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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between dimensions of hygiene factors and intention to leave among prison personnel, also to identify whether there is dominant dimension of hygiene factor that has higher effect than other dimensions related to intention to leave.

The findings were done by using reliability test, multiple regression and Pearson correlations. The research done by mean of survey, a questionnaire was distributed to 310 randomly selected respondents. The data was analyzed by using SPSS version 16.0

The findings indicate that there is significant negative relationship between three dimensions of hygiene factor and intention to leave, however only one dimension not significant. Coworker is the dominant dimension that has the highest influence on intention to leave. These findings show that the related factors should have given attention to retain employees in the organization. Some suggestions have been recommended for the organization and for future research to be more complete and comprehensive.
ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk melihat hubungan di antara dimensi 'hygiene factor' dan dijatuhkannya hukuman penjara, di samping itu, untuk mengenal faktor dominan/merata yang mempengaruhi terhentikannya kerja di kalangan kitangan penjara.

Kajian telah dilakukan dengan menggunakan ujian kebolehpercayaan, regresi berganda, dan regresi berganda dan regresi berganda dari Pearson. Penelitian yang dilakukan oleh min kajiseldik, satu soal selidik telah diedarkan kepada 310 responden yang dipilih secara rawak. Data telah dianalisis dengan menggunakan SPSS versi 16.0.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In order for an organization to be doing well, it must constantly make sure the satisfactorily of their employees. In addition, blissful workers are more likely to be an industrious worker. Man power in an organization is the for the most part essential asset or resource to enable organization to do their business. Exclusive of human resource, the organization will not be able to realize the developed business plan and retaining them has become a dispute to organizational management because of diverse employee requirements. Furthermore, organization with complementary fulfilled workers tends to be supplementary successful (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

It is not easy for management to make a decision what makes employees happy – to understand and to give the employee desires. Employee intention to leave demands grave management consideration because of it high performance levels, it puts difficulty on the organization insufficient resources which turn to be costly, people tend to change jobs within a year rather than decide to grow in one. Therefore, it is essential to preserve the workers in the organization especially capable senior staff or skillfulness workers.

According to Connolly and Connolly (1991), turnover is valuable for the organization. It involves the division cost such as the rate use in recruiting and selecting fresh employee, and the cost involved throughout the training stage. Turnover is the willingly and
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