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ABSTRACT: Although the number of universities in Vietnam has expanded significantly in recent decades, the quality gap in the country’s higher education has recently received much attention. Much qualitative research determined why more and more university graduates are out of work and university lecturers move to other jobs, which are the causes affecting job satisfaction, and work efficiency. However, there is still a lack of quantitative research to examine this issue. This study adds to the findings of previous studies. It enriches the research literature by examining Organizational definition as a variable detailing the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among Vietnamese university lecturers. We conducted a cross-sectional survey (n = 200). Multiple linear regression and moderator regression analysis tested the proposed hypotheses. Research results show a positive and significant relationship between organizational identity, job satisfaction, and job performance of Vietnamese university lecturers. In particular, organizational identity functions as a moderating variable of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.
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INTRODUCTION

In 2019, Vietnam had 237 universities, with 172 public ones, 60 private ones, and 5 with 100% foreign capital. There are 74,991 university lecturers, with 59,232 in public universities and 15,759 in private ones. The number of Vietnamese students enrolling increased by nearly 40% between 2008 and 2020 (Nguyen & Pham, 2020). Yet, the number of lecturers available is insufficient to keep up with rapid growth. Besides teaching, many of them have to do too many other tasks. Many studies determined the factors affecting their job satisfaction and work efficiency to help them work more effectively, reduce stress, and improve the quality of higher education. There have been significant discoveries, such as in higher education, where education quality is affected by a variety of factors in which faculty serves as the foundation for determining and developing educational quality, organizational performance, and competitive advantage, particularly in terms of sustainable development (Tai, Singh, & Hieu, 2021). Many factors influence their job satisfaction and work efficiency, including coworker relationships, regulations, management policies, employment characteristics, professional development, salary, remuneration, benefits, students, promotion opportunities (Liem, 2016; Thao & Viet, 2017; Nghi et al., 2017; Tan & Hoa, 2018; Quang & Thao, 2018; Linh, 2018; Quan & Trang, 2015; Tai et al., 2016), student attendance, information, faculty orientation, reward and recognition, teamwork, innovation (Minh & Tuan, 2017) demographic characteristics such as ages, genders, marital status (Bang, Ha, & Huan, 2014).

There have been no empirical studies on the impact of organizational identification on Vietnamese university lecturers' work efficiency and job satisfaction. However, according to various studies in other disciplines, organizational identification is more effective in forecasting work efficiency (Ng, 2015; Blader, Patil, & Packer, 2017). It changes the relationship between employees and their organization. According to studies, employees with high organizational identification scores will blend their personalities with their organizational features, which improves their work efficiency (Blader, Patil, & Packer, 2017). Because the relationship between like-minded employees positively affects organizational identification (Sluss et al., 2012). Their identification with the organization will develop due to their values and beliefs aligning with the ones of the organization (Shim & Faerman, 2017; Pratt, 1998). Their solid organizational identification contributes to their compliance and job satisfaction (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Pratt, 1998). Conversely, some studies uncover the dark side of organizational identification. The ones with a high degree
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of corporate identification may feel disconnected from their organizations (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). There is also controversy about the negative relationship of organizational identification with employee performance and job satisfaction (Naseer et al., 2019; Galvin et al., 2015; Ashforth, 2016; Conroy et al., 2017). Thus, the theory of the underlying mechanism of organizational identification still needs a lot of additional research (Blader, Patil, & Packer, 2017). There is still a lack of quantitative research on the role of organizational identity for university faculty. Therefore, this study aims to fill the theoretical gap in previous studies, examine the role of organizational identification in the job satisfaction of university lecturers and job performance of university lecturers, and test the moderator role of organizational identification in the relationship between job satisfaction of university lecturers and their job performance in Vietnam.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Organizational Identification

Albert and Whetten (1985) define organizational identification as statements that organization members perceive to be central, distinctive, and enduring to their organization. The definition reveals three critical criteria: centrality, distinctiveness, and durability. Centrality means that the statement should include essential features of the organization. As a statement of central characters, it defines what is crucial and necessary to the organization. Organizational identification is a specific type of social identification in which people identify themselves as members of a group or organization (Schwarz, 2017). It is characterized by a psychological union between individuals and their organizations (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006; Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Organizational identification is an individual's values and beliefs similar to those of others within the organization (Pratt, 1998; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). It expresses personal pride in being a member of an organization because its goals and values become its own (Riketta, 2005; Tajfel, 1978). It is a combination of multiple personal and organizational identification formed through interactions with others within the organization (Stryker, 1980). Organizational identification identifies an individual with social categories within an organization due to a desire for security, reducing uncertainty, and enhancing self-esteem in the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

An individual's organization identification allows us to determine to what extent the individual participates in the success of a group whose performance exceeds their strength (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Individuals with high scores on organizational identity believe that their fortunes are tied to their organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992), consider themselves essential in the organization (Pratt, 1998), and classify people to arrange their social surroundings (Tajfel, 1978; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Organizational identification is a concept of identity-based corporate linkage (Pratt, 1998). People with high scores on organizational identification establish their definitions of social categories when they believe they belong to them (Tajfel, 1978, Ashforth et al., 2008; Liu & Perry, 2016).

Individuals form their organizational identification on the interaction between employees and their organizations. Therefore, people with a high score are viewed positively by the organization (Miao et al., 2014). People with a strong sense of organizational identification focus their attention on tasks that assist the organization in meeting its goals (March & Simon, 1958). Their social and historical backgrounds, goals, and qualities influence their organizational identification (Perry, 2000; Perry & Vandenameele, 2008).

Lecturers’ Job performance

Each university faculty member has specific responsibilities, and several factors influence their job performance (Selvanathan, Yan, Supramaniam, Arumugam, & Supramaniam, 2019). For decades, their degree of work efficiency and the reasons for increased or decreased productivity have been the subject of debate (Selvanathan, Yan, Supramaniam, Arumugam, & Supramaniam, 2019; Butler, 2001). According to many studies, their work efficiency is affected by many factors. Therefore, they are not just about salaries and benefits but also about working conditions in institutions and classrooms (Karimi & Gitonga, 2017). Furthermore, student satisfaction with their assignments and tests, and grading methods, are essential determinants of faculty performance (Ghasharian Asl & Osam, 2021). Colleagues, capital, and resources, among other factors, have a favorable impact on their work efficiency (Johnes & Yu, 2008). Ability, task knowledge, environment, and motivation are all factors that influence their work efficiency (Schraw, 2006). Teaching performance, research output, and job satisfaction in their employment positions are distinct (Brewer & Selden, 2000; Kim, 2005).

Lecturers’ Job Satisfaction

The employees are satisfied with their jobs, expressed by their efforts to boost labor productivity (Reyes & Shin, 1995). Job satisfaction is a psychological condition that includes emotions, rewards, and all aspects of the work environment and having the job itself (Churchill et al., 1974). It determines their commitment to teaching and relates to their long-term retention in the
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teaching profession (Reyes & Shin, 1995). The right to make direct decisions about their work and hygiene considerations affects lecturers' job satisfaction in studies (Amatz & Idris, 2011; Moore, 1992). When teachers are more involved in decision-making, they have more autonomy in their work and are in better working conditions. As a result, they contribute to improved student achievement and job satisfaction (Ferguson, 2000; Jacobson, 2005; Mertler, 2002; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Harry, 2005), management style (Fenwick & Murlis, 1994), autonomy (Paul, 2003).

Relationship between Organizational Identification and Lecturers' job performance

Organisational identification, according to research, is the psychological link between an individual and an organization, which has a significant impact on work behaviors (Riketta, 2005), motivates people to associate with the group's influential figures (Tajfel & Turner, 1985), and has the closest link to task performance (Ng, 2015). Individuals with a high organizational identification score are more inclined to invest personally in the company and participate in beneficial activities (Simon, 1947). There is a link between organizational identification and job performance, according to studies, because people with high organizational identification scores not only profit from group affiliations but also have to follow particular group standards (Jones & Volpe, 2011). This interaction improves their self-discipline and motivates them to participate in group activities, ultimately elevating their status (Scott, 2007). It causes people to work harder for their organizations' and individuals' goals, and it causes them to become more unified with their organization's successes and failures. (Campbell, 2015). Because it improves lecturers' job motivation, the degree of organizational identification has a favorable effect on their work efficiency (Ugaddan & Park, 2017). Thus, many studies have found a relationship between organizational identification and job performance (Boyne, 2002; Brewer, 2006; Walker et al., 2011). Therefore, there is a significant relationship between organizational identification and faculty work efficiency. Consequently, we can conclude that they are linked based on these findings (Vogel, Homberg, & Gericke, 2016; Liu & Perry, 2016).

Relationship between Organizational Identification and Lecturers' Job Satisfaction

An individual with a low organizational identification score has negative psychological consequences, social rule-breaking, and unethical worker behavior (Irshad & Bashir, 2020). Those with a high organizational identification score, on the other hand, receive psychological benefits, follow the code of ethics, and their ethical behaviors have a positive impact on the organization, reflecting the employee's closeness to the organization to which they belong (Tarakci et al., 2018). They also show their greater attachment to the organization (Beyth-Marom, Harpaz, Bar-Haim, & Godder, 2006). The employees with high scores on organizational identification and job satisfaction exhibit a commitment to do what they expect to keep their jobs (Yam et al., 2017). These results show a relationship between organizational identity and lecturers' job satisfaction.

Relationship between Lecturers’ Job Satisfaction and their Work efficiency

Organizational identification is a source of positive employee outcomes (Tarakci et al., 2018), and it facilitates the comprehension of worker behaviors. (Rho et al., 2015). Employees with a higher degree of organizational identification feel obliged to accomplish organizational goals due to a sense of togetherness and common aims (Yam et al., 2017). The faculty's job satisfaction is related to the ability of the teaching job to meet their expectations and improve their teaching performance (Ololube, 2006). It is a pleasant or positive emotional state that occurs due to job appraisal or work experience (Locke, 1976). Faculty commitment to the organization is influenced by job satisfaction and organizational trust (Tai, Singh, & Hieu, 2021), participatory decisions, and improved productivity (Dickson, 1982). As a result of these findings, there is a link between their job satisfaction and labor outcomes.

Hypotheses

H1. There is a positive and meaningful relationship between organizational identification and faculty job satisfaction.
H2. There is a positive and meaningful relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.
H3. Organizational identification moderates the relationship between faculty job satisfaction and job performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

We conducted the research at the Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City universities in March 2021. These two cities account for 80% of the universities in the country. Survey participants are full-time university faculty. The research team used a qualitative method by in-depth interviews with educational researchers and psychologists to adjust the research scale and better the questionnaire to suit the characteristics of the surveyed area. Based on the results from the literature review and their comments, the questionnaire was adjusted. Accordingly, it consisted of two parts. Part 1 collects data about the participants' demographics, such as ages, genders, and occupations, whereas Part 2 collects data about work efficiency, job satisfaction, and organizational identification.
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Data on work performance were collected using part of a questionnaire developed by (White, Smith, & Cunningham, 1988), including five items. Next, data on job satisfaction were collected using a questionnaire developed by (Bérubé, Donia, Gagné, Houlfort, & Koestner, 2007), including five items. Finally, data on organizational identification were collected using part of a questionnaire developed by (Buchanan, 1974; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Porter & Smith, 1970; Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970, Cheney, 1982; Miller, Allen, Casey, & Johnson, 2000), including six items.

The English questionnaire has been translated into Vietnamese by two professional interpreters according to specific rules to accommodate a variety of Vietnamese cultures based on the comments of the language expert. It was then pre-tested on 40 participants selected to be demographically representative across age, sex, and education levels. In addition, minor edits made the questionnaire more straightforward to understand before being used for the official survey.

Participating in the research is the selection of full-time university lecturers in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City. Ho Chi Minh. The questionnaire was sent directly to the respondents by the purposeful sampling method. We received 200 valid answer sheets (reaching 100%). Table 1 shows the demographic statistics (Table 1).

### Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Column N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Column N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Column N %</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Column N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics lecturer</td>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign lecturer</td>
<td>31-35 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language lecturer</td>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT lecturer</td>
<td>41-45 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths lecturer</td>
<td>46-50 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy lecturer</td>
<td>above 50 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH RESULTS**

**Analyzing the Reliability of the Scales**

Testing the scales using Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient aims to identify and remove junk variables to avoid misleading factors when analyzing exploratory factors. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient has a range of values between 0 and 1 [0,1]. A measurement variable meets the requirements if it has a Corrected Item - Total Correlation ≥ 0.3 (Cronbach, 1951; Taber, 2018). The verification criterion is that the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient must be greater than 0.6, and the correlation coefficient of the sum variable in each scale must be greater than 0.3 (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Table 2 reveals that the rankings of the factors are all standard. Therefore, they are reliable and used for the subsequent analysis and moderator regression analysis.
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Table 2. Summary of Reliability and Relative Minimum Variables of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Number of variables observed</th>
<th>Reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha)</th>
<th>The correlation coefficient of the smallest total variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After testing Cronbach’s Alpha, we conduct exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to test the validity of variables about their unidirectional, concurrent, and discriminant by extracting the Principal Components Analysis and Varimax rotation in the research model. With a sample size of 200, the factor loading of the observed variables must be more than 0.5; variables converge on the same factor and are distinguishable from other factors. In addition, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin coefficient (KMO) is an index used to consider the suitability of factor analysis and must be in the range of $0.5 \leq \text{KMO} \leq 1$ (Cerny & Kaiser, 1977; Kaiser, 1974; Snedecor, George, Cochran & William, 1989).

Table 3 shows that all factor loading coefficients of the observed variables are higher than 0.5; Bartlett tested with Sig. = 0.000 and KMO = 0.889. All 16 items are extracted into three components with Eigenvalues > 1 and Cumulative variance percent = 55.326 %. As a result, a research model with two independent and one dependent variable for linear regression analysis and moderator regression analysis to test hypotheses.

Table 3: Exploratory factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix(^a)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification6</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification4</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification1</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification5</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification2</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification3</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction5</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction1</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction2</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction3</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction4</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance3</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance5</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance4</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pearson correlation analysis

The authors employ Pearson correlation analysis to examine the relationship between quantitative variables. As shown in Figure 2, with a significance of 5%, the correlation coefficient indicates that the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables is statistically significant (Sig. < 0.05). The magnitude of the correlation coefficients ensures that multicollinearity does not occur. Therefore, other statistics can be employed to verify the link between variables.

Moderation regression and linear regression analysis

The Multivariable linear regression is analyzed based on the relationship between two independent variables, namely Identification and Satisfaction, and one dependent one, Performance (model 1), and Moderation regression Analysis is used to determine the Identification that moderates the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance (model 2). We centered the data on satisfaction and Identity variable before applying moderator regression analysis. Table 4 has shown model 1 with $R^2 = 0.304$ and model 2 with $R^2 = 0.308$. These results have indicated that the linear regression model was built to fit the data set Model 1 = 0.304 % and Model 2 = 0.308%. Both models show that the two independent variables have no statistical significance on the dependent variable. Both models show that the two independent variables have no significant impact on the dependent one and are not of statistical significance. Moderation regression Analysis (model 2) reveals that the Midentification is a moderation variable that adjusts the relationship between the Xsatisfaction and Performance. That means the impact of Xsatisfaction and Performance depends on the decrease or increase of Midentification.
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Table 4. The results of multiple linear regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable:</th>
<th>(model1)</th>
<th>(model2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>0.279***</td>
<td>0.258***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.397***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.065)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction:Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.909***</td>
<td>2.925***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.221)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R2</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Std. Error</td>
<td>0.637 (df = 197)</td>
<td>0.643 (df = 196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Statistic</td>
<td>45.144*** (df = 2; 197) 28.496*** (df = 3; 196)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 4 shows that, with a 95% confidence level, the hypotheses proposed by the research team are acceptable. Specifically, model1 demonstrated that Satisfaction has the highest effect on Performance with $\beta = 0.269$. Model 2 has indicated that the Identification moderates the association between Satisfaction and Performance with $\beta = 0.175$, implying that as the Identification rises or falls, the relationship between Satisfaction and Performance rises or falls.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Firstly, Table 4 results show that hypothesis H1 is accepted. There is a positive and meaningful relationship between organizational identification and job performance. It means that organizational identification has a positive and significant relationship with the performance of lecturers. This result is similar to previous findings by Jones & Volpe (2011), Campbell (2015), Ugaddan & Park (2017), and Scott (2007). They put forth more effort to achieve the organization’s goals and are more aware of its successes and losses. It is similar to what was discovered by Boyne (2002), Brewer (2006); Walker et al. (2011), Vogel, Homberg, & Gericke (2016), Liu & Perry (2016), which found a link between the lecturers’ organizational identification and their work performance.

Secondly, Table 4 indicates that hypothesis H2 is accepted. It suggests that job satisfaction among lecturers has a positive and meaningful association with their job performance. This result is similar to previous studies conducted in other fields Oololube (2006) and Locke (1976). Individuals with high scores on job satisfaction have psychological benefits. In addition, they follow the code of ethics. Their ethical behavior positively impacts their job satisfaction and ability to teach as desired and increases their teaching performance. This result implies that individuals with high scores on job satisfaction and organization trust have high scores on organizational identification (At, Singh, & Hieu, 2021).

Finally, the findings demonstrate that hypothesis H3 is accepted. That means organizational identification governs the relationship between the lecturers’ job satisfaction and work efficiency. Thus, on the one hand, organizational identification has been considered a source of positive outcomes for employees (Yam et al., 2017; Rho et al., 2015; Tarakci et al., 2018) and related
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to the faculty teaching capacity attained as expected and hence increased teaching performance (Ololube, 2006). Those with high organizational identification scores demonstrate their pleasant or good emotional states due to job evaluations or work experience (Locke, 1976), which determines their participation and improves their work efficiency (Dickson, 1982). Therefore, from these above research findings, it is concluded that organizational identification impacts the relationship between lecturers' job satisfaction and work efficiency.

This study shows that the role of organizational identification is confirmed in higher education. Therefore, managers in higher education need to understand that it is a factor affecting the satisfaction and job performance of university employees. In addition, employee organizational identification is an essential factor in the change process of any higher education institution. This study further affirms that Organizational identity is defined as the statements that organizational members consider central, distinct, and enduring to their organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Therefore, it influences the behavior of both leaders and members in many aspects of an organization.

Limitations

Like other experimental studies, this study has some limitations that need considering when discussing its findings. First and foremost, our survey approach reflects the respondents' subjective perception of the questions investigated. Unfortunately, subjective data has some inherent flaws that are difficult to eliminate (Pakpour, Gellert, Asefzadeh, Updegraff, Molloy, & Sniehotta, 2016). Our data is collected over some time. Because cross-sectional data do not allow dynamic assessment of changes in intention and accompanying behavior, the usefulness of our findings may be limited (Xin, Liang, Zhanyou & Hua, 2019). The purposive sampling method also has certain restrictions and does not fully reflect the features of the population (Lin et al., 2016; Strong et al., 2018). Other studies will overcome these limitations with larger sample sizes, random sampling methods, and examination of demographic characteristics. Our survey was conducted in a Vietnamese cultural context. Consequently, more general statements should be put forward by applying more development research models and results from other countries and cultures (Sun et al., 2012). Furthermore, the R² of both models is low, which will reduce the significance of the models. In further studies, it is necessary to increase the sample size to improve them.
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