and thus we hypothesize that:

H4: Role Stressors will be positively correlated to turnover intentions.
H4a: Role conflict will be positively correlated to turnover intentions.
H4b: Role ambiguity will be positively correlated to turnover intentions.
H4c: Role overload will be positively correlated to turnover intentions.
H4d: Role novelty will be positively correlated to turnover intentions.

**Organizational commitment and job satisfaction**

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been extensively examined. However, there are still some controversy issues regarding both constructs (Rayton, 2006; Vilela et al., 2008; Armutlulu and Noyan, 2011). Two points of views emerged: The first is that job satisfaction is considered to be
antecedent to organizational commitment. The major thrust behind the first point of view is that staff members’ perception about their job is shaped before their perception about the college (Porter et al., 1974; Koch and Steers, 1978; Mowday et al., 1982; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Williams and Hazer, 1986; Shan, 1988; Chatman, 1991; Shin and Reyes, 1991; Vandenberg and Lance, 1992; Shin and Reyes, 1995; Fletcher and Williams, 1996; Mengüç, 1996; Martin and Bennett, 1996; Udo et al., 1997; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Abraham, 1999; Currivan, 1999; Yavas and Bodur, 1999; Schwepker, 2001; Kim et al., 2005; Chen, 2006; Paulin et al., 2006; Punnett et al., 2007; Vilela et al., 2008; Yang and Chang, 2008; Zeinabadi, 2010; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Armutlulu and Noyan, 2011; Zeinabadi and Salehi, 2011; Yucel and Betkas, 2012). Mowday et al. (1979: 226) stated that "employees are likely to have a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values".

The second point of view is that organizational commitment is considered to be antecedent to job satisfaction. The major thrust behind the second point of view is that as soon as staff members decide to join the college a feeling of commitment emerges even before feeling of satisfaction (Schein, 1968; Steers, 1977; Koch and Steers, 1978; Staw, 1980; O'Reilly and Caldwell, 1981; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Still, 1983; Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Hunt et al., 1985; Williams and Hazer, 1986; Pierce and Dunham, 1987; Shan, 1988; Chatman, 1991; Vandenberg and Lance, 1992; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Kacmar et al., 1999; Currivan, 1999; Coelho et al., 2005; Li, 2006; Silva, 2006; Vilela et al., 2008; Yucel and Betkas, 2012). Although the results and conclusions are mixed, there is strong evidence that the first point of view is the most common (Koch and Steers, 1978; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Williams and Hazer, 1986; Shan, 1988; Farbaks and Tetrick, 1989; Mathieu and Hamel, 1989; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Vandenberg and Lance, 1992; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Currivan, 1999; Schwepker Jr, 2001; Bhuran and Mengüç, 2002; Kim et al., 2005; Guleruyz et al., 2008; Vilela et al., 2008; Yang, 2010; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Salehi and Gholtash, 2011; Larsen et al., 2012; Yucel and Betkas, 2012). To investigate the causal relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the model proposed in this study assumes that job satisfaction is causally an antecedent of organizational commitment. The model assumes higher job satisfaction produces higher organizational commitment. Thus, we hypothesize that:

**H5:** Job satisfaction will be positively correlated to organizational commitment.

### Job satisfaction and job performance

The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance has been widely debated and illusory (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Babin and Boles, 1996; Munro et al., 1998; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Bhuian and Mengue, 2002; Kim et al., 2005; Le Rouge et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2009; Yang, 2010; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Yucle and Bektaş, 2012). Furthermore, Bowling (2007) found evidence to support the view that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is spurious as the relationship was partially eliminated after controlling another variable “general personality traits”. Thus, we hypothesize that:

**H6:** Job satisfaction will be positively correlated to job performance.

### Job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intention

Understanding the consequences of job satisfaction is important because they have an important effect on job performance, organizational commitment, turnover intentions and could influence human resource policies and practices (Rayton, 2006; Armutlulu and Noyan, 2011). Mueller and Price (1990)’s empirical study found that organizational commitment was strongly correlated with turnover intentions than with job satisfaction as indicated by the results of the path analysis. Furthermore, they stated that job satisfaction did not have a direct influence on turnover intention. Several studies have identified job satisfaction and organizational commitment as the principal antecedent of turnover intentions (Porter et al., 1974; Williams and Hazer, 1986; Ohana and Meyer, 2011). However, it remains unclear which is the most important predictor of turnover intentions (Price and Mueller, 1981; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Lee et al., 1999; Somers, 1995; Poznanski and Bline, 1997; Silva, 2006; Armutlulu and Noyan, 2011; Alniaik et al., 2011; Gieter et al., 2011). In addition, various researchers indicated a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Porter and Steers, 1973).
However, the longer the retained staff-members have been in their jobs, the higher the level of job performance, the higher the level of job satisfaction, the higher the level of organizational commitment, the lower the level of turnover intentions and vice versa (Mobley, 1977; Mobley, 1982; Williams and Hazer, 1986; Shaw, 1999; Griffeth et al., 2000; Lam et al., 2001; Sousapoa and Henneberger, 2002; Silva, 2006; Yang, 2010; Aghdasi et al., 2011; Alniacik et al., 2011; Kim and Brymer, 2011; Yucel and Bektas, 2012), thus, we hypothesize that:

**H7: Job satisfaction will be negatively correlated to turnover intentions.**

The causal relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions were examined extensively by various researchers. They found a negative relationship between both constructs (Mowday et al., 1979, 1982; Johnston et al., 1987; Lucas et al., 1987; Ingram and Kuen, 1990; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Tett and Meyer, 1993; Brown and Peterson, 1993; Martin and Bennett, 1996; Schwepker, Jr, 2001; Wang and Law, 2002; Kim et al., 2005; Yang and Chang, 2008; Yang, 2010; Kim and Brymer, 2011). Carbery et al. (2003) analyzed a sample of 89 hoteliers by applying a hierarchical regression analysis test. The results showed that organizational commitment accounted for a significant contribution of variance than job satisfaction in turnover intentions. Furthermore, they emphasized that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important indicators in predicting the intention of the staff-member to leave the college. Thus, we hypothesize that:

**H8: organizational commitment will be negatively correlated to turnover intentions.**

Various researchers examined the relationship between job performance and turnover intentions and found that a negative relationship between these two constructs (Huselid, 1995; Huselid and Becker, 1996; Kim and Brymer, 2011), thus, we hypothesize that:

**H9: Job performance will be negatively correlated to turnover intentions.**

Employees with strong affective commitment would be motivated to higher levels of performance (Alniacik et al., 2011). Furthermore, employees who identify with and are involved in their organization (i.e., are committed) presumably want to maintain membership in the organization and exert efforts on its behalf (Scarborough and Somers, 2006). Aghdasi et al. (2011) stated that uncommitted employees not only had the lowest level of acceptance of organizational values but they also felt alienated from the organization. Thus, we hypothesize that:

**H10: organizational commitment will be positively correlated to job performance.**

To our knowledge, no paper up till now investigated the mediating role of job satisfaction, job performance and organizational commitment between role stressors and turnover intentions, thus, we hypothesize that:

**H11: Organizational commitment will mediate the relationship between role stressors and turnover intentions.**

**H11a: Organizational commitment will mediate the relationship between role conflict and turnover intentions.**

**H11b: Organizational commitment will mediate the relationship between role ambiguity and turnover intentions.**

**H11c: Organizational commitment will mediate the relationship between role overload and turnover intentions.**

**H11d: Organizational commitment will mediate the relationship between role novelty and turnover intentions.**

**H12: Job satisfaction will mediate the relationship between role stressors and turnover intentions.**

**H12a: Job satisfaction will mediate the relationship between role conflict and turnover intentions.**

**H12b: Job satisfaction will mediate the relationship between role ambiguity and turnover intentions.**

**H12c: Job satisfaction will mediate the relationship between role overload and turnover intentions.**

**H12d: Job satisfaction will mediate the relationship between role novelty and turnover intentions.**

**H13: Job performance will mediate the relationship between role stressors and turnover intentions.**
H13a: Job performance will mediate the relationship between role conflict and turnover intentions.
H13b: Job performance will mediate the relationship between role ambiguity and turnover intentions.
H13c: Job performance will mediate the relationship between role overload and turnover intentions.
H13d: Job performance will mediate the relationship between role novelty and turnover intentions.

Research questions and model of the study:
1. Is there a significant relationship between role stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, and role novelty) and staff-members’ job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intentions? “Answer H1 through H4”.
2. Is there a significant relationship between staff-members’ job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intentions? “Answer H5 through H7”.
3. Is there a significant relationship between staff-members’ organization commitment and turnover intentions? “Answer H8”.
4. Is there a significant relationship between staff-members’ job performance and turnover intentions? “Answer H9”.
5. Is there a significant relationship between staff-members’ job performance and organization commitment? “Answering H10”.
6. Does organizational commitment mediate the relationship between role stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, and role novelty) and turnover intentions? “Answer H11”.
7. Does job satisfaction mediate the relationship between role stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, and role novelty) and turnover intentions? “Answer H12”.
8. Does job performance mediate the relationship between role stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, and role novelty) and turnover intentions? “Answer H13”.

Research Methodology
Sample and data collection
Survey data was collected from the CMT staff-members. As a matter of fact, 100 questionnaires were distributed among the entire CMT staff from a database related to the host Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport (AASTMT), where, 65 questionnaires were returned and were used for our analysis (no missing values) resulting in a 65 per cent response rate. 33.8 per cent were males and 66.2 per cent were females. Their ages ranged from 20 to less than 50 years old with job experience over seven years. Most of them were master and PhD holders with a relatively high monthly income.

Measures
A questionnaire survey was used to obtain measures of role stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload and role novelty), job performance, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intentions. All of the scales were translated from English into Arabic using the double translation method. A pilot study based on 30 returned questionnaires showed that respondents were clear about the content of the questions and instructions. Thus no change was necessary for the questionnaire to be used
in the main study. The reliability and validity for Egyptian use were established using the sample from the pilot study as well as the final one.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study comprised eight establishment scales. The measure of role stressors consists of four dimensions: role ambiguity, role conflict, role novelty and role overload. Role conflict and role ambiguity were adapted from Rizzo et al (1970). Role overload was adapted from pearlin and Schooler (1978); Peterson and his colleagues (1995) and Malik and Usman (2011). Role novelty was adapted from Black (1988). These measures were originally adapted from Kahn et al. (1964). The second is related to job satisfaction developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974, 1975); Dubinsky et al. (1986); Hartline and Ferrell (1996); and Sohi et al. (1996). The third is related to job performance developed by Babin and Boles (1996). The fourth is related to organizational commitment developed from Mowday et al., (1974, 1979) and Kelley and Davis (1994). The fifth is related to turnover intentions adapted from Mitchel (1981); Good et al. (1992, 1996); Keaveney (1992); and Ganesan and Weitz (1996). All of the rating is accomplished on a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Analysis and Results

The researchers used the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The first statistical analysis to be performed was coefficient Cronbach's alpha to measure the internal reliability analyses to examine various scales. Reliabilities of these scales were as follows, role ambiguity 0.915, role conflict 0.814, role novelty 0.853, role overload 0.879, job performance 0.845, job satisfaction 0.873, organizational commitment 0.750 and turnover intentions 0.934. On the other side, discriminate validity was measured by using Chi-square test. Based on the results of the chi-square analysis, the researchers found that all of the variables were valid. Furthermore, Table (1) will illustrate the profile of CMT respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total (N = 65)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total (N = 65)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 less than 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 less than 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 less than 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job experience</th>
<th>Total (N = 65)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to 3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to 5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to 7 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years and above</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Degree</th>
<th>Total (N = 65)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>Total (N = 65)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3000 less than 4000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 less than 6000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000 or above</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from table (1) supports a consistency between the respondents’ age, job experience, scientific degree and monthly income. Consequently, the sample is considered to be a representative to the college of management and technology (CMT).
Evidence in table (2) shows that there is a negative relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions, but failed to reach significance level as there were (r = 0.060, P>0.5), (r = 0.239, P>0.5) respectively. Contrary to the researchers’ expectation it was found a positive relationship between role ambiguity and job performance, however it did not reach to a significance level as (r = 0.169, P>0.5). These results imply that CMT team board (Dean, Vice dean, Chairman, Course-coordinator) who provide goal information and feedback are likely to transmit effectively their expectations and instructions to their staff members. In addition, lack of job satisfaction and organizational commitment enhance the probability for employee turnover intentions ((Price and Mueller, 1981; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Randall, 1990; Lee et al., 1992; Somers, 1995; Poznanski and Bline, 1997; Martin, 2004; Silva, 2006; Armutlulu and Noyan, 2011; Alniaik et al., 2011; Gieter et al., 2011). Furthermore, staff members play a boundary-spanning role between their chain-of-command and students. As a result, they must have a clear understanding of what decisions are they allowed to make by themselves and what decisions should be referred to the management of compatible and agreement orders that obviously did not affect their performance. Thus H1 b, H2 b, H3 b and H4 b were not supported.

Evidence in table (2) showed that there is a significant negative relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction (r = 0.304, p <0.5) and negative but not significant between role conflict and job performance (r = 0.033, p >0.5). Consistent with the researchers’ expectation there was a significant and positive relationship between role conflict and turnover intentions (r = 0.361, p<0.1). On the other hand, there was a positive but not significant relationship between role conflict and organizational commitment (r = 0.131, p>0.5). These results imply the existence of incompatibility between the demands and communicated expectations of certain jobs requirements. And how the demands and communicated expectations of other job requirements affect staff-members performance and satisfaction but it does not affect their commitment to the college to a certain extent but if these conflicts increase, there is a huge possibility for employee turnover intentions. Thus H1a and H4a were supported while H2a and H3a were not supported.

Consistent with the researchers’ expectation, evidence in table (2) showed that there is a negative relationship between roles overload and job satisfaction but failed to reach significance (r = 0.019, p<0.5). Contrary to the researchers’ expectation it was found that a positive relationship between role overload and both job performance and organizational commitment but not significant (r = 0.039, p>0.5) and (r = 0.178, p>0.5) respectively. In addition it was found that there is a significant positive relationship between role overload and turnover intentions (r = 0.345, p<0.1). These results are consistent with various
researchers (Virick et al., 2007; Pearson, 2008; Malik and Usman, 2011). Since when staff-members are overloaded with work demands, it does not necessarily mean that they will quit the job. Another way to look at it is that CMT can increase work demands (role overload) and not have any significant impact on the retention likelihood as long as they can give staff-member some opportunity to have a time free outside of work or other duties and keep their conflict level down. Thus, H1c, H2c, H3c were not supported and only H4c was supported.

Evidence in table (2) showed that there is a positive relationship between role novelty and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, but failed to reach significance as (r = 0.110, p>0.5) and (r = 0.079, p>0.5) respectively. In addition, it was found that there is a negative relationship between role novelty and both job performance and turnover intentions, but failed to reach significance (r = 0.026, p<0.5) and (r = 0.210, p<0.5). Thus, H1d, H2d, H3d, H4d were not supported. Furthermore, it was found that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and turnover intentions, but both of them failed to reach significance as (r = 0.031, p<0.5) and (r = 0.316, p<0.5) respectively. Thus H5 and H8 were not supported. In addition, it was found that a significant positive relationship between job performance and job satisfaction as (r = 0.373, p<0.1), thus H6 was supported. Also, it was found a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions as (r = 0.376, p<0.1), thus H7 was supported. Furthermore, it was found a negative relationship between job performance and turnover intention, but failed to reach significance as (r = 0.073, p>0.5), thus H9 was not supported. Also, it was found that there is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and job performance, but failed to reach significance as (r = 0.064, p>0.5), thus H10 was not supported.

![Table 2](image)

Evidence in table (3) showed that R² change is 0.211, which means that role stressors dimensions explain an additional 21.1 percent of the variance in turnover intentions, even when the effects of organizational commitment are statistically controlled. This is a statistically significant contribution, as indicated by the significant F change value for this line (0.000) if (5, 59) = 3.506, p<0.0005 even though neither of the role stressors dimensions alone made any significant contribution. Thus H11, H11a, H11b, H11c and H11d were not supported.

![Table 3](image)

**Source: the researcher, based on data analysis**

Evidence in table (4) showed that R² change is 0.211, which means that role stressors dimensions explain an additional 21.1 percent of the variance in turnover intentions, even when the effects of organizational commitment are statistically controlled. This is a statistically significant contribution, as indicated by the significant F change value for this line (0.000) if (5, 59) = 3.506, p<0.0005 even though neither of the role stressors dimensions alone made any significant contribution. Thus H11, H11a, H11b, H11c and H11d were not supported.

![Table 4](image)

**Source: the researcher, based on data analysis**
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Evidence in table (4) showed that $R^2$ change is 0.195, which means that role stressors dimensions explain an additional 19.5 percent of the variance in turnover intentions. Even when the effects of job satisfaction are statistically controlled for and this is a statistically significant contribution, as indicated by the significant $F$ change value for this line ($0.000$) ($f(5, 59) = 5.983, p<0.0005$). Three variables made significant contributions which are job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload. Thus H12 was partially supported as H12b and H12c were supported, on the other hand H12a and H12d were not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig of T</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Job performance</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>Insignificant influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>-1.569</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>Insignificant influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Role conflict</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>Insignificant influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Role novelty</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>Insignificant influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Role overload</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>Insignificant influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of F | 0.008 (very significant)

| Multiple R | 0.073   |
| R Square   | 0.005   |
| Adjusted R Square | 0.011  |
| R Square change | 0.222 |

Table (5) Hierarchical regression analysis between job performance and role stressors dimensions

Evidence in table (5) showed that $R^2$ change is 0.222, which means that role stressors dimensions explain an additional 22.2 percent of the variance in turnover intentions, even when the effects of organizational commitment are statistically controlled for and this is a statistically significant contribution, as indicated by the significant $F$ change value for this line ($0.000$) ($f(5, 59) = 3.474, p<0.0005$) even though neither of the role stressors dimensions alone made any significant contribution. Thus H13, H13a, H13b, H13c and H13d were not supported.

Discussion and conclusion

The main aim of this research is to fill the preceding gap in the literature by introducing the first empirical investigation of the relationship among role stress (role conflict, role ambiguity, role novelty and role overload) on job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions; and the situational relationships among job satisfaction, job performance, employee commitment to organizations and employee turnover intentions through a case analysis on College of Management and Technology (CMT) one of the Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport in order to get a better understanding of its applicability and utilization in a non-western culture context. Using Pearson correlation analysis and hierarchical regression analysis provides unique insight results. The research findings have important conclusions and implications for CMT.

First, Career management and development change in psychosocial needs and personal characteristics plays a critical and crucial role throughout the career phases (Jones et al., 2007). In this study there was a consistency between ages, job experience and scientific degree. The average age was 20 less than 30 who hold master degree with three to five years job experience. Furthermore, there was a consistency between staff member who are in their mid-career phase with job experience above seven years and hold their PhD. It is important to mention that most of the respondents were females.

Second, role stressors by itself are considered to be less of a burden rather than a challenge to those who are in their early career stage in creating a sense of self accomplishment. A possible reason for this finding is that staff-members feel that the college of management and technology is doing their best to facilitate their abilities to provide service within resource restrictions, rules and procedures of the Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport. This is consistent with what Voon et al.
(2009) stated and found in their study. Furthermore, another possible reason may be related to the congeruency between staff-members’ capability and job demands. Staff-members who find some difficulty in performing their job effectively or efficiently need their course-coordinator, chairman, vice dean or even the dean himself desperately. They appreciate their support, considerateness and fairness. On the other hand, staff-members’ capabilities are high compared to the job demands. Thus, the supervisor support and consideration is not as appreciated as they believe in themselves and in their contributions to develop an increased self-efficacy to achieve their work role that can really make a difference in the college. As staff-member progress in their career from master to PhD degree, they need to establish and maintain a positive word-of-mouth. Positive word-of-mouth is a very important tool in establishing a good image and reputation in the college. During the later career phase, staff-members have established their positive image and reputation which drive them to enter the zone of comfort and relief with their current position. They are eager participate in further research papers to be published, attending conferences, updating their knowledge, be a reviewer, join in membership and fellowship—etc.

Third, another result that can be discussed is the difference in magnitude of the effect of job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover intentions. One might think that organizational commitment would have an important effect on either job performance or job satisfaction. Because of the desire to remain in the college is one of the components of organizational commitment. Nevertheless, our results indicate that job satisfaction has a greater impact on turnover intentions compared with job performance or organizational commitment. A possible reason is that commitment in CMT is present prior to recruitment and it is very active at the beginning of the employment relationship. When a staff member feels that there is a strong similarity between their values and goals of their college, they will experience a higher level of job performance and job satisfaction. Which in turn, will have a negative influence on intention to leave. The congruence between employees’ values and organizational values is particularly high in CMT. Once the values and goals of the organization are integrated, job content plays a greater role in the remaining process that will be reflected to the college well-being. Netemeyer et al. (1997) argued that whenever a specific-student-problem arises, colleagues can be of great help if the responsible staff-member is not available. Socialisation efforts from colleagues play an important part in a situation where a newly hired staff-member is trying to adapt college values and interact with their colleagues. These stem from our culture such as collectivism versus individualism (Brown and Humphreys, 1996; Humphreys, 1996).

Fourth, our results confirm that CMT could profit in very tangible ways (high job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment and low intention to leave) by selecting, attracting and maintaining those staff-member who “fit” well. As long as the decision maker board is able to identify the specific underlying reasons for good/poor organizational fit. These steps can be taken to increase the results.

Fifth, staff-member are more likely to perform better, by being satisfied with and committed to the CMT and are less likely to quit depending on the realistic appraisal of their value systems and working environment provided and offered. However, when a low performer exhibits high job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been evaluated by the course-coordinator that likes him/her, attribution bias could arise which damage the college as it may perhaps cause them to keep a hold of under-performers or prevent them from progressing and improve. A possible solution would be to use different methods of performance appraisal in the evaluation process. CMT should place more emphasis on designing and implementing a positive alliance between career planning and career management with career development which tend to reduce role stressors and turnover intentions and consequently increase staff-member performance, satisfaction and commitment toward the college. Furthermore, CMT should understand role stressors and its consequences in relation to their staff-member capabilities. By this way, they can assign activities to certain staff-members that they can excel in performance even when they are under stress. This is called a positive stress and these persons are getting their mind away from stress and they are capable to find an “exit” level to be motivated in accomplishing the assigned task.
Surprisingly, despite the indicated results of the significant and positive relationship between staff-member performance and satisfaction, staff-member has neither emotional commitment nor high excitement towards the college. These result implies that by increasing the staff-members' satisfaction, their level of performance increases but not their level of commitment. A possible reason is that staff member are satisfied with the benefits offered by the college such as medical insurance, salaries, rewards, recognition, compensations and bonuses-----. Furthermore, the Academy made various agreements with various universities in USA, UK and France in order to aid their staff-member to fulfil their master and/or their PhD degree. However not every candidate can be financially sponsored by the Academy. In addition to what was mention staff member may have the fear of losing their jobs and positions especially when there are very few job opportunities available nowadays.

Sixth, Job experience plays an important role in job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. It can be used to develop the CMT climate and culture in the direction of promoting positive outcomes. Within the Academy, the human resource development department is usually responsible for conducting job analyses, needs assessments, meetings, focus group discussions and interviews in order to identify performance and skills gaps and their possible causes. As a result, they make decisions about the Academy’s need for improvement and development. If the reason for failure is due to lack of skills, knowledge, or appropriate attitude, the importance of training appears as an appropriate solution. The key for successful and productive training is to ensure that training is tied to CMT needs and strategies (Wan, 2007). In general, training should be focused on communication and interaction skills, stress management, and strengthening the staff-member competence, capabilities, knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes continuously to match work demands. Training highlights respect and flexibility which could easily turn out to be win-win situations avoid poor management practices, inadequate training and removing obstacles and barriers and giving them some degree of autonomy at the same time.

Seventh, ethical climate in CMT is another critical issue that directly or indirectly affect the relationship among the investigated constructs. Any educational system that aims to foster greater staff-member performance, satisfaction and commitment should take serious actions to ensure ethical climate. Unfortunately, our study did not either examine ethical climate construct or provide any insights to shed the light for specific ethics or policies codes that should be enforced. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of every member in the Academy to communicate that unethical behaviour will not be either tolerated or accepted and serious actions will be taken especially when the time of getting promoted comes out or even whenever there is any opportunity for advancement. Then and only then our Academy will be on its way for success and superiority.

An eighth major practical implication of our research is that role conflict and role overload has a much greater impact on turnover intention than either role ambiguity or role novelty. Thus, CMT should give the highest priority to tackle role conflict and role overload in stress management. Limited empirical research regarding role overload and role novelty as sources of role stressors and their consequences restrict the enrichment of the elaboration and explanation. This could be a motive for future research.

Research limitations and direction for future research

This research offers insights into the unique contribution and interesting relationships between the constructs under investigation and provides a clear understanding of the importance and critical role of job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment and turnover intention. Nevertheless, the findings must be irritated with some limitations:

Using quantitative methods and relying on cross-sectional data as the only source of information in establishing and making causal statements about the hypothesised relationships between variables is considered valuable. It is however a weak method when attempting to identify the reasons for those relationships. Causality could not be determined. The longitudinal studies might offset the disadvantages of cross-sectional research. Despite of the relatively high response rate of staff-member in CMT, the
sample size is still considered to be small. Examining the relationships between the constructs under investigation across more than one college in the Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport might offset this limitation. Time series data are needed for examining the effect of improvement in CMT.

Since one of our contribution is to shed the light and gain a better understanding of role overload and role novelty phenomenon as a whole and consisting with Bakker et al. (2004) study, our results show a lack of relationship between role overload and role novelty as sources of role stressors and job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Therefore, future research can be conducted to fill these gaps and overcome these limitations.

Future researches are needed to explore the other important antecedents of job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to leave. Also, the underlying structure and causal relationship of this study may be tested on other segments such as banks, hospitals, hotels—— etc. A longitudinal research approach would make additional contributions to our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction, job performance and organizational commitment in terms of understanding their inferences, their development over time and their causal sequence.
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