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Abstract

This thesis aims to examine the mediating role of perceived organizational support (POS) between high commitment HR practices (HCHR practices) and turnover behaviour. It also aims to explore the moderating role of supervisor support on high commitment HR practices and perceived organizational support. Although some previous studies have examined the role of perceived organizational support in the HR practice-turnover process, this literature was largely underdeveloped. For instance, some of the important HR practices that are reported to have a significant relationship with POS have not been studied in the HCHR practices-POS-turnover process. Further, the potential moderating influence of supervisor support has not yet been accounted for. Based on social exchange theory, it was expected that HCHR practices would lead to higher POS and lower turnover intentions/actual turnover.

A cross-sectional survey was conducted in the banking sector in Pakistan. Data was collected in two waves. The first wave of data was collected in 2011 from multiple branches of three banks across the country. Out of a total sample of 1000 employees, 580 completed questionnaires were returned. Confirmatory factor analyses were carried out. The factor loadings confirmed the distinctiveness of the proposed constructs. Reliability coefficients were calculated for each measurement scale based on the items retained after confirmatory factor analysis. All scales showed high reliability. In the second wave of the data collection, conducted in 2014, data about the actual turnover of employees was collected. Data about 158 respondents who participated in the first wave were collected.

The data was analysed using structured equation modelling in MPlus to test the theoretical model and hypothesized relationships. Supervisor support was examined as a moderating variable. The results indicate that supervisor support did not have an influence on the relationship between HR practices and perceived organizational support. Among the four HR practices tested, only two practices: job autonomy and job security, were found to have predicted POS, while justice and developmental experience did not predict POS. Further analysis revealed that POS does not mediate the relationship between any HR practice and turnover intentions or actual turnover.

The study makes a number of theoretical, methodological and practical contributions. The effects of possible moderating variables have not previously been studied in the HR practices-POS-turnover process. The current research makes an important contribution.
by testing the moderating effects of supervisor support in this process. By testing the possible influence of the HR practices, job security and job autonomy on the POS-turnover process, the current study added important nuances to our knowledge about the role of these practices. The current study further contributes to the literature by testing a more comprehensive array of HR practices and their influence on POS and employee turnover in a holistic and composite model. The literature also lacks any notable study that has examined the POS-turnover process in any of the Middle Eastern or South Asian countries. As Pakistan has many cultural similarities with the Middle Eastern and South Asian countries, the current study provides important evidence from this region. A number of future research possibilities have been identified through this research.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Over the last few decades, job turnover has become an increasingly important area of research from both a theoretical and a practical standpoint. From a practical standpoint, the high cost of training in rapidly changing business environments has attached a greater significance to employee retention. Employers invest a great deal of money in employee training which is wasted once employees leave the organization. In addition, an organization’s human resources are a source of competitive advantage, and thus retaining talent is now more important (Kehoe & Wright, 2013; Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell & Allen, 2007; Pfeffer, 2005). From a theoretical standpoint, understanding turnover processes may help organizations take appropriate measures that can reduce the level of turnover, which is likely to translate into reduced costs, improved work performance and enhanced productive capacity (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Good, Page & Young, 1996).

The recent economic recession has brought a greater emphasis and a renewed focus on voluntary job turnover. The recession starting in 2007 was termed as the most serious economic down turn of past decades, whose effects were not only felt in developed economies but also in a large number of developing and underdeveloped economies across the world. Today, the world is economically more interdependent than ever before. Export industries in most developing and underdeveloped countries have a high degree of reliance on the economic health of the developed countries (Gereffi & Frederick, 2010). The global recession, on the one hand, triggered massive job cuts and, on the other hand, created a sense of job insecurity among surviving employees. The
literature suggests that economic turbulence places a premium on employees’ ongoing efforts to assess and enhance their employability (Direnzo & Greenhaus, 2011; Reichel & Neumann, 1993). Leading research company Mckinsey’s global survey results in June 2009 reported: “Organizations face the challenge of retaining talented people amid morale sapping layoffs that tend to increase voluntary turnover over the medium term. Often, top performers are the first to go” (Dewhurst, Guthridge & Mohr, 2009, p.3). In the face of uncertainty and turbulence, employees make a careful assessment of the human resource practices of an organization and its overall treatment of employees. If an employee makes an overall negative perception about the organization and its policies, his or her intentions to stay in the organization in the long run may be negatively influenced. The need to remain employable may give greater impetus to searching for a more stable and secure job. Although most countries in the world began to show economic recovery at the end of 2009, the unemployment rates did not recover to the pre-recession level even until the end of 2014. The unemployment rate in the Euro area was about 7 % at the end of 2007 and 11.5 % in August 2014 (European Commission, 2014). In the midst of looming uncertainty, employees’ assessment of an organization’s reaction and its policies have influenced their attitudes and job outcomes. This new situation warrants a review of voluntary turnover processes, especially in relation to an employee’s evaluation of high commitment human resource practices and overall perception about the organization, given that these processes appear to be central to employee decisions to quit.

There is a large body of literature which suggests that human resource management practices (hereafter HR practices), and particularly high commitment HR practices, are linked to job turnover (Zhong, Wayne & Liden, 2015; Kehoe & Wright, 2013; Sun, Aryee & Law, 2007; Guthrie, 2001; Huselid, 1995; Arthur, 1994). High commitment HR practices signify an investment in employees that enhances their commitment to the organization
and renders them less likely to switch jobs. Those organizations that have favourable HR
practices experience lower turnover rates (Huselid, 1995). The literature that has thus far
focused on the relationship between HR practices and job turnover has not sufficiently
accounted for the mechanisms that explain this relationship. Rather, findings have
suggested a direct relationship between HR practices and job turnover, but precisely how
this association is brought about is less understood.

Some recent studies suggest that HR practices do not have a direct causal relationship
with employee turnover, but posit that the relationship between HR practices and actual
job turnover is mediated by other variables. These variables include perceived
organizational support, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover
intentions (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart & Adis, 2015; Spoor & Hoye,
2014; Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003). In parallel streams of literature, researchers have
focused on the determinants of actual turnover, and have found this to be an outcome of
job satisfaction (Kuo, Lin & Li, 2014; Irvine & Evans, 1995; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Mobley,
1977; Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974), job commitment (Zoppiatis, Constanti &
Theocharous, 2014; Somers, 1995; Cohen, 1993; Cohen & Hudecek, 1993; Lee, Ashford,
Walsh & Mowday, 1992; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982), perceived organizational
support (Kurtessis et al., 2015; DeConinck & Johnson, 2009; Maertz et al., 2007; Allen et
al., 2003) and turnover intentions (Cohen, Blake & Goodman, 2015; Allen et al., 2003; Tett
& Meyer, 1993). Taken overall, this is suggestive that the relationship between HR
practices and turnover may not be direct but is instead influenced by how HR practices
impact on employee attitudes.

One central focus for recent studies of this indirect relationship has been perceived
organizational support. Perceived organizational support (POS) is defined as "employees’
global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions
and cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986, p. 505). Based on a social exchange approach, Eisenberger et al. (1986) argued that employees make an overall judgement about the commitment of an organization to them, and if this judgement is positive, will reciprocate by demonstrating organizational commitment. The reason for this is that employees with higher perceptions of organizational support develop a sense of ownership of the organization. They consider the problems of the organization as their own and celebrate the achievements of the organization. This sense of ownership develops a bond between employee and the organization which deters employees from looking actively for another job and, indeed, may result in employees developing intentions to stay. As a result, the probability of actual turnover significantly lessens.

Given that POS has been found to be related to both HR practices and employee attitudes such as commitment, job satisfaction and job turnover, examining these streams of literature in tandem may provide an important avenue of research for improving our understanding of those mechanisms linking HR practices to behavioural outcomes such as job turnover. Some studies in the POS literature have already begun to unpack and examine these relationships, though they are rather few in number (see Wong, Wong & Wong, 2015; DeTienne, Agle, Phillips & Ingerson, 2012; Riggle, Edmondson & Hansen, 2009; Hui, Wong & Tjosvold, 2007; Loi, Ngo & Foley, 2006; Randall, Cropanzano, Borman & Birjulin, 1999). Moreover, those studies that have been conducted have used turnover intentions as a proxy for actual turnover and the models used to discuss turnover intentions are relatively simplistic, possibly underestimating the complexity of the HR practice/turnover process. One exception here is Allen et al. (2003) model which examines the role of HR practices in employee turnover, including participation in decision making and growth opportunity, as well as the role of perceived fairness. Their model suggests a complex process in which HR practices have an indirect relationship
with both job attitudes (commitment, satisfaction and turnover intentions) and job behaviours (actual turnover) via the mediating role of POS. However, Allen et al. (2003) focused only on only three high commitment HR practices, even though there are other high commitment HR practices that have been widely reported to generate POS (e.g. job security, job autonomy) but which have not been studied in the POS-turnover process.

The current study, therefore, aims to both build on and extend the work of Allen et al. (2003) in a number of respects:

First, Allen et al. (2003) focused on three HR practices, as already mentioned. However, a large body of literature suggests that job autonomy and job security are important antecedents of POS and job attitudes (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2013; Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Emberland & Rundmo, 2010; Allen, Armstrong, Reid & Riemenschneider, 2008; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Ahuja, McKnight, Chudoba, George & Kacmar, 2007; Coomber & Louise Barriball, 2007; Golden, 2007; Thompson & Prattas, 2006; Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli & Lynch, 1997; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Some authors examined job security and job autonomy as elements of overall job conditions (Laschinger, Purdy, Cho & Almost, 2006; Barnett & Brennan, 1997). However, some contemporary literature suggests that job autonomy and job security are actually used as deliberate, well thought-out HR strategies by the organizations to enhance employees’ positive job attitudes, aimed at reducing employee turnover (Zhong et al., 2015; Arthur, 2011; Lee, Lee & Wu, 2010). The current study follows this approach and views these constructs as elements of the HR system and not simply of overall job conditions.

A number of leading writers have suggested that job security and job autonomy are important HR practices that may influence job outcomes (DeTienne et al., 2012; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Delaney & Huselid, 1996; Huselid, 1995; Schuler & Jackson, 1987).
Job security is particularly relevant to the current study as the post-recession job market still produces a high degree of uncertainty. Employees may be giving greater importance to a secure job to avoid potential layoff. Thus, it is important to study how job security in the current situation impacts POS and voluntary turnover. Similarly, there is growing evidence in related streams of studies that job autonomy affects the turnover process (Galletta, Portoghese & Battistelli, 2011; Shih, Jiang, Klein & Wang, 2011; Ahuja et al., 2007; Currivan, 1999). However, job autonomy has not thus far been studied in the context of turnover processes in the POS stream. Further, the current study is being carried out in Pakistan, where job autonomy is believed to be low (Khilji, 2004). Hence, including job autonomy in the model will enable the exploration of the impact of job autonomy on turnover processes in a low-autonomy context. Therefore, including these two very important HRM practices will improve the model’s capability to explain turnover processes.

Second, the turnover literature suggests that there are variations between different countries in terms of turnover intentions attributable to different cultural and organizational contexts. For example, turnover intentions and actual turnover in France were found to be very high, whereas turnover intentions in Japan were significantly lower (Sousa-Poza & Henneberger, 2004). Given the potential international variation in turnover intentions shown in the literature, it is worthwhile to examine the validity of Allen et al.’s (2003) model in a different country context. For instance, no notable study has been carried out in the Middle East or South Asia, including Pakistan, in the domain of POS and turnover processes. There is ample evidence in the literature that different HRM practices may have different levels of effectiveness in different country contexts (Caligiuri, 2014; Fey, Mourgulis-Yakushev, Park & Björkman, 2009; Björkman, Fey & Park, 2007; Aycan, Kanungo, Mendonca, Yu, Deller, Stahl & Kurshid, 2000). However, the
impact of HRM practices on POS and job turnover has not been studied in Pakistan and
indeed, the literature is generally deficient in both HRM and organizational behaviour
domains in Pakistan (Khilji, 2004).

Pakistan has a unique socio-cultural context resulting from the interplay of various factors
including Indian origin, British colonial legacy, contemporary American influence, religious
embeddedness, institutional structure and its economic situation (Mehdi, 2013; Qadeer,
2006; Khilji, 2004, 2003). This socio cultural environment has a major influence on
organizational working. Although business and government organizations have similar
organizational structures to American and British organizations, there are deep
differences with regards to how people interact within those organizational structures.
For example, supervisor support is considered to be a universal dimension that has a
favourable impact on organizational working. Yet what is classified as supervisor support
in Pakistan may largely vary from Western countries. Because of its Indian origin that
emphasizes the collective nature of working, a supervisor is viewed as a “big brother”
who is not only expected to provide support in organizational matters, but also in
personal situations. Supervisors, despite being authoritative and paternalistic, are
expected to be benevolent and supportive like older brothers. In pressing situations,
money may be borrowed from “trusted” colleagues and supervisors without paying any
interest (Nadeem, 2013). In some cases, if supervisors switch to another job, they help
their subordinate to move to the new organization on a better pay package. Thus
supervisor support plays an important role in building perceptions about organizational
support and job turnover decisions. Similarly, due to the family-centred culture
characteristic of Pakistan, sometimes the complete extended family (including parents) is
dependent on the income of one individual (Khilji, 2013; Tarafder, 2013). Financial
expectations from the family may hence influence the relative importance an employee
attaches to job security, which may then be a very important factor in creating positive perceptions about organizational support and turnover intentions.

These examples highlight the importance of studying HR practices and outcomes in this unique cultural context. On the one hand, the literature is seriously deficient in the HRM and OB domains within the Pakistani context and, on the other hand, the business sector is rapidly expanding. This expanding business sector is in dire need of up to date academic research that could help employers understand how employees develop positive perceptions about organizations and what contributes to job turnover in a highly volatile yet growing economy.

The current study would also aim to develop insights into the cross-cultural validity of POS and other related constructs that have been developed in the West.

Third, Allen’s model did not examine the role of potential moderators. In order to enhance the understanding of turnover processes, it is important to include factors that can potentially moderate the relationship between HR practices and POS. Moderators address “when” or “for whom” a variable most strongly predicts or causes an outcome variable and it alters the direction or strength of the relation between a predictor and an outcome (Jose, 2013; Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). Some of the HR practices that lead to higher POS may not have the same relationship in the presence of a moderator. Theoretically, high commitment HR practices should lead to positive perceptions about the organization; however, in the real world setting, there are some important organizational factors that can potentially moderate the nature of the relationship. If these potential moderators are ignored in the model, the results may not represent the true relationship in the organizational setting. Thus identifying the important moderators of relations between predictors and outcomes indicates the maturity and sophistication of a field of inquiry (Frazier, Tix & Barron, 2004). The current study fills this gap by
examining supervisor support as a moderator. The role of supervisor support has conventionally been examined as an antecedent of perceived organizational support, which is based on Levinson (1965) notion that employees personify their supervisor as the organization. Thus, employees see the actions of their supervisors as indicators of the organization’s intent and policies rather than of their personal motives (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). However, related streams of literature suggest that support/lack of support can influence employee perceptions regarding organizational initiatives and work outcomes (Galletta et al., 2011; Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2010; van Mierlo, Rutte, Vermunt, Kompier & Doorewaard, 2006). If a branch manager or immediate supervisor is abusive or unfair to a subordinate, the subordinate’s perception about positive organizational initiatives may be affected despite the fact that the organization may genuinely care about its employees. As supervisors are the agents of the organization, their actions/attitudes may overwhelm or affect employees’ perceptions about overall organizational support. For instance, whilst job autonomy may have a positive impact on perceived organizational support, if the supervisor is too demanding and abusive, more job autonomy may mean that the subordinate has to make more decisions on his own, which may increase the risk of committing a mistake. Any mistake in such a situation may trigger an aggressive response from the supervisor. In this case, more job autonomy may result in negative perceptions about the organization as the abusive supervision changes the relationship between autonomy and POS. Despite the evidence in the OB literature that the supervisor’s attitude may moderate employee perceptions of the organization, supervisor support has not been studied as a moderator in the HR practices-POS-turnover process. This study will, therefore, examine the moderating role of supervisor support on the relationship between POS and its antecedents.

Fourth, given the increasing evidence that the recession of 2007 has had medium to long term effects on employee behaviours and job outcomes (Solberg, Tómasson, Aasland &
Tyssen, 2014; Brewer, Kovner, Yingrengreung & Djukic, 2012b; Kaur, 2012; Vuolo, Staff & Mortimer, 2012; Direnzo & Greenhaus, 2011), it is timely to re-examine the relationship between high commitment HR practices and job turnover and assess whether the relationships discussed by Allen et al. in 2003 hold in the current economic climate.

Thus, the study aims to:

a. examine the role of perceived organizational support in HR practices and turnover processes.

b. extend the work of Allen, Shore, and Griffeth (2003) by examining the role of high commitment HR practices and perceived organizational support in the turnover process.

c. examine the potential moderating role of supervisor support in the relationship between high commitment human resource practices and perceived organizational support.

d. assess the validity of the turnover model suggested by Allen et al. (2003) in an Asian context and test the cross-cultural validity of the measures used in this study in the Pakistani context.
1.2 Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides the introduction to the thesis and outlines the research aims. Chapter 2 reviews literature on the theoretical origin of perceived organizational support (i.e. social exchange theory), the impact of HR practices on perceived organizational support, and the mediating role of perceived organizational support, affective commitment, and job satisfaction in the HR practices-turnover relationship. The literature on job autonomy, procedural justice, distributive justice, developmental experience and job security, is reviewed in relation to POS and other job outcomes. This review of literature leads to hypotheses development. Social exchange theory is used to explain hypothesized relationships between HR practices and positive job outcomes.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology. The chapter begins with a description and justification of the philosophical stance adopted for this research. Details about sampling, sample characteristics, data collection methods, issues related to the translation of the research instrument and ethical considerations are discussed. The chapter then presents a detailed discussion of the scale development for the constructs measured in this study, which is followed by empirical testing of the validity and reliability of the scales using confirmatory factor analysis. The scales containing items finalized through the confirmatory factor analysis were then tested for their reliability. The chapter also presents findings of the pilot study.

Chapter 4 provides the results of the statistical analyses and tests of the hypotheses. The hypothesized model was tested using structural equation modelling in MPlus.

And the last chapter, Chapter 5, is dedicated to discussion of the results. The results are compared with previous studies and similarities and differences between the current
study and the POS literature are discussed. Wherever relevant, contextual explanations for the results are presented. The chapter concludes by presenting theoretical, methodological and practical contributions, identifying limitations and indicating areas of future research.

1.3 Chapter Summary

The chapter has provided an introduction to the research. First, the background of the study, the significance of the study, the introduction of perceived organizational support theory, and research aims were presented, followed by an overview of the rest of the thesis. The overall structure of the thesis was outlined and a brief summary given of each chapter. The next chapter will review the literature on different aspects of perceived organizational support and the impact of HR practices on POS and turnover behaviour.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I have argued that high commitment HR practices have a positive relationship with perceived organizational support (POS) and a negative relationship with job turnover. The current chapter will review the literature to unpack these arguments. The first part of this chapter reviews the role of HR practices in shaping voluntary turnover behaviour. Five practices outlined in Chapter 1, i.e. fairness, job security, job autonomy, and training and development, are discussed. High commitment HR practices, it will be argued, lead to favourable employee perceptions about the organization. Thus, the next part discusses the role of HR practices in forming a positive perception about the organization, followed by a discussion of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes. The discussion in these different sections leads to the development of relevant hypotheses.

2.2 HR Practices and Employee Turnover

One of the biggest challenges faced by the organization in cut-throat competition is the retention of employees. The business landscape in most industries is changing at a pace that is unprecedented, partly due to changes in the technological environment (André Cavalcante, 2013; Delargy, 2001).

In order to cope with such rapid changes in the business environment, organizations have to keep their employees trained and up to date with the latest developments in the market and this considerably increases an organization’s investment in employees. If an employee quits it may mean that all the investment the organization has made in the employee goes in vain. Therefore, both academics and managers are highly interested in
studying practices and processes that lead to employee retention, due to the costs associated with employee turnover and the attendant loss of talented employees. In this section, therefore, I will examine the literature that has focused on the relationship between HR practices and employee turnover.

There is lack of consensus regarding what exactly constitute human resource practices. Hornsby and Kuratko (2003) proposed that HR practices include five different areas, i.e. job analysis and description, recruiting and selection, training, performance appraisal and compensation. Huselid (1995) defined HRM practices as employee recruitment and selection procedures, compensation and performance management systems, employee involvement and employee training, among others. Thus, Huselid (1995) included employee involvement or employee participation as an important HR practice. Lee et al. (2010) included job security and teamwork in their six key HR practices, in addition to HR planning, compensation, performance appraisal and training and development. Meyer and Smith (2000) also included employment security as a key HR practice as the perception of job security is based on organizational policies relating to the retention of employees as its valuable members. While, as can be seen, a wide array of practices is understood to constitute Human Resource Management, for the purposes of this chapter, it is important to understand whether all of these practices generate positive feelings among employees about the organization. Do all HR practices decrease turnover intentions? Are all HR practices linked with positive job outcomes? One way to structure thinking about the multitude of HR practices and their possible effects is to distinguish between sets of HR practices that are primarily directed at increasing employee commitment and sets of HR practices whose primary purpose is to increase control over employees (Whitener, 2001; Arthur, 1994, etc.). The objectives, policies and practices adopted by the two systems are very different from each other, and are consequently also perceived differently by employees. The goal of control HR systems is to reduce
direct labour costs, or improve efficiency, by enforcing employee compliance with specified rules and procedures and basing employee rewards on some measurable output criteria (Park, Mitsuhashi, Fey & Björkman, 2003; Arthur, 1994). On the other hand, commitment HR systems focus on developing employee behaviours and attitudes by forging psychological links between organizational and employee goals. Employees in these systems are trusted to use their discretion to carry out job tasks in ways that are beneficial to the organization. Control HR systems work best in those conditions where the costs of employee turnover to a firm are expected to be relatively low.

The present case under study, the Pakistan banking industry, offers rather complex jobs and relies on the specialist skills of its employees. Banking employees have to deal with a range of customers that have varied needs. Customers often require tailored solutions to their needs that require job autonomy for the employee dealing with customers. There is empirical support for the assertion that in companies that depend on the employees’ skills and expertise rather than repetitive and robotic work generated by machines, commitment HR practices will work better to reduce turnover. In organizations that have technologically intensive and integrated production processes requiring higher skill levels, commitment practices are found to be related to lower employee turnover (Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel & Pierce, 2013; Arthur, 1994; Dean & Snell, 1991).

Also, when it comes to predicting turnover intentions, most authors agree that those practices that imply investment in employees, care, recognition and fair treatment are likely candidates (Chenevert, Jourdain & Vandenberghe, 2016; Park & Shaw, 2013; Guhait & Cho, 2010; Chew & Chan, 2008; Allen et al., 2003; Whitener, 2001). Hence, it is HR commitment practices that will be the focus of the current study.

Whether a company uses a control rather than a commitment oriented HRM system is reflected in the task design and the HR practices used. In control HRM systems, jobs are
generally characterised as comprising relatively simple, well-defined tasks. To save money, minimum training is given to employees as these simple and repetitive tasks can be performed with minimum training and experience. This often comes at the cost that employees in such systems possess lower levels of skills and thus they are only able to perform tasks that are relatively simple and routine (Macdonald, Assimakopoulos & Anderson, 2007). Control HR systems work best in those conditions where the costs of employee turnover to a firm are expected to be relatively low, so employers have very little incentive to minimize turnover through HR policies and policies designed to increase employee commitment or attachment. Control HR practices often include practices like employee monitoring, productivity enhancing training, and employee discipline management (Su & Wright, 2012).

On the other hand, in commitment systems, jobs are more complex and sophisticated and employers invest in employees so that they are able to perform better and stay committed and loyal. Classic commitment HR practices that have been identified in the literature include job security, job autonomy, employee involvement, fairness, compensation, and training and development. Different labels are used to describe this set of practices, such as “high commitment work practices” (Becker, Huselid, Becker & Huselid, 1998; Huselid, 1995), “high involvement HR practices” (Batt, 2002; Guthrie, 2001), “high-performance work practices” (Becker et al., 1998; Huselid, 1995), and “supportive human resource practices” (Allen et al., 2003). For the purpose of clarity and uniformity, where applicable, this chapter uses one term “High-Commitment HR practices” (HCHR) for commitment practices despite the fact that different studies might have used different terminology. The next paragraphs review studies that discuss particular types of commitment HR practices and their relationship with job turnover.
Arthur (1994) conducted an empirical test of the control and commitment taxonomy in the manufacturing sector and the results indicated that those organizations with commitment systems had better performance and better labour efficiency compared with those having control systems. Arthur (1994) anticipated that these results would generalize to service sector organizations. Thus, based on Arthur’s findings it can be argued that commitment practices are likely to have an even stronger positive influence in service sector organizations like banking, telecommunication and teaching. This is because, compared with manufacturing organizations where production systems are highly aided by technology, service organizations greatly depend on the skills of the individuals providing those services. The literature suggests that services and providers of services are inseparable and that there is consequently substantial variability in the quality of services due to the variability in employees’ skills (Blatter, Muehlemann, Schenker & Wolter, 2015; Yelkur, 2000). Thus, employers need to invest more in training and commitment inducing practices to bring some uniformity and improvement in service quality.

The explanation given by Arthur (1994) about the link between HR practices and turnover was mainly economic as he argued that in high commitment systems employers tend to retain employees as they have invested in their training. Employees would hence see this investment as a source of personal development and be less likely to leave the organization. Although the economic explanation presented by Arthur (1994) makes sense, nonetheless, the precise mechanism explaining why commitment practices work well in reducing turnover is not entirely clear. The psychological process that mitigates employee turnover intentions as a result of positive evaluation of commitment practices is not clearly specified.
Whitener (2001) and Wood and De Menezes (1998) also used the classification presented by Arthur (1994), i.e. control practices and commitment practices. These studies confirmed the findings of earlier studies and noted that commitment practices increase effectiveness and productivity and rely on conditions that encourage employees to identify with the goals of the organization and to work hard to accomplish those goals. Whitener (2001), however, expanded the work of Arthur and speculated that the relationship between high commitment HR practices and employee turnover is due to the social exchange between employees and employers. High commitment HR practices would be perceived positively by employees and thereby build trust between employees and management. Employees would interpret human resource practices and the trustworthiness of management as indicative of the organization’s commitment to them. They would reciprocate their perceptions via their own commitment to the organization, which would lower their turnover intentions.

Allen et al. (2003) add some nuance to this argument by suggesting that high commitment HR practices are treated as a positive offer from the organization by the employee who then responds with greater commitment and job satisfaction. Indeed, other authors (e.g. Bowen & Ostroff, 2004) argue that HR practices produce desired effects on employees’ attitudes and behaviours only to the extent that they are perceived by employees as intended by the organization. It is thus important to understand what influences whether HR practices are perceived by employees as intended by the organization.

Different mechanisms have been suggested in related streams of literature to explain the relationship between HCHR practices and job turnover. One candidate concept here is Perceived Organizational Support (POS) because of its focus on discretionary actions of employers which are then often viewed by employees as high commitment HR practices.
2.3 Perceived Organizational Support

An important line of research that sheds light on the nuance of the employee-organization social exchange is perceived organizational support. Eisenberger et al. (1986) were among the earliest scholars to use social exchange theory in examining employee-employer exchanges when they presented the theory of organizational support. Eisenberger et al. (1986) used this framework to examine exchange processes in organizations by conceiving a new construct, perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support is defined as "the extent to which employees perceive that their contributions are valued by their organization and that the firm cares about their well-being" (Eisenberger et al., 1986, p. 501). There has been considerable agreement on the definition and nature of the POS construct. POS has been used in the same sense in a large number of studies as well as in other streams of literature, and there appears to be no major disagreement (Kurtessis et al., 2015; Hayton, Carnabuci and Eisenberger (2012); McCarthy, Cleveland, Hunter, Darcy and Grady (2012); Riggle et al. (2009); Erdogan and Enders (2007); Shanock and Eisenberger (2006); Erdogan, Kraimer and Liden (2004); Moorman, Blakely and Niehoff (1998); Settoon, Bennett and Liden (1996); Shore and Wayne (1993).

The very definition of POS indicates the “commitment of the organization” to employees, in contrast with earlier studies which focused on “employees’ commitment” to the organization without highlighting the reciprocal nature of organizational commitment (Shore and Wayne, 1993). Employees continuously make evaluations of the organization’s treatment of them. This evaluation includes the distribution and allocation of rewards like pay, bonuses, rank, and job enrichment as well as praise and approval. However, in the case of intangible rewards like praise and approval, the employee gauges the frequency,
extremity, and judged sincerity of employer statements (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Blau, 1964).

The perception of organizational commitment creates a feeling of obligation to respond. The more employees find the organization is committed to them, the more likely they are to be committed to the organization. Eisenberger et al. (1986) also noted that high perceived organizational support leads to lower absenteeism and indicates employees’ commitment in the organization. This decrease in absenteeism was greater for those who strongly believed in exchange ideologies (employees’ belief that it is appropriate to base their efforts and concern for the organization on how well the organization treats them), thus indicating differences in individual propensities to engage in exchange relationships. The difference in the intensity of the exchange relationship was consistent with the earlier study of Gouldner (1960) and some later writers like Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005).

Of critical importance with respect to the current study is the discretionary element of POS which explains what sort of organizational initiatives lead employees to develop a perception that the organization cares about them. Discretionary positive treatment conveys to an employee that the organization is taking favourable action as it genuinely cares about them and is not under any compulsion to do so. Favourable organizational initiatives are highly valued if employees believe the actions taken by the organization are voluntary and employee-focused (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Eisenberger et al., 1997). If employees feel that the actions taken by the organization are due to regulatory pressures, union pressures, changing job market conditions, pressures of community or buyers, then it would contribute little to perceived organizational support (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011; Armeli, Eisenberger, Fasolo & Lynch, 1998; Eisenberger et al., 1997).
Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) further noted that besides external pressures, even if the positive treatment is due to some internal organizational need, it would not contribute much to POS. For example, in the case of employee training programmes, they maintained that the content of training and the reason for training help to predict whether certain training will lead to POS. If employees view training programmes as arising from management’s self-interest and need to keep pace with emerging skill requirements, then it would contribute very little towards POS. However, if training programmes are designed to increase the employee’s capability to perform organizational tasks, and at the same time they incorporate elements that lead to the employee’s personal development, such training programmes may have a positive impact on POS.

Given this feature of POS, it is important to examine whether and when the earlier described HCHR practices are likely to be viewed as discretionary by employees. In other words, HCHR practices are likely to have positive outcomes such as reduced turnover intentions only if they are perceived by employees as support offered by the organization “out of free will”, purely to support the employee.

Allen et al. (2003) examined three sets of HR practices in this respect: participation in decision making; fairness of rewards and growth opportunities, on the basis that these practices signal to employees that the organization recognizes their contribution and wishes to invest in them. In the following paragraphs, this argument will be explicated and extended with reference to these and other HCHR practices that may be understood to act as discretionary signals of the employee’s worth and value: development opportunities, distributive and procedural justice, job autonomy and job security.
2.3.1 Development Experience

Training and employee development are recognized as among the most important aspects of HCHR practices, signifying human capital investment for individual and organizational improvements. The recent literature distances itself from the more traditional and narrow view of training in which it is defined simply as a skill development activity focused on improving productivity only (Piore, 1968; Schultz, 1961; Merenda, 1958). As one writer commented, “On-the-job training is defined as training conducted in the process of production. It occurs within institutions where production is the primary concern, and training is the by-product of efforts to meet production responsibilities” (Weber, Cassell & Ginzburg, 1969, page 2). This traditional view is best illustrated by a labour report issued by New York University in 1964 which defined job training as the instruction combined with work to qualify a trainee for a particular occupation (Moed, 1966). This traditional view ignores the potential development of employees as a result of training.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) defined training as a planned learning experience aimed at bringing permanent change in an individual's knowledge, attitudes, or skills. This challenged the traditional notion of equating training with job skills and defined it as a learning experience to bring a permanent change not only in the skill set of employees but also in attitudes. Traditional views of training have now changed and in the contemporary era training is more thought to be related to human resource development. Many new topics have since emerged in the training literature, focusing on its relationship to the development of inter-personal skills, to improving attitudes, commitment to the organization, career satisfaction, and developmental experience among others (Dong, Seo & Bartol, 2014; Saks, Haccoun & Haccoun, 2011; Porteous, 1997). In the recent organizational behaviour/psychology literature, training has been studied as an important variable contributing to positive job outcomes including job

Training and development are also linked to actual employee turnover. Conventional wisdom suggests that trained individuals become more marketable and consequently might leave the organization. In line with this conventional argument, Haines, Jalette and Larose (2010) argued that training and development may actually increase turnover by increasing employees’ external marketability and ease of movement. Benson, Finegold and Mohrman (2004) also found that investment in employees’ skills does make them more marketable and thus they are more likely to leave. However, if training is followed by development, career growth and promotion, then turnover rates may be substantially decreased. Thus training alone, without development, may not generate attachment to the organization, perhaps because developmental training indicates that the organization not only cares about performance but also considers the employee’s developmental aspirations.

Developmental training may thus signal the willingness of the organization to invest in people in order to meet their growth needs and may thus be considered a discretionary practice by employees, which is likely to reduce turnover intentions. Cheng and Brown (1998) studied training and development in a cross cultural study conducted in Australia and Singapore, and suggested that training and developmental opportunities lead to a reduction in job turnover. In a similar study, Conrade, Woods and Ninemeier (1994) suggested that quality training that meets employee expectations in terms of content,
method and career relevance and progression reduces employee turnover. Kuvaas (2008), in a study of 593 employees from 64 savings banks in Norway, noted that as long as training and career development activities are perceived as developmental, they tend to reduce turnover intentions and voluntary turnover. However, if training is perceived as routine, repetitive and non-developmental, it does not have an impact on turnover intentions. Given that training coupled with development activities may be seen by employees as a signifier of the organization’s concern about them and thus induce reciprocation from the employee, it can be argued:

**Hypothesis 1: Developmental experience is positively associated with POS.**

**2.3.2 Organizational Justice**

Another practice that has been widely cited to create positive perceptions about the organization and reduce turnover intention is fairness (Karatepe & Shahriari, 2014; Byrne, 2005; Allen et al., 2003; Dailey & Kirk, 1992) or organizational justice. Fairness and organizational justice have been used in the literature interchangeably, but for the purpose of this thesis, the term organizational justice will be used for the sake of uniformity. Organizational justice indicates to employees that the organization recognizes their contributions and provides them equal opportunities in all aspects. Philosophical debates about justice date back to the time of Plato and Socrates and are ongoing today. Justice has been discussed and debated under the purview of ethics, governance, society and employment relations (Ryan, 1993). In organizational behaviour and psychology research, justice is less about what is morally fair and just but rather when something is perceived as fair. Organizational justice is considered to be socially constructed and thus “what is fair or just” is derived from subjective perceptions of organizational justice (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). Organizational justice has gone through different phases in the employment relations literature, and with the passage of time its
scope has expanded from issues related to when a distribution of resources and rewards is considered as fair to more abstract issues like when supervisor interaction with different subordinates is considered fair.

The two dimensions of organizational justice that have been most widely studied, aside from interpersonal and informational justice, are distributive justice and procedural Justice (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2013; Colquitt et al., 2001; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Moorman, 1991; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1986). Thus for the purpose of this discussion, in this chapter, distributive justice (reward fairness) and procedural justice (procedural fairness) are taken as dimensions of organizational justice.

The idea of distributive justice gained more attention after Adam’s equity theory which stresses the equitable distribution of resources. This concept conveys the perceived ratio of work outcomes (e.g. rewards, pay, promotions) to perceived work inputs in comparison to the corresponding perceived ratio for a co-worker (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2013; Jones & Skarlicki, 2003; Greenberg, 1990). The term procedural justice was first coined by Thibaut and Walker (1975) who defined it as the fairness of formal procedures underlying organizational decisions made about employees. It focuses on how resources are distributed among employees, while distributive justice deals with the fairness of the distribution of outcomes in the organization (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2013; Greenberg, 1990). The process for making organizational decisions is just as important to employees as outcome fairness (Jones & Skarlicki, 2003)

Whitener and Walz (1993) noted that one of the important determinants of organizational commitment and turnover intention based on social exchange theory is the distribution of “fair rewards” in the organization. They argued that the social exchange perspective suggests that the impact of rewards on turnover intentions is indirect, whereby an employee will make an overall evaluation about the reward justice
that in turn affects his/her commitment to stay in the organization. Individuals evaluate rewards and costs in several ways. They evaluate the balance of their rewards and costs by comparing their perceptions of the inducements they are offered to the contributions they provide to the organization. If they feel that the contributions they are making to the organization substantially overweigh the rewards they are receiving, they may consider the desirability of leaving the organization.

A large body of literature suggests that organizational justice creates positive perceptions about the organization in the minds of employees as they feel they are treated fairly and they are getting the compensation and rewards that they deserve (Blader & Tyler, 2013; Colquitt, Scott, Rodell, Long, Zapata, Conlon & Wesson, 2013; Masterson, 2001; Morris & Leung, 2000; Moorman, 1991). This overall evaluation of organizational justice by employees is influenced by various factors relating to their treatment in the organization, including compensation packages, promotion, training opportunities, supervisor support, etc. All these factors not only potentially positively impact on employees’ perceptions in their own right, but the extent to which they are perceived to be fair and just also determine the overall evaluation about the organization. For example, if two employees get an increase in remuneration, their positive evaluation is not only dependent on the increment but also on how much this increment reflects their perceptions of a fair reward for their efforts.

A number of studies have found an absence of justice leads to job turnover (Campbell, Perry, Maertz, Allen & Griffeth, 2013; Loi et al., 2006; Allen et al., 2003; Dailey & Kirk, 1992). Loi et al. (2006) studied justice, organizational commitment and intention to leave and their results indicated that both procedural and distributive justice contributed to the positive evaluation of the organization that leads to lower intention to leave. Although the justice literature documents both fairness of reward (distributive justice) as well as
fairness of procedures (procedural justice) to be related to positive outcomes, Allen et al. (2003) focused on distributive justice only. Jones and Martens (2009) argued that organizations can be viewed as market places in which people trade their talents and motivation in return for both tangible (e.g. pay) and intangible rewards (e.g. fair treatment, dignity and respect). This is in line with social exchange theory which suggests that people tend to reciprocate benefits received. Thus employees who are fairly treated would reciprocate with continued employment. Allen et al. (2003) noted that justice of reward is considered to be a high commitment HR practice by employees that generates positive feelings about the organization and thus leads to lower turnover intentions. Justice provides employees with an environment in which each employee has a fair opportunity to excel. If employees who exert greater efforts are rewarded higher, this will likely have a positive impact on pay increases and promotion opportunities. In a way, organizational justice operates to support employee efforts to excel in the organization. Hence, the relationship between organizational justice perceptions and turnover intentions is influenced by how the former impact on the employee’s perceptions of organizational support, though it appears that distributive and procedural justice may differ in terms of the strength of their relationship with POS. To enable this possibility to be tested:

**Hypothesis 2a: Procedural Justice is positively associated with POS.**

**Hypothesis 2b: Distributive Justice is positively associated with POS.**

### 2.3.3 Job Autonomy

In the fierce competitive environment, a growing number of service sector organizations strive to differentiate themselves on the basis of high-quality customer service (Dabholkar, 2015; Peccei & Rosenthal, 1997). Unlike physical products, the delivery of services largely depends on the service providers as both are inseparable. Customers not
only want quick service, but sometimes also need customization of the services they require. Speedy customization of services is not very likely unless the service provider has sufficient autonomy that enables him/her to take necessary decisions that affect the quality of service delivery (Joo, Yang & McLean, 2014; Bowen & Lawler III, 2006). The quality of service delivery impacts employees’ morale and satisfaction with the job and in turn are negatively related to employees’ turnover intentions (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock & Farr-Wharton, 2012; Bontis, Richards & Serenko, 2011; Hoffman & Ingram, 1992). Thus job autonomy is particularly important in the context of service sector organizations. In contrast with the manufacturing sector, where production employees are engaged in producing batches of uniform, repetitive products, service sector employees generally deal with humans. Each human interaction may be unique and require customized solutions. Lack of autonomy deters employees from customizing solutions and thus makes their jobs less efficient. Low efficiency may in turn lead to lower satisfaction with the job and lower commitment to the organization. Since the current study is conducted in the service sector (i.e. banking sector), where autonomy is critical for customer service and employees’ job satisfaction, job autonomy has been included in the bundle of HCHR practices. Autonomy empowers employees to perform their jobs more effectively and efficiently as they are able to make decisions on their own when the nature of the situation requires quick decision making and enhances their ability to resolve job related issues. Thus job autonomy is considered an HCHR practice that influences the employee’s perception of the organization and turnover intentions.

Job autonomy and workers’ psychological outcomes have been widely discussed in the literature (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 2013; Park & Searcy, 2012; Wood, Van Veldhoven, Croon & de Menezes, 2012; Galletta et al., 2011). Hackman and Oldham (1975) defined job autonomy as “The degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling the work and in determining
the procedures to be used in carrying it out” (p.162). Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) refer to autonomy as “employees’ perceived control over how they carry out their job, including scheduling, work procedure, and task variety” (p.82). Though these definitions are differently worded, in essence, they are based on employees’ freedom to act within the organizations.

Freedom to act and use discretion within the organization gives employees a sense of empowerment that is vital to the demonstration of discretion. Employees given job autonomy are considered capable of being able to make appropriate decisions on their own and thus it indicates confidence and trust of the organization in employees’ capabilities. Giving job autonomy to employees signifies the organization’s readiness to bear the consequences of autonomous decisions made by employees. While a number of studies suggest that greater job autonomy has benefits for organizational performance (Volmer, Spurk & Niessen, 2012; Fitzgerald, Youngs & Grootenboer, 2003; Barrick & Mount, 1993), at the same time poor decisions by an employee could result in substantial losses for the organization. Thus autonomy signals the organization’s readiness to trust in employee ability in terms of generating financial and other organizational consequences. This trust and confidence is treated as a positive offer from the organization which employees may try to reciprocate with greater loyalty, initiatives, prudent decision-making and organizational attachment. Such confidence in employees’ capabilities is not compelled by an external factor; rather it originates from the organization’s positive evaluation of the employees’ capabilities and is discretionary in nature. Because the employee is valued as an important member of the organization and worthy of being entrusted with job autonomy, the employee develops positive perceptions about the organization and tries to respond it with lower turnover intentions (Thompson & Prottas, 2006).
Job autonomy not only indicates confidence in employees but also allows them greater flexibility in how they define their roles, and they will consequently have greater discretion in deciding how to perform the work (Kuvaas, Buch & Dysvik, 2014; Fried, Hollenbeck, Slowik, Tiegs & Ben-David, 1999). Such flexibility is associated with positive job outcomes including job satisfaction and lower job burnout (Wood et al., 2012; Hundley, 2001; Poulin & Walter, 1993) that are likely to enhance an employee’s attachment to the organization and reduce job turnover intentions (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2013; Hang-Yue, Foley & Loi, 2005).

Moreover, job autonomy also enhances employees’ self-image. Employees enjoy greater autonomy when they are sufficiently confident in their abilities and they can handle their tasks without taking instructions from their seniors. High-ability individuals are likely to take on more tasks, which will produce greater role breadth. Greater role breadth is an indication that the employee’s diverse capabilities and competencies are recognized by the organization and the organization is ready to entrust him/her with extra roles (Balkin, Roussel & Werner, 2015; Ahuja et al., 2007; Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger & Hemingway, 2005). Recognition enhances employees’ positive perception about the organization and reduces intentions to quit.

Employees may try to reciprocate the employer’s confidence with greater commitment and loyalty towards the organization, which results in better employee performance. Enhanced autonomy not only increases ownership of problems but also persuades employees to recognize that a wider range of skills and knowledge is important for their roles. Increased control over the work environment motivates workers to try out and master new tasks, which is consistent with work design research that has demonstrated the motivational benefits of work autonomy (Morgeson et al., 2005). When employees exercise job autonomy they feel that any positive outcomes generated by the job are a
consequence of their decisions and efforts, providing a sense of accomplishment, satisfaction and fulfilment and leading ultimately to greater job satisfaction (Chang, Leach & Anderman, 2015; DeCarlo & Agarwal, 1999; Lee, 1998; Spector, 1986).

The ideas discussed above have been theoretically mooted but there is also empirical evidence to suggest that job autonomy leads to greater organizational commitment and lower turnover intentions. Lee (1998) noted that job autonomy is one of the most studied predictors of turnover intentions. Kim and Stoner (2008) studied role stress, job autonomy, and social support in predicting burnout and turnover intentions among social workers and found that job autonomy had a negative effect on turnover intentions. Ahuja et al. (2007) studied employees in IT companies and found that job autonomy indirectly related to turnover intentions via its negative relationship with job exhaustion and its positive relationship with job commitment. Although a number of studies indicate that job autonomy is positively associated with organizational commitment and negatively associated with turnover intentions, the process through which job autonomy influences turnover intentions is not well studied. It can be argued that job autonomy is likely to lead employees to develop positive perceptions about the organization that in turn lead to lower turnover intention; therefore, the following hypothesis can be developed:

**Hypothesis 3: Job autonomy is positively associated with POS**

### 2.3.4 Job Security

In the section above, it was argued that the context of this study, the service sector, has implications for which HR practices may act as important signals of an employee’s worth and value. In addition to occupational context, the socio-economic context is likely to play a vital role in how employees interpret their treatment from the organization. In this section, the role of job security will therefore be discussed.
The importance of understanding the role of job security has increased over the past decade with the increased emphasis on employee reactions to major organizational change. The inherent uncertainty regarding the continuation of one's job and the situational uncertainty resulting from changes such as downsizing, mergers, and reorganizations have had a significant impact on employees’ attitudes towards the organization (de Jong, Wiezer, de Weerd, Nielsen, Mattila-Holappa & Mockało, 2016; Davy, Kinicki & Scheck, 1997; Brockner, DeWitt, Grover & Reed, 1990). Uncertainty surrounding job security increases substantially at times of poor economic conditions when companies are squeezed by plunging sales and low economic activity. Pressured by low sales and falling profits, organizations often resort to mass lay-offs. In such situations, employees’ apprehensions about their future status as a member of the organization tend to increase, which then influence the employee’s relationship with the organization.

Job security has been defined differently by various authors. Herzberg (1968) defined job security as the degree to which an organization provides stable employment for its employees. Heaney, Israel and House (1994, p. 1431) noted that “an employee’s perception of a potential threat to continuity in his or her current job should be differentiated from actual job loss and unemployment”. The definitions vary in content but address similar themes. All these definitions imply that job security refers to employees’ expectations regarding the continuity and permanence of their jobs and not actual job loss.

The impact of job security on job outcomes has been widely studied. Job security indicates an organization’s recognition of the employee’s importance and indicates an intention to retain the employee as a valuable member of the organization. To respond to the organization’s assurance for job continuity, employees may feel obligated to respond to such intentions. Based on the notion of social exchange, a number of studies have
found job security to be associated with positive job outcomes including organizational commitment (Cheng, Huang, Lee & Ren, 2012; Yousef, 1998; Davy et al., 1997), job performance (Schreurs, Hetty van Emmerik, Günter & Germeyys, 2012; Yousef, 1998), job satisfaction (Burchell, 2011; Reisel, Probst, Chia, Maloles & König, 2010; Davy et al., 1997; Heaney et al., 1994), stress (Heaney et al., 1994), the quality of the psychological contract (Guest, 1998; Martin, Staines & Pate, 1998; Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994), leader member exchange (Cheng et al., 2012) turnover intentions (Stiglbauer, Selenko, Batinic & Jodlbauer, 2012; Davy et al., 1997), OCB (Reisel et al., 2010; Feather & Rauter, 2004) and health (Heaney et al., 1994; Kuhnert, Sims & Lahey, 1989).

Job security indicates that the organization values the contribution of employee and wants to retain him/her in the organization even during difficult economic situations. In the aftermath of the economic recession in 2008, many organizations were financially squeezed and they considered cutting costs to deal with the low economic activity. In such gloomy economic conditions, if the organization provides job security, it is considered to be a discretionary action by the organization that would lead to positive feelings about the organization and low employee turnover. However, if the job security is provided due to legal reasons or union pressure, such job security does not contribute towards lower turnover intentions.

Job security has been found to be related to turnover intentions and job turnover in a number of studies. Davy et al. (1997) studied the nature of the relationships between job security, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and withdrawal cognitions and found strong support for the proposition that job security has a significant relationship with turnover intentions. The relationship, however, was found to be indirect, seemingly a consequence of how job security is considered to be a positive offer from the employer to which employees reciprocate with greater job satisfaction and commitment leading to reduced turnover intentions.
Delaney and Huselid (1996) argued that job security positively affects positive job outcomes by encouraging employees to work harder, since they are prepared to expend extra effort if they expect a lower probability of future layoffs. Employment security offers an indication of an organization’s willingness to retain employees in the same position or through internal promotions (Bonavia & Marin-Garcia, 2011; Delaney & Huselid, 1996). In both cases, it sends a positive signal to employees.

In a meta-analysis of 72 published studies Sverke, Hellgren and Näswall (2002) noted that job insecurity was associated with performance and turnover intentions. The study indicated that job insecurity, on the aggregate level, has a moderately strong positive association with employee turnover intentions. In another study, Stiglbauer et al. (2012) found that security has negative impact on turnover intentions; however, the relationship between job security and turnover intentions is mediated by well-being.

Sousa-Poza and Henneberger (2004) used secondary data to compare 25 countries in terms of job security and turnover intentions. Although they found significant variations in perceptions of job security and intentions to leave the organization across these countries, they reported that the relationship between job security and employee turnover was significant in most countries. The variation found in this study may be attributed to the macro environmental situation in which the company is operating (Fenwick & Tausig, 1994). Nonetheless, the role of company policies and practices cannot be ignored. Even in the days of an economic recession, employee perceptions of job security are largely shaped by the organization’s policies towards its employees. If an organization leads employees to believe that their jobs are secure, despite high job insecurity in the industry and the country in general, employees may experience less anxiety and consider their jobs more secure. Thus employee perceptions of job security are heavily influenced by company practices. Perception of job security is the result of a process that is conceptually close to the cognitive appraisal process through which an
employee evaluates the significance of what is happening for his or her well-being. In terms of job security, such appraisals are likely to focus on the extent to which it is believed the organization is serious in its intentions to retain the employee. Employees may receive cues from top management, observe changes in the organization or receive announcements that their jobs are at risk. People do not arrive at their interpretations in a social vacuum and hence managerial policies, organizational history regarding employee retention and the attitudes of top management influence perceptions of job security (James & Mathew, 2012; Hartley, 1991). If an employee’s assessment of organizational policies suggests that his or her job could be at risk, he or she is likely to think about voluntarily quitting the organization in the hope of gaining a more secure job. Thus a number of authors have described organizational policies and signals regarding job security as an important HR practice that influences job outcomes including turnover intentions (Mauno, De Cuyper, Tolvanen, Kinnunen & Mäkikangas, 2014; Kooij, Jansen, Dikkers & de Lange, 2010; Lee et al., 2010; Conway & Monks, 2008; van Veldhoven, 2005; Meyer & Smith, 2000; Delaney & Huselid, 1996). Hence:

**Hypothesis 4: Job security is positively associated with POS**

### 2.4 Supervisor’s Support – Antecedent or a Moderator?

Eisenberger et al. (1986) argued that employee perceptions about the organization are based on the actions of organizational agents. Employees tend to assign humanlike characteristics to the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and thus view the actions of agents (managers) as the organization’s own. This personification is based on the work of Levinson (1965) who suggested in his article titled “Reciprocation: The Relationship between Man and Organization” that employees personify their supervisor as the organization. Managers in the organization cannot separate themselves from their position and they are seen as agents of organizations rather than individuals acting on
their own. So employees see the actions of their supervisors as indicators of the organization’s intent and policies rather than of the personal motives of its representatives.

Coyle-Shapiro and Shore (2007) suggested that employees tend to have a relationship with a single entity, no matter how many managers and supervisors influence their work. They tend to view all possible agents as one entity with human-like characteristics. Eisenberger et al. (1986) argue that this perception is an accumulation of experiences concerning rewards and punishments received from agents of the organization over a period of time and represents the employer’s commitment to the employee’s wellbeing as a whole instead of a reaction to specific events (Jones & Skarlicki, 2013; Ortega-Parra & Ángel Sastre-Castillo, 2013; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997; Dipboye, 1995). Employees regard the actions of organizational agents, particularly supervisors, as the organization’s own actions, which in turn lead to an aggregated positive or negative perception about organizational support. Although the POS literature generally assumes that the relationship between employees and supervisors is based on the notion of personification, some writers raised questions about this personification assumption.

Coyle-Shapiro and Shore (2007) suggested that the idea of personification has not undergone enough scrutiny in the POS literature and there have been no attempts to examine how personification occurs and whether it exists or not in the case of organizations. Based on the Levinson (1965) description of personification, the POS literature generally assumes supervisor support as an antecedent of POS. However, it is necessary to address questions raised by some recent authors (Kooij et al., 2010; Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2007; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007). Thus the following paragraphs look into the dominant notion in the POS literature which suggests that supervisor support is an antecedent of POS as well as some recent studies that suggest that supervisor support may be a potential moderator between HR practices and POS.
Supervisor support has been one of the most widely studied antecedents of POS. A number of studies have found a strong positive relationship between perceived supervisor support (PSS) and POS. In the same way that an employee forms a global perception concerning the extent to which the organization is prepared to value the contribution of employees and care about their wellbeing, employees also develop a general belief about their supervisors concerning the extent to which they value the contributions of their subordinates and care about their wellbeing (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Pursuant to the arguments of Levinson (1965) who regards managers or supervisors as agents of the organization and suggests that employees treat the actions of agents as the organization’s own actions, employees’ general perceptions of supervisors are crucial in informing the overall perception of the organization. A number of studies have found positive relationships between perceived supervisor support and POS (Kurtessis et al., 2015; Newman, Thanacoody & Hui, 2011a; Dawley, Houghton & Bucklew, 2010; Erdogan & Enders, 2007; Maertz et al., 2007; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghhe, Sucharski & Rhoades, 2002; Hutchison, 1997; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). In most of these studies, PSS is seen as a predictor of POS, and assumes that POS then leads to different job outcomes like organizational commitment, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, positive mood and in-role and extra-role behaviour. In other words, the relationship between PSS and job outcomes is mediated by POS.

On the other hand, some other studies contradict these findings. The literature in related streams like LMX and Organizational Commitment suggests that a supervisor may have broader, independent effects on turnover intentions rather than only mediated effects (Mathieu, Fabi, Lacoursière & Raymond, 2016; Van Waeyenberg, Decramer & Anseel, 2015; Tekleab, Takeuchi & Taylor, 2005; Wayne et al., 1997; Settoon et al., 1996; Becker, 1992). A direct relationship of PSS with job outcomes like turnover intentions, job
satisfaction and commitment suggests that the personification process should be applied with care in the literature. Employees may not interpret all actions of supervisors as the organization’s own and they may distinguish between those supervisory actions representing organizational policy and those representing a supervisor’s personal whims and preferences. Coyle-Shapiro and Shore (2007) also raised concerns about the excessive use of the personification assumption in employment relations, claiming this assumption has been insufficiently scrutinised. Future studies may measure levels of personification along with PSS, POS and outcome variables to see if that affects the role of mediation among these variables.

Some recent studies contradict the idea of a full mediation model between supervisor support and turnover intentions through POS. Newman et al. (2011a) found that PSS not only affects turnover intentions through the mediating role of POS, but it also has a direct effect. In another recent study McCarthy et al. (2012) used both POS and PSS as mediating variables with work-life-balance and job outcomes, i.e. role conflict, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. Using supervisor support and POS as independent predictors of job outcomes indicates recognition of a possible direct effect of PSS on job outcomes. These two studies found that supervisor support has its own independent effect on turnover intentions apart from POS, yet they did not account for the full scope of the supervisory role in the organization. In another study Maertz et al. (2007) questioned the full mediation of POS with supervisor support and turnover intentions. They argued that the POS literature suggests that there is a causal path in which support from a supervisor only influences turnover by affecting the employee’s perceptions and attitudes regarding the organization. In this view, the supervisor’s effect on turnover decisions is a generator of POS and a developer of organizational commitment among his/her employees. However, the role of supervisor support goes beyond that of a predictor of POS. The findings of their studies supported their arguments as they found
that supervisor support has an interaction effect with POS. In other words, the relationship between POS and job turnover is moderated by levels of perceived supervisor support.

Although Maertz et al. (2007) shed some light on the interaction effect of PSS on POS, this stream of literature so far has not looked into the possible moderating role of supervisor support between HR practices and POS. Some closely related streams of study, however, have found that supervisor support moderates the relationship between organizational initiatives/work design and job outcomes. Russo and Waters (2006), for instance, studied the moderating role of supervisor support between workaholism and work-family conflict and argued that high levels of supervisor support buffer the impact of work and family stressors on work family conflict. Employees are more likely to remain with an organization if they feel that their supervisors value their contribution and treat them with respect and recognition. Thus supervisory support creates a climate that generates a reciprocal relationship in which employees feel emotionally connected and obliged to engage in positive exchanges with their organizations (Hsu, 2011; Eisenberger et al., 2002). On the other hand, if the supervisor is unsupportive, this can lead to the generation of negative feelings about organizational initiatives as well the overall work climate. The unsupportive climate is likely to mitigate the impact of positive organizational initiatives on job outcomes. A number of studies in the OB domain report that organizational climate can potentially moderate the relationship between organizational factors and job outcomes (Jiang & Probst, 2015; Probst, 2004; Smith-Crowe, Burke & Landis, 2003). Supervisor support is hence likely to play an important role in developing the organizational climate and structuring the work environment. Supervisors not only provide information and feedback to employees but also help them in critical situations (Durham, Knight & Locke, 1997), which impacts employees’ perceptions about work environment factors. Employees’ perceptions about their work
environment strongly impact their work behaviour and work outcomes (Wan, 2010) and is itself influenced by the level of supervisory support that employees receive.

There is empirical evidence in related streams of literature that the relationship between HR practices and job outcomes is moderated by demographic and contextual factors (Zhong et al., 2015; Kooij et al., 2010; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007; Avolio, Zhu, Koh & Bhatia, 2004). Wang and Walumbwa (2007), for example, studied the moderating role of transformational leadership in family-friendly HR practices, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions and found that transformational leadership moderates the relationship between family-friendly HR practices, commitment and turnover intentions. Although supervisor support was not measured in this study, we can draw a parallel between transformational leadership and supervisory support in the given context.

In a recent study, Tian, Zhang and Zou (2014) studied the moderating role of supervisor support in a mediated relationship between job insecurity, affective commitment and counter-productive behaviour. They argued that employees actively look to their supervisors for constructive support at times of job uncertainty and crisis situations. Supervisor support, on such occasions, provides employees with instrumental aid and emotional support that reduces their psychological stress, which positively influences their perceptions about the organization. The results of the study indicate that supervisor support moderates the mediated relationship between job insecurity, affective commitment and counterproductive behaviour.

In another study, Kim, Lee and Sung (2013) studied the moderating role of family friendly practices and gender discrimination on job attitudes. They argued that supervisory support for work–family balance mitigates the negative impact of gender discrimination on female employees’ job attitudes. On the other hand, if the supervisor shows no interest in work–family balance, this may exacerbate the negative effects of female
employees' gender discrimination perceptions on work–family balance and their related job attitudes. Thus, supervisory support has an important influence on the relationship between female employees' perception of gender discrimination and their job satisfaction. The results of the study indicate that supervisory support moderated the relationship between family friendly practices, perception of gender discrimination and job satisfaction.

The reasoning and results of the above studies (i.e. Tian et al., 2014 and Kim et al., 2013) which suggest that the relationship between organizational practices and job outcomes can be moderated by supervisor support may be applicable to the current research as well. The current research argues that the relationship between HR practices and POS is influenced by supervisors as the supervisor’s treatment of employees affects their perceptions of favourable organizational initiatives. In the following paragraphs, the reasoning related to potential moderation between HR practices used in the current study and perceived organizational support is discussed.

In line with Tian et al. (2014) study, it may be argued that the relationship between job security and perceived organizational support is moderated by supervisor support as the supervisor’s conduct sends signals to employees regarding whether their job in the organization is secure or not. Similarly, supervisors have substantial involvement in training and promotion decisions taken by the organization. Supervisors are not only engaged in career mentoring of their subordinates (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994) but also have substantial involvement in decisions relating to their career development. Supervisors’ ratings and recommendations often serve as a basis for training and development opportunities for employees (Martin, 2010; Scaduto, Lindsay & Chiaburu, 2008). In addition, developmental training may require employees to take time off from their regular working routine during training sessions. If supervisors do not support the
employee’s participation in developmental training, the employee may not be able to capitalize on developmental opportunities available in the organization, which in turn may affect the employee’s perception about organizational support. Thus supervisor support is likely to moderate the relationship between overall developmental experience and perceived organizational support.

Likewise, the relationship between job autonomy and positive perceptions about the organization is influenced by perceived supervisor support, since job autonomy is influenced by supervisors’ attitudes. If supervisors are less inclined to delegate powers to their subordinates, employees are likely to experience low autonomy (Volmer et al., 2012). Dysvik and Kuvaas (2013) noted that the interplay between supervisor support and job autonomy is likely to generate varying levels of turnover intentions as the relationship between job autonomy and turnover intentions is moderated by the supervisor support. By applying similar logic, it may be argued that the relationship between job autonomy and perceived organizational support is therefore also likely to be moderated by supervisors’ support. Lastly, employees’ perceptions about transparency and organizational justice are influenced by the actions of supervisors. Employees evaluate fairness and transparency on the part of the organization as well as their supervisors (Ahmed & Muchiri, 2014; Greenberg & Colquitt, 2013; DeConinck & Johnson, 2009). Supervisors’ support may reinforce perceptions of organizational justice and thus moderate the relationship between organizational justice and supervisor support.

Supervisors serve as the deliverer or implementer of human resource practices (i.e. job security, job autonomy, developmental experience and organizational justice) that bring these policies to life (Pak & Chung, 2013; Cunningham & Hyman, 1995). Hence, supervisor support has a significant influence on the relationship between HR practices and perceived organizational support. Thus it seems reasonable to argue that the relationship
between HR practices and perceived organizational support is moderated by perceived supervisor support.

**Hypothesis 5: PSS moderates the positive relationships between high commitment HR practices and POS.**

The literature reviewed in the preceding sections indicates that HCHR practices influence job turnover intentions. However, these HCHR practices (organizational justice, job autonomy, job security, and developmental experience) may not affect job turnover directly. The relationship between HCHR practices is mediated through POS. HCHR practices generate positive perceptions about the organization and then this overall positive perception (i.e. POS) leads to lower turnover intentions. The literature in the last section provided evidence from empirical studies that POS acts as a mediator between HCHR practices and job turnover. The next section will review the link between POS and job turnover.

### 2.5 POS and Turnover

POS has been found to be negatively related to turnover intentions in a number of studies (Joo, Hahn & Peterson, 2015; Allen & Shanock, 2012; Gillet, Gagné, Sauvagère & Fouquereau, 2012; McCarthy et al., 2012; Newman et al., 2011a; Riggle et al., 2009; Hui et al., 2007; Loi et al., 2006; Allen et al., 2003; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Randall et al., 1999). Most studies have found a strong relationship between POS and turnover intentions. However, it is important to mention that these studies focused on voluntary turnover, not compulsory turnover initiated by organizations.

Different aspects of the POS-turnover relationship have been studied. These studies can be grouped into three categories: a) studies that examined the POS-turnover relationship
without testing for any mediation effects (e.g. Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996), b) studies that examined the impact of HR practices such as organizational justice on turnover intentions, using POS as a mediating variable (Stamper & Johlke, 2003; Eisenberger et al., 2002), and c) where the impact of POS on turnover intentions was assessed through the effects of another mediating variable, such as commitment or job satisfaction (Armstrong-Stassen & Ursel, 2009; Allen et al., 2003). The focus of the current research is those studies in which POS mediates the relationship between HR practices and turnover intentions. As far as the mediating role of POS in turnover intentions is concerned, the literature has reported both partial (McCarthy et al., 2012; Newman et al., 2011a) and complete mediation depending upon different antecedent variables (Harris, Andrews & Kacmar, 2007; Harris, Harris & Harvey, 2007; Eisenberger et al., 2002).

The POS literature suggests that the relationship between POS and turnover intentions is not direct. High POS generates a moral obligation for employees to return organizational favours with greater commitment (Marescaux, De Winne & Sels, 2013; Newman et al., 2011a; Allen et al., 2003; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus the relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by organizational commitment (El Akremi, Colaianni, Portoghese, Galletta & Battistelli, 2014; Newman et al., 2011a). On the other hand, some other studies report that high POS generates higher job satisfaction. Job satisfaction decreases employees’ burnout and they are then less inclined to leave the organization. Thus, job satisfaction is thought to mediate the relationship between POS and turnover intentions (Filipova, 2011; Baranik, Roling & Eby, 2010). Allen et al. (2003) reported that the relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. These studies are in line with the findings of the meta-analysis by Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) that suggests that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are among the two most important outcomes of POS in terms of influencing employee decisions to quit the organization.
Based on the reasoning given above, it can be argued that the relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Thus it is suggested:

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 7: The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by organizational commitment

2.6 Turnover Intentions and Turnover

Turnover intentions are also among the most studied variables in the POS literature. Like some of the other job outcome variables, turnover intention has attracted a large body of literature of its own, independently of POS. Turnover has been actively debated in the literature for the last six decades and a number of studies were carried out at the end of the 1960s (Hulin, 1966; White, 1960; Ross & Zander, 1957). Since that time, more attention has been paid to turnover intentions/withdrawal behaviour instead of actual job turnover, largely because turnover intentions are the strongest precursor of actual turnover (Brewer, Kovner, Greene, Tukov-Shuser & Djukic, 2012a; Lee & Mowday, 1987; Michaels & Spector, 1982). In an empirical study Tett and Meyer (1993) found that turnover intentions/cognitions mediate nearly all of the attitudinal linkage with turnover. Similar observations were made in a meta analytic study by Steel and Ovalle (1984) which found a very high correlation between turnover intentions and actual turnover and concluded that turnover intentions are a better predictor of employee turnover than overall job satisfaction or job commitment. Sverke et al. (2002) observed that actual turnover is often substituted with turnover intentions in empirical research because data on actual turnover are hard to collect. The relationship between POS and actual turnover
is mediated by POS, thus POS may not directly influence actual turnover; rather, it first influences job turnover intentions and then intentions in turn lead to actual turnover. Similarly, Tett and Meyer (1993) analysed 155 studies in a meta-analysis and reported that job satisfaction and commitment lead to turnover intentions that in turn lead to actual turnover. Based on these arguments:

Hypothesis 8: The relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover is mediated by turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 9: The relationship between job satisfaction and actual turnover is mediated by turnover intentions.

The hypothesized relationships are given in figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1 Proposed Model – HR Practices and Job Turnover

- POS = Perceived organizational support
- OJC = Organizational justice
- SEC = Job security
- AUT = Job autonomy
- PSS = Perceived supervisor support
- DEX = Developmental experience
- ACM = Affective commitment
- TOI = Turnover intentions
- JST = Job satisfaction
- ATO = Actual turnover

POS (Moderator)
2.7 Summary of the Chapter

The chapter reviewed literature in six key areas: 1) HR practices and Turnover 2) HR practices and POS 4) POS and turnover intentions 5) turnover intentions and actual turnover 6) the moderating role of supervisor support in the turnover process. This review indicates that the literature on job turnover processes is underdeveloped, especially with regards to the influence of moderating variables in general and of supervisor support in particular. Research that has examined the influence of HR practices on employee turnover through the mediating role of POS is not only scarce but also narrow in scope. Previous studies have not tested the role of job autonomy, job security and procedural justice in the HCHR Practices-POS-Turnover process even though these are embedded in HR practices and likely to be important variables in this regard. Testing an improved model that incorporates some other vital HCHR practices (i.e. job security, job autonomy and procedural justice) would therefore enhance the explanatory power of existing models. Further, supervisory support as a moderating variable would help in better understanding the HR practices-turnover process. The next chapter will discuss the research methodology, including the development of the research instruments used to measure the variables.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology and Instrument Development

3.1 Chapter Introduction

In the last chapter I reviewed the literature and provided hypothesized relationships between different variables. Towards the end of the chapter, the theoretical model was outlined which shows the hypothesized relationships to be tested in this study. Before testing the hypotheses and discussing the results, it is important to discuss the research methodology, design and process that were used for conducting this study. The chapter begins by situating the study in terms of philosophical stance and providing justification regarding the philosophical position taken. Then it discusses the research design including details of sampling, sample characteristics, data collection methods, issues related to translation of the instrument, and ethical considerations. Results of the pilot study are presented in the next section and the changes made in the questionnaire in light of results of the pilot study are also discussed. The chapter then moves on to discuss the development of the questionnaire and the scales used in the study. The final part of the chapter discusses reliability and validity issues. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is presented. The items finalized on the basis of the CFA, are then tested for scale reliability using Cronbach alpha analysis.

3.2 Philosophical Considerations

Social science research is usually conducted against a background of some tradition of theoretical and methodological ideas. These research traditions have been developed over a long period of time in various streams of academic literature and are generally termed as research paradigms. Different research paradigms contain different ontological and epistemological assumptions that influence the choice of research methods (Blaikie, 2009) and therefore decisions on methodological issues are
largely determined by philosophical assumptions that researchers implicitly or explicitly make. “The rationale of a particular research strategy is grounded in a network of implicit or explicit assumptions regarding ontology and human nature that defines the researcher’s view of the social world. These assumptions provide the foundations of research practice, inclining the researcher to see and interpret the world from one perspective rather than from another. By identifying the researcher’s assumptions about human beings and the world in which they live, we can identify the basic paradigm that serves as a foundation of inquiry” (Morgan, 1983, p 21). Research paradigms outline assumptions mainly in three areas 1) nature of human behaviour 2) Epistemology –Is it possible to neutrally observe social reality? 3) Ontology - Does social reality exists independently of the cognitive process through which we apprehend what we take to be a reality? (Gill & Johnson, 2010).

Epistemology is derived from “two Greek words “episteme” which means ‘knowledge’ or ‘science’ and ‘logos’ which means ‘knowledge’, ‘information’, ‘theory’ or ‘account’ ... epistemology is usually understood as being concerned with knowledge about knowledge” (Johnson & Duberley, 2000, p 3). Epistemology is concerned with how we know whether or not any claim made about the phenomena we are interested in, is warranted. How do we know that a claim is true or false? It is about knowing what is our theory of truth (Gill & Johnson, 2010). Is it possible to neutrally observe a phenomenon or not (Bryman & Bell, 2011)? Ontology, on the other hand, deals with the essence of phenomena and the nature of its existence. The word ontology is derived from two Greek words ontos and logos. Ontos means ‘being’ whiles logos refers to a theory of knowledge. So ontology is concerned with the question of whether the phenomena we are studying are real or illusory. In other words, does the phenomenon we are studying actually exist independently of our knowing and perceiving it- or is what we see and regard as real an outcome or creation of these acts of knowing and perceiving (Gill & Johnson, 2010)?
Each research paradigm has its own epistemological and ontological assumptions. Different writers have presented different research paradigms. Some have categorised research paradigms into classical and contemporary categories. Blaikie (2007) has mentioned four classical (Positivism, Critical Rationalism, Classical Hermeneutics, and Interpretivism) and six contemporary paradigms (Critical Theory, Ethnomethodology, Social Realism, Contemporary Hermeneutics, Structuration Theory and Feminism). Guba (1990), in his book The Paradigm Dialog, proposed four major paradigms namely positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and constructivism. A similar categorization is proposed by Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) who suggest that there are four important paradigms used in social and behavioural sciences research that include positivism, post-positivism, pragmatism, and constructivism. There is some common ground in all categorizations in that they all offer a continuum between objectivity to subjectivity i.e. positivism to constructivism. As discussion on the categorization of major paradigms is outside of the scope of this thesis, I will briefly discuss the four research paradigms proposed by Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) before discussing which philosophical position is taken for the purpose of this research.

Positivism regards reality as consisting of events that can be directly observed by human senses. So the knowledge gained through human senses can genuinely be warranted as knowledge (Blaikie, 2009). In order to observe things directly, positivists assume a dualism between the ‘subject’ and ‘object’, which means it is possible to separate the subject (researcher or observer) from the object (the observed) by application of scientific methodology. Thus the knowledge we gain from observing a phenomenon is uncontaminated and free from the observer’s own ideas about the phenomenon. Positivism assumes there is some neutral point from which the observer can stand back and observe the world objectively and in a value-free manner (Gill & Johnson, 2010). Positivism is associated with hypothetico-deductive approaches where a theory is used to develop hypotheses and then those hypotheses are tested by application of rigorous research methods and use of statistical and mathematical tests (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Bryman & Bell, 2011; Morris, 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie,
Human behaviour can be explained in terms of cause and effect and causality between variables can be established in an objective manner.

Post positivism is a modified version of positivism. Post positivism attempts to address some of the criticisms made on the positivist position. It challenges the notion of the absolute truth of knowledge advocated by positivism (Phillips, 2000). Work on post positivism was mainly inspired from the work of Popper (1959), Hanson (1958) and Kuhn (1970). Unlike positivism, the post-positivist philosophy does not advocate strict dualism. The researcher and his or her perceptions are not seen as being wholly detached from the inquiry. A distinction is made between sensory experiences and the cognitive process of perception and their cultural and knowledge related biases (Clark, 1998; Hanson, 1958). The post-positivist approach recognizes that science requires logical reasoning and attention to evidence but is not restricted to what can only be observed directly. Evidence can be inferred from self-reports inherent in interviews or questionnaires (Clark, 1998; Bronowski, 1956). While recognizing causality, it emphasizes looking at relationships in their broader social and historical context (Allmendinger, 2002). Causality or relationships among variables may be known imperfectly or probabilistically and researchers should strive for better explorations of causality and reality. Post positivism uses primarily quantitative methods with hypothetico-deductive logic (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The research generally begins with a theory, collects data, that either supports or refutes the theory and then makes revisions as needed to refine the theory (Creswell, 2009).

A third approach is Pragmatism. Pragmatism does not stick to one particular epistemological or ontological position. Instead of focusing on methods, researchers emphasize the research problem and use all approaches to address the problem (Creswell, 2013; Creswell, 2009). Both inductive and hypothetico-deductive approaches are used. Similarly both objective and subjective points of view are accepted and used depending on the stage of the research cycle. Regarding social realities, pragmatists do not stick with a particular ontology, rather diverse viewpoints regarding social
realities are recognized and the best explanation is accepted (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Pragmatists do not see the world as an absolute unity, and thus in line with this stance mixed methods are used. Individual researchers have a freedom to choose different methods, techniques and procedures as per their requirements (Creswell, 2009)

Constructivism is associated with qualitative approaches. It does not recognize dualism as a valid stance; rather reality is considered to be co-constructed by participants. It assumes that individuals develop subjective meanings of their experiences with different objects. These meanings are varied and multiple and the researcher tries to capture the complexity of phenomena instead of placing them into strict categories. Researchers attempt to make sense of (or interpret) the meaning others have about the world. Context, culture and the conditions in which an object is studied are paid close attention and researchers try to explain how context shapes the way people make sense of a particular thing. The research methods used by constructivists are largely qualitative and inductive. (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Creswell, 2009; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009) The four research paradigms are summarized in table 3.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Post Positivism</th>
<th>Pragmatism</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Primarily Quantitative</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic</strong></td>
<td>Deductive</td>
<td>Primarily deductive</td>
<td>Deductive and Inductive</td>
<td>Inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>Objective point of view</td>
<td>Modified dualism</td>
<td>Both objective and subjective points of view</td>
<td>Subjective point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knower and known are dualistic</td>
<td>Finding probably objectively ‘true’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knower and known are inseparable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
<td>Inquiry is value free</td>
<td>Inquiry involves values, but they may be controlled</td>
<td>Values play a large role in interpreting results</td>
<td>Inquiry is value bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>Naïve realism</td>
<td>Critical or transcendental realism</td>
<td>Accept external reality</td>
<td>Relativism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose explanations that best produce desired outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causal Linkages</strong></td>
<td>Real causes temporally precedent to or simultaneous with effects</td>
<td>There are some lawful, reasonable stable relationships among social phenomena. These may be known imperfectly. Causes are identifiable in a probabilistic sense that changes over time</td>
<td>There may be causal relationship but we will never be able to pin them down</td>
<td>All entities simultaneously shaping each other. It’s impossible to distinguish causes from effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Philosophical Position for the Current Research

The philosophical position that a researcher takes must be in line with the research questions and methods used in the research (Bryman & Bell, 2011). For the purpose of this research, the researcher takes a positivist position. The research question is to discover the impact of human resource practices on POS and job turnover and whether the impact of HR practices on turnover is mediated through POS. Thus the research is mainly causal in nature. The recognition in the theoretical framework that variables have universal causal relationships free of context draws it closer to positivism. Further positivist epistemology assumes that the knowledge about social phenomena derives from measurement and quantification of the objects and their relationship can be studied through objective means. The knowledge gained through objective measurements and quantification is generalizable across different individuals and different situations (Gill & Johnson, 2010). The study used quantitative hypothetico-deductive methodology and quantitative analysis strategies that are in line with this positivist stance. The data were collected through questionnaires consisting of interval scales that can be objectively quantified to test relationships between different variables. Further in the second phase of data collection, objective data were collected to investigate whether the respondent was still working in the same organization or had left it. The data was analysed using quantitative methodologies where statistical inferences were drawn based on the data collected through questionnaires. Thus the research questions, research instruments, data collection and data analysis are embedded in a context free approach and are in line with the positivist stance.
3.3 Research Approach - Quantitative

The quantitative-qualitative debate is ongoing in social science research. Advocates of each approach present robust and valid arguments in favour of one to undermine the other. Some researchers resort to mixed methods research that has both qualitative and quantitative elements. The choice of research approach depends on research questions and philosophical position of the researcher. The research questions in this research are related to establishing causality between different variables through a mediated path, thus the approach suitable for establishing causality is quantitative. Qualitative research does not focus on establishing causality rather it pays attention to capture the complexity of the research while quantitative research emphasizes quantification in the collection and analysis of data. Qualitative research predominantly favours inductive approaches while quantitative research favours deductive approaches. Data is generally collected through observation, open-ended questionnaires and unstructured interviews in qualitative research while survey and closed-ended questionnaires are more popular modes of data collection in quantitative studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Salient points relating to qualitative and quantitative research are given in table 3.2:
### Table 3.2 Qualitative and Quantitative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal orientation to the role of theory in relation to research</td>
<td>Deductive; testing of theory</td>
<td>Inductive; generation of theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemological orientation</td>
<td>Natural science model, in particular positivism</td>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontological considerations</td>
<td>Objectivism</td>
<td>Constructionism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced from Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 27)

As the current research is hypothetico-deductive research and one of the primary objectives is to test hypotheses, a quantitative methodology has been adopted for this research.

### 3.4 Research Design

#### 3.4.1 Context of the Study

The study was conducted in the retail banking sector of Pakistan. The banking sector in Pakistan predominantly consists of private banks including foreign-origin banks. There are some government owned banks as well, but most of the government owned banks were privatized during banking reforms of the 1990s. There is stiff competition among banks and thus banks are investing heavily to upgrade their human resources. Staff near to retirement age is being replaced with business and IT graduates by offering early retirement packages. Over the last two decades, the banking sector has become a preferred choice for young graduates (Hussain, n.d.). The study was conducted in three banks, each having multiple branches across Pakistan. Bank 1 is a government owned and managed...
bank, Bank 2 is a privatized bank that was owned by the government before the 1990s and later privatized and Bank 3 is a private bank established in last decade. The three banks have different volumes of operations and different numbers of branches.

The choice of one government, one privatized and one private bank was to cover different ownership structures prevalent in the banking sector to make it more representative of the banking sector. Banks of foreign origin were not included in the study as foreign banks largely pursue their head-office policies that influence their local operations and thus the consequent organizational culture is mixture of foreign and local influence.

The banking sector is very competitive and employees have to go an extra-mile to please their customers. So, in most cases employees continue to work until the late night after official closing hours. It is normal practice in the banking industry to work two to four hours extra every day after official banking hours without any extra compensation (Khattak, Khan, Haq, Arif & Minhas, 2011). The banking industry is regulated by the State Bank of Pakistan (the central bank of Pakistan). The structure of private banks is highly decentralized, while government owned banks still observe some degree of centralization.

During the last two decades banks have seen a shift in their human resource policies. For all mainstream banking functions including credit, finance, foreign exchange, customers services, accounting etc., banks are hiring graduates and postgraduates. Most of these employees hold degrees in management related disciplines and are fluent in English and Urdu. English is the official language for all written communication and bank documents, while verbal dealing with customers is generally undertaken in Urdu (the national language). Lower cadre jobs that do not constitute banking operations (for example security, cleaning, office boys) are hired through third party agencies to save costs. In addition a number of employees for entry level jobs e.g. data entry, cash handling, etc. are also outsourced (Hussain, n.d.; Subohi, 2013). As the lower cadre employees including security
guards, cleaners, data entry clerks are outsourced, they were excluded from the sample as their perception and turnover intentions are influenced by their employer i.e. outsourced contractors.

3.5 Pilot Study

This section discusses the need for conducting the pilot study, sample details, research methodology, translation of the questionnaire, data analysis results and changes made in the final questionnaire in light of the pilot study.

The pilot study was important for three reasons. Firstly, despite the fact that the scales being used in the study were widely tested and validated, they had not as yet been used in any notable study in Pakistan. Thus the first objective was to test the appropriateness and reliability of the measures. Secondly, it was important to test whether the questions asked in the questionnaire were understood the same way as they were intended or whether some words have different connotations in Pakistan. And thirdly, it was deemed important to verify whether respondents were comfortable with the English version of the questionnaire and to assess if there was any need for translation into Urdu.

3.5.1 Sample for Pilot Study

As the main study was to be conducted in three banks, the same three banks were selected for the pilot study. As detailed in section 3.4.1, Bank 1 is a government owned and managed bank, Bank 2 is a privatized bank that was owned by the government before the 1990s and Bank 3 is a private bank. Two branches from each bank were selected. All six branches were located in a metropolitan city in the province of Punjab which represents a commercial central part of the country.

As a first step, the consent of the regional head offices of the three respective banks was sought. Then branch managers of these six branches were contacted to seek cooperation. The branch managers were then requested to provide email addresses of employees working in their respective branch. Both male and female employees with different qualification backgrounds participated in
the pilot study (see table 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 for details). The sample selected for the pilot study was comparable to the sample used in the final study.

An email was sent to the names provided by branch managers to ask for their consent, which comprised a total of 82 individuals. Out of these 82 target individuals, a total of 50 agreed to take part in the pilot study. They were then sent questionnaires as an email attachment. All participants were requested to return the completed questionnaires directly to the researcher so that they could be reassured about confidentiality. Participants were requested to provide their names and contacts in case there were any follow-up questions. The target population included both bank officers and managers. Junior lower cadre employees employed for manual work i.e. cleaning, security, etc. were excluded from the sample. The reason for excluding these employees is that they are hired and paid by a third party. As they are not direct employees of the bank, the banks’ reward and promotion policies are not directly relevant for third-party employees. The participants included in the pilot study were excluded in the final study to avoid overlap.

Follow up emails were sent to those participants who did not return their questionnaires after one month. A total of 32 respondents completed and returned questionnaires.

The demographic information of the respondents is given in table 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 Pilot Study- Gender of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4 Pilot Study - Qualification of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Masters</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Com</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.Com= Bachelor in Commerce, M.Com= Masters of Commerce, B.A= Bachelor of Arts

Table 3.5 Pilot Study - Age Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 30 year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 indicates that females comprise 13% of the total respondents. This is proportionate to the number of females working the in the banking industry. Similarly, the qualification data presented in table 3.4 tells us that the greatest chunk of target respondents (i.e. 62%) consist of MBAs. It is discussed in the previous section that the banking sector has been targeting recruitment at MBA and business degree holders for the last two decades. These figures, therefore, reflect the high numbers of business graduates in the banking industry.

3.5.2 Translation of the Questionnaire

Participants reported that, in general, they were comfortable with the English version of the questionnaire, though some reported that certain questions had slightly less clarity than others. These questions were translated into Urdu so that both an Urdu and English version of the questions were presented side by side. The idea of doing this was discussed with two academics (professors of Pakistani Universities in the area of management) and two practitioners (senior bank managers).
After a lengthy discussion with them, it was decided to provide translations of only those specific questions that were reported to have less clarity. The reason for not translating the whole questionnaire into Urdu was that respondents in the pilot study were completely comfortable with the majority of the questions and moreover, the advisors mentioned above believed that a completely Urdu version would actually be more difficult for respondents. Although Urdu is the national language and widely spoken, it is not generally used as the official language in organizations, and hence some of the Urdu terminologies used to describe business and business processes were judged to be too obscure for respondents to comprehend.

The translation procedure described by Brislin (1970) was followed. The English version of the relevant items was translated into Urdu and then translated back into English by independent translators. In case of disagreement in the back translation, both translators discussed the variation and decided together the most precise Urdu version. The final version of translated items was then reviewed by a professor in organizational behaviour and another lecturer at a university in Lahore, Pakistan who were proficient in both English and Urdu. Further, the translated questions were also validated by two bilingual banking executives.

Complete scales used in the pilot study and modifications made in the scales in light of the feedback received in the pilot study are given in Appendix 3.
3.5.3 Scales Used in the Pilot Study

The scales used in the pilot study were adapted from existing scales that have been widely used and tested in earlier studies. This was done since developing totally new measurement scales can potentially be a very time-consuming and complex phenomenon as a new instrument may have a relatively higher possibility of not measuring what it is supposed to measure. Despite these scales being previously tested and validated, they were tested in the pilot study to determine their appropriateness for the Pakistani context. Items were measured using a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A detailed discussion on how the scales outlined below were chosen, compared against other scales and finalized in light of the pilot study can be found in section 3.6.1.

The scale for procedural justice was taken from Rahim, Magner and Shapiro (2000). A sample item included in the scale was “My bank has formal procedures to ensure that officials have accurate information for making decisions”. The scale for distributive justice consists of four items. Three items were taken from Kim, Price, Mueller and Watson (1996) which include the items “I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort that I put in the bank (Money and recognition are examples of rewards)”; “I am rewarded fairly considering the responsibilities I have”; and “I am not rewarded fairly in view of my experience” (Kim et al., 1996 in Price, 1997 p 121) and one item from Folger and Konovsky (1989) ”an independent observer from outside the organisation would have made a similar judgment about my performance”. To measure Perceived Organizational Support (POS), the eight-item scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) was used in the pilot study. The scale has widely been used in previous studies. A sample item is “help is available when I have a problem”. Job autonomy was measured using a four-item scale developed by Thompson and Prottas (2006). This scale was developed in a research study in which Thompson and Prottas (2006) studied job autonomy in relation to flexible timings and work family conflict. A sample item is “I decide when I take breaks”. Supervisor support was measured using a four-item scale developed by Rhoades et al. (2001) using the procedure described by Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) who replaced the word “organization” with “supervisor” in some items of the original POS scale developed by Eisenberger et
al. (1986). A sample item is “My supervisor cares about my well-being”. Job satisfaction was measured using a single-item global measure of job security which was adapted from The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) which studies comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics across countries (Karasek, Brisson, Kawakami, Houtman, Bongers & Amick, 1998). The item was “I feel my job is secure at this bank”. Affective commitment was measured using a six-item scale for affective commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). The scale is widely accepted in the commitment and POS literature. A sample item is “I feel a strong sense of belonging to my bank”. Training opportunities were measured with two items taken from Bartlett (2001) relating to access to training and skill development. A sample item is “This bank provides training opportunities for employees. Growth opportunities were measured with the two item scale developed by Price and Mueller (1986) relating to career growth opportunities and access to training. A sample item is “The bank provides me with the opportunity to improve my skills and knowledge”. Job satisfaction was measured with a three-item overall job satisfaction scale developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins and Klesh (1983). The scale has been widely used for measuring job satisfaction in related streams of the literature. A sample item is “In general, I like my job”. Turnover intentions were measured with a three-item “intention to turnover” subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire developed by Cammann et al. (1983). The scale has been used in many studies in POS for measuring turnover intentions. A sample item is “I will probably look for a new job in the next year”. The complete scales used in the pilot study are given in Table 3.8.

In addition to the scales discussed in preceding paragraph, the questionnaire contained free text boxes for respondents to make comments about the questionnaire.
3.5.4 Findings from the Pilot Study

As the number of respondents totalled 32, it was not possible to conduct Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) or Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) due to insufficient data in relation to the number of questions in the questionnaire. Hence, two analyses were run on the data namely, descriptive statistics (including means and standard deviations) and Cronbach alpha reliability analysis. Means and standard deviations are given in Table 3.6. As can be seen, the means for the different scales range from 3.45 for distributive justice to 4.92 for supervisor support. The standard deviation is highest for turnover intentions (1.80) and lowest for perceived organizational support (.80).

Cronbach alpha was calculated for all scales. Cronbach alphas higher than 0.70 were as follows: Growth Opportunities 0.80, Job satisfaction 0.84, Turnover intentions .90, Supervisor support .76 Procedural justice 0.79, Distributive justice .83. These scales were retained even though some respondents mentioned in the open ended questions that they found some of the negatively worded items in these scales confusing. As a consequence for the main study, all negatively worded items were changed to positively worded items. Thus, in the POS scale, item 6 “The bank shows very little concern for me.” was changed to “The bank shows a lot of concern and care for me.”

The reliability coefficient for affective commitment was 0.63, for perceived organizational support 0.66, and for training .59. In the POS scale, item 8 has a low Corrected Item-Total Correlation. Moreover, some participants also mentioned in the open ended questions that this item was confusing and should be removed. Removing this item from the analysis resulted in a new alpha of .76.

One negatively worded item in the Affective Commitment scale “I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this bank” was changed to “I feel emotionally attached to this bank” This was due to the fact that the analysis indicated that this item was responsible for the relatively poor Cronbach score .63 for this scale. This finding is consistent with the findings of Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) who found that negatively worded questions may create a source of confusion in certain situations. When they
changed negatively worded questions into positively worded questions, respondents were better able to understand them.

Table 3.6 Mean and Standard Deviation of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRG</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 Reliability Analysis for the Scales used in Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Initial Cronbach</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha when (Lowest loading) item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally in the pilot study, it was found that the job autonomy scale had a very low Cronbach alpha i.e. .44 that represent very low level of reliability. Thus in order to investigate it further, follow-up interviews were conducted.

3.5.5 Follow up Interviews

Short follow up interviews were conducted to further explore three areas: 1) to identify possible reasons for the low reliability coefficient of the job autonomy scale, 2) to explore the connotations of the term “supervisor” as some respondents were obviously unclear about who exactly was being referred to by the term “supervisor” and 3) to discuss item 2 of the training scale which had very low Corrected Item-Total Correlation. Thus four participants were chosen from those who gave their biographical details as requested on the pilot questionnaire and were interviewed over the telephone. These were the participants who mentioned one of these two issues in their open ended responses within the questionnaire.

Regarding the autonomy scale, it emerged that respondents were not able to relate this to their context. The scale used for the study was developed by Thompson and Prottas (2006) and it was more inclined to measure work flexibility than autonomy in job related decision making. For example, one item was “I decide when I take breaks”. During the interviews, respondents told me that in a banking organization, where customer service hours are hugely demanding with long
queues of customers waiting to be served, taking a break at the employee’s own discretion is highly unpractical and thus it does not reflect job autonomy. As one participant said “If employees start taking breaks at their own discretion, it will be a big mess. We do not have extra staff to cover during these breaks”. Another participant added “It is simply not possible in the banking sector. From 9 to 5, we have to serve customers. It may be possible in the organizations that do not have public dealing”. As participants of the pilot study raised concerns about the applicability of all four items to the banking sector, this scale was discarded and an alternative

Regarding the autonomy scale, it emerged that respondents were not able to relate this to their context. The scale used for the study was developed by Thompson and Prottas (2006) and it was more inclined to measure work flexibility than autonomy in job related decision making. For example, one item was “I decide when I take breaks”. During the interviews, respondents told me that in a banking organization, where customer service hours are hugely demanding with long queues of customers waiting to be served, taking a break at the employee’s own discretion is highly unpractical and thus it does not reflect job autonomy. As one participant said “If employees start taking breaks at their own discretion, it will be a big mess. We do not have extra staff to cover during these breaks”. Another participant added “It is simply not possible in the banking sector. From 9 to 5, we have to serve customers. It may be possible in the organizations that do not have public dealing”. As participants of the pilot study raised concerns about the applicability of all four items to the banking sector, this scale was discarded and an alternative three item scale measuring job autonomy developed by Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller (1986) was adopted. This scale measures the degree of centralization of decision making and how much employees feel empowered in an organization in job related activities as opposed to Thompson and Prottas (2006) scale that seem to be inclined to measure scheduling flexibility. For example, an item in the new scale “My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own” seems to be focused, on its face value, on measuring decisions making ability in a broad array of job activities rather than narrowly focusing on work scheduling only. The new scale was discussed with two participating managers who
earlier raised issues about applicability Thompson and Prottas (2006) scale in the pilot study. Both of them agreed that the new scale was more appropriate for measuring work autonomy in the banking sector as it was focused on measuring employee’s ability to make decisions independently. Curry et al., (1986) scale has been widely used in the studies measuring job autonomy (see Griffin, Hogan & Lambert, 2012; Lambert, Hogan, Dial, Jiang & Khondaker, 2012; Ramamoorthy, Flood, Slattery & Sardessai, 2005; Beehr, Glaser, Canali & Wallwey, 2001). One negatively worded item in the original scale “On my job, I have very little freedom to decide how I do my work” was modified and changed to positively worded item “I have a lot of freedom as to how to do my job”. This change was made to align this scale with the rest of the questionnaire in which all negatively worded items were changed to positively worded items. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Regarding the use of word “supervisor”, all four respondents informed me during the interview that, in Pakistan, the word supervisor is not generally used for ones’ immediate boss; rather a supervisor is the lower cadre employee who is one step senior from labourers at the bottom of the hierarchy. Generally, this word is used for cleaning or security staff (e.g. cleaning supervisor or “security supervisor”). Thus based on these findings, the word supervisor was changed to “manager” in all the questions. For example, the question “My supervisor cares about me” was changed to “My manager cares about me”.

Regarding item 2 of the training scale (i.e. I am aware of the amount and type of training that my bank is planning for me in the coming year), respondents informed me that this is more related to the communication system of the organization rather than representing access to the training system. As one respondent said, “trainings are not decided much in advance, trainings are scheduled each year and only those employees who are selected for the training are informed. There is no such communication system or portal that informs us about trainings scheduled in coming years”.
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Based on these follow up interviews and comments a number of changes were made in the final questionnaire. Details of these changes are given in the following section.

### 3.5.6 Changes made as a result of the Pilot study

Item-wise changes made in the final questionnaire as a result of the pilot study are given in table 3.8. As the table indicates, these changes can be summarized into five key areas:

a) The job autonomy scale used in the pilot study was not found to be appropriate for the main study and thus this scale was exchanged for another more relevant scale.

b) Some items which were reported confusing and showed low corrected item-total correlation in the reliability analysis were dropped (e.g. Training item TRG2).

c) Slight changes were made in the wording to make some questions clearer (e.g. procedural justice item PJC1)

d) Negatively worded questions were changed into positively worded questions (e.g. item affective commitment item ACM4).

e) The word “supervisor” was replaced with “manager” in all questions.

These changes were incorporated into the final questionnaire and the final scales after incorporating these changes are provided in Appendix 2.
Table 3.8 Scales Used in the Pilot Study and Modifications Made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Items No</th>
<th>Any Change or modification made in light of the pilot study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>My bank has formal procedures to ensure that officials have accurate information on which to base their decisions.</td>
<td>PJC1</td>
<td>In the light of feedback, this item was slightly changed to &quot;My bank has formal procedures to ensure that officials have accurate information for making decisions&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My bank's formal procedures are carried out in the same way for everybody.</td>
<td>PJC 2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The bank has formal procedures for employees to challenge decisions that they feel are wrong.</td>
<td>PJC 3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal procedures exist in my organization to ensure that officials do not allow personal biases to affect their decisions.</td>
<td>PJC 4</td>
<td>Slight change in wording to &quot;Formal procedures exist in my organization to ensure that officials do not allow personal biases (personal likes and dislikes) to affect their decisions&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are formal channels that allow employees to express their views and opinions before decisions are made.</td>
<td>PJC 5</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort that I put in the bank (Money and recognition are examples of rewards).</td>
<td>DJC1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am rewarded fairly considering the responsibilities I have.</td>
<td>DJC 2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am rewarded fairly in view of my experience.</td>
<td>DJC 3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An independent observer from outside the organisation would have made a similar judgment about my performance.</td>
<td>DJC4</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Supervisor Support</td>
<td>My supervisor really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>PSS1</td>
<td>The word supervisor was replaced with &quot;manager&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor gives value to my opinion.</td>
<td>PSS2</td>
<td>The word supervisor was replaced with &quot;manager&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td>PSS3</td>
<td>The word supervisor was replaced with &quot;manager&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>PSS4</td>
<td>The word supervisor was replaced with &quot;manager&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job</td>
<td>AUT1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a lot of influence about what happens on my job</td>
<td>AUT2</td>
<td>The scale had very low reliability. In addition, some respondents pointed out that this is not suitable for the banking sector, thus this scale was replaced with a new scale developed by Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller (1986). Details are given in section 3.5.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I decide myself when I take short breaks during working hours.</td>
<td>AUT3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done.</td>
<td>AUT4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>I feel my job is secure at this bank.</td>
<td>Sec1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Opportunities</td>
<td>There are a lot of opportunities for employees to grow here in this bank.</td>
<td>GRO1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The bank provides me the opportunity to improve my skills and knowledge.</td>
<td>GRO2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>My bank has stated policies on the amount and type of training employees can expect to receive.</td>
<td>TRG1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am aware of the amount and type of training that my bank is planning for me in the coming year.</td>
<td>TRG2</td>
<td>The item had low reliability. Discussion with respondents revealed that this item was more about the communication system in the organization than access to training itself, and thus this item was dropped from the final scale. The Cronbach alpha improved from .59 to .77 when this item was dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bank provides training opportunities for employees.</td>
<td>TRG3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank gives value to my opinions.</td>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from my bank when I have a problem.</td>
<td>POS2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank is willing to help me when I need a special favour.</td>
<td>POS4</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td>POS5</td>
<td>This negatively worded item was changed to &quot;The bank shows a lot of care and concern for me&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>POS6</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank would forgive a mistake on my part.</td>
<td>POS7</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If given the opportunity, the bank would take advantage of me.</td>
<td>POS8</td>
<td>Many respondents pointed out that this item was confusing, thus this item was dropped from the final scale. Once deleted, the Cronbach alpha value improved from .62 to .76.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to my bank.</td>
<td>ACM1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel that problems faced by my bank are also my own problems.</td>
<td>ACM2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be happy to work at this bank until I retire.</td>
<td>ACM3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this bank.</td>
<td>ACM4</td>
<td>This negatively worded was changed to &quot;I feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this bank.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working at this bank has a great deal of personal meaning to me.</td>
<td>ACM5</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell others I work at this bank.</td>
<td>ACM6</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>JST1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I do not like my job.</td>
<td>JST2</td>
<td>This negatively worded item was changed to &quot;In general, I like my job&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here in this bank.</td>
<td>JST3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turnover Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will actively look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td>TOI1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting.</td>
<td>TOI2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td>TOI3</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Full Scale Study

After making changes in the questionnaire in light of the pilot study, the full scale study was started. This section contains a detailed discussion of the scales used in the final study in light of the pilot study.

3.6.1 Measurement Scales

Measurement scales were adapted from existing scales that have been widely used and tested in earlier studies. Pre-existing scales were used in order to increase the validity of the measurements undertaken. Measurement error takes place due to variation between the information sought and the information generated by measurement processes used by researchers (Malhotra & Birks, 2000). Developing a totally new measurement scale can potentially be a very time consuming and complex phenomenon as a new instrument may have a relatively higher possibility of not measuring what it is supposed to measure. And it may take a fairly long time to get a scale refined and achieve an acceptable level of reliability and validity (Polit & Beck, 2013). Using existing scales that have already been validated and empirically tested has been recommended by a number of prominent authors (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Schrauf & Navarro, 2005; Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). However, Schrauf and Navarro (2005) caution that pre-existing scales might not fully meet the needs of researchers in different cultures or with a largely different sample. In order to make measures compatible with the study in question, they may require some adjustments to the original questionnaire. This is why a pilot study was deemed essential in the present research project.

For the purpose of this study, an attempt is made to use existing scales wherever possible. Although some adjustments have been made and the scales adapted according to the target respondents as a result of discussion with experts and pilot testing, yet the scales were predominantly the same as have been used in previous studies. In the
following paragraphs, the scales used to measure each variable are discussed. Reliability scores of the scales used in the pilot study are given in Section 3.6 (Table 3.6) and reliability scores of the scales used in the main study, after conducting CFA are provided in Section 3.11.1 and table 3.17. Complete finalized scales are provided in Appendix 2 for all the variables used in this study.

3.6.2 Procedural Justice

The construct procedural justice has long been in use in the literature. The scale used in this study was taken from Rahim et al. (2000). Alternative scales developed by Bauer, Truxillo, Sanchez, Craig, Ferrara and Campion (2001) and Niehoff and Moorman (1993) were also evaluated. However, the scale developed by Rahim et al. (2000) was found to be the briefest and most relevant. The scale has been used in a number of studies related to organizational justice and POS and it is one of the highest cited studies presenting a scale on organizational justice (see Lin, Hung & Chiu, 2008; Lin, 2005; Pack, 2005). All five items of the scale had high factor loadings in the original study and a Cronbach alpha above 0.7 which meets the recommendations by Nunnally (1978). The sample item included in the scale is “My bank's formal procedures are carried out in the same way for everybody”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Reliability analysis of the scales discussed here is provided in succeeding sections. (For complete scales, please see Appendix 2)

3.6.3 Distributive Justice

Different scales of distributive justice were reviewed including the highly cited scales of Folger and Konovsky (1989), Kim et al. (1996) and Rahim et al. (2000). Considering the wording and conciseness of the scales, the anticipated validity of three items of Kim et al “I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort that I put in the bank (Money and recognition are examples of rewards)”; “I am rewarded fairly considering the
responsibilities I have”; and “I am not rewarded fairly in view of my experience” (Kim et al., 1996) in (Price, 1997 p 121) and one item from Folger and Konovsky 1989 "an independent observer from outside the organisation would have made a similar judgment about my performance" were included in the scale. The scale has shown discriminant and convergent validity in previous studies and the Cronbach alpha was reported 0.85 (Price, 1997). The scale has been used in a number of subsequent studies and all studies reported high reliability (Gould-Williams, Bottomley, Redman, Snape, Bishop, Limpanitgul & Mostafa, 2013; Armstrong-Stassen, 2008; Buttigieg, Deery & Iverson, 2008; Ramamoorthy et al., 2005). Armstrong-Stassen (2008) reported a coefficient alpha of 0.96 and Flood, Turner, Ramamoorthy and Pearson (2001) reported Cronbach’s alpha of 0.90. Thus the scale has been found to be highly reliable in previous studies and is well cited in related streams of research. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

### 3.6.4 Perceived Organizational Support

Unlike other constructs, there is not much variation in terms of measurement scales for POS in the literature. A large majority of studies have used the scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) The original scale was developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) in the seminal study on POS. The original scale consisted of 36 items to measure perceptions of organizational support. The scale was found to be highly reliable in the early studies however later studies found that there is no effect on the reliability of the scale if the shortened version of 8 items is used (Eisenberger et al., 1997). Rhoades et al. (2001) used this 8-item scale and found it appropriate to replace the 36-item long scale. The 8-item scale has been used by Dixon and Sagas (2007) Cronbach alpha 0.90; Vandenberghe, Bentein and Stinglhamber (2004) Cronbach 0.90, Suazo (2009) Chiang and Hsieh (2012) .92, etc. Vandenberghe et al. (2004) used 5 out of the original 8-item short version of the POS scale. In recent years, many authors have indeed used a further shortened 4-item
version of the POS scale (Luchman, Kaplan & Dalal, 2012; Miao, 2011) and 6-item scales (Wu, Hu & Jiang, 2012). These shortened versions were also found reliable and did not affect the validity or reliability of the scale. As the 8-item scale has been very widely used and a number of studies in different contexts have confirmed its validity and reliability, an 8-item version was used for the purpose of this research. A sample item is “help is available when I have a problem”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.6.5 Job Autonomy
The scale for measuring job autonomy was initially taken from Thompson and Prottas (2006) and tested in the pilot study. This scale was developed in a research study in which Thompson and Prottas (2006) studied job autonomy in relation to flexible timings and work family conflict. The definition of autonomy used by them was ability to decide when, where and how to do a job. The reliability coefficient in their original study was 0.71. The scale was later used by a number of studies including (Armstrong-Stassen, 2008; Buttigieg et al., 2008; Price, 1997) and has high reliability. A sample item is “I decide when I take breaks”. Like other scales, this scale was tested too in the pilot study to evaluate its suitability for the final study. In the pilot study, the scale showed a very low reliability besides having some validity issues. Details of the problems that emerged from the pilot study are discussed in the section 3.5 Pilot Study. So based on the issues surfaced during the pilot study, an alternative scale for job autonomy was used. The alternative scale used in this study was developed by Curry et al. (1986). The scale measures the degree of centralization of decision making and how much employees feel empowered in an organization. It was felt that this was more relevant and appropriate measure of job autonomy in respect to work related issues that can possibly influence POS as opposed to the Thompson and Prottas scale that was more focused on measuring the autonomy to make work scheduling decisions like breaks and work flexibility. The new scale has been
widely used in a number of studies and consistently shown high reliability (Lambert & Paoline III, 2010; Lambert, Hogan & Griffin, 2008; Applegate & Paoline III, 2007; Ramamoorthy et al., 2005; Beehr, Glaser, Canali & Wallwey, 2001). Thus in light of the results of the pilot study and evaluation of the relevance to the current study, a 3-item scale adapted from Curry et al. (1986) was used in this research. A sample item is “My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.” Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.6.6 Supervisor Support
Supervisor support is measured using a 4-item scale developed by Rhoades et al. (2001) using the procedure described by Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) who replaced the word “organization” with “supervisor” in some items of the original POS scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). Rhoades et al. (2001) reported high factor loadings of all items for this scale and the factor loadings ranged from 0.74 to 0.84. The scale was later used in a number of studies including Dawley, Andrews and Bucklew (2008), Casper, Harris, Taylor-Bianco and Wayne (2011), and Hayton et al. (2012) . Studies have consistently shown high reliability for this scale. For the purpose of current study, the term supervisor was replaced with “manager” (details are given in Section 3.6 Pilot Study). A sample item is “My manager cares about my well-being”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.6.7 Job Security
There has been some debate in the literature regarding the use of single-item measures. Sometimes in applied work situations, single-item measures are unavoidable (Borg & Elizur, 1992). Some authors have found that the predictive validity of a single-item measure is as good as that of multiple item measures (Bergkvist & Rossiter, 2007; Lee, Singhapakdi & Sirgy, 2007). A single-item global measure of job security was adapted
from The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) which studies comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics across countries (Karasek et al., 1998). Karasek et al. (1998) used this JCQ in a series of 6 studies, conducted in 4 countries with total responses exceeding 16,000. The single-item global measure for job security was later used by a number of other studies including Danford, Richardson, Stewart, Tailby and Upchurch (2008), Gould-Williams (2003), Brown, Forde, Spencer and Charlwood (2008), Eldridge and Nisar (2011), etc. The use of a single-item global measure of other constructs like job satisfaction and participation in decision making is also widely documented in the literature. Witt and Hellman (1992) used a single-item scale for measuring participation in decision making. Seashore, Lawler, Miris and Cammann (1982) developed a single item scale for measuring job satisfaction which has later been used in many other studies (Cleveland & Shore, 1992; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Jordan and Turner (2008) studied the feasibility of a single-item scale for measuring organizational justice and reported that a single-item scale demonstrated comparable reliability and validity to longer scales. Thus use of a single-item scale for measuring job related constructs including job security is a widely recognized practice and hence this is used for the current study. The item was “I feel my job is secure at this bank”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.6.8 Affective Commitment

The scale for affective commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1990), Meyer and Allen (1997) was used to measure Affective Commitment. The scale is very widely cited and has been extensively used in studies of organizational commitment in the POS literature (Merritt, 2012; Colakoglu, Culha & Atay, 2010; Aube, Rousseau & Morin, 2007; Bright, 2007; Rhoades et al., 2001). A sample item is “I feel a strong sense of belonging to my bank”. Chen and Francesco (2003) reported a Cronbach score of 0.91, and Jenkins (1993) reported a Cronbach Alpha of $\alpha = 0.88$ for this scale. Other studies have also
consistently shown high reliability scores for this scale. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.6.9 Training
Recent literature on POS has paid more attention to the overall developmental experience than studying formal training in relation with POS. Wayne et al. (1997) reported that developmental experience and promotion opportunities are predictors of POS. Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, Liden and Bravo (2011) included two major themes in the overall developmental experience namely support for developmental activities (training) and perceived career opportunities within the organization. Training opportunities are measured with two items from Bartlett (2001) relating to access to training and skill development: “My bank has stated policies about how much training each employee will receive.” and “This bank provides training opportunities for employees.”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.6.10 Growth opportunities
Growth opportunities were measured with the two items scale developed by Price and Mueller (1986) scale relating to career growth opportunities and access to training. The items taken from Price and Mueller (1986) are “The bank provides me the opportunity to improve my skills and knowledge” and “There are a lot of opportunities for employees to grow here in this bank”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

3.5.11 Job Satisfaction
Job satisfaction was measured by a three-item overall job satisfaction scale developed by Cammann et al. (1983) who reported a reliability coefficient of 0.77 . The scale has been widely used for measuring job satisfaction in related streams of the literature. Cronbach alphas reported in different studies include Law and Wong (1999) \( \alpha = 0.88 \), Egan, Yang
and Bartlett (2004) 0.70 and Namisivayam and Zhao (2007) $\alpha$ 0.83. A sample item is “In general, I like my job”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

### 3.6.12 Turnover Intentions

Turnover intentions were measured with a three-item “intention to turnover” subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire developed by Cammann et al. (1983) who reported a reliability coefficient of 0.83 for this scale. The scale has been widely used in studies related to turnover intention / intent to leave. Nadiri and Tanova (2010) reported a reliability coefficient $\alpha$ 0.85, Law and Wong (1999) $\alpha$ 0.81, George (1989) $\alpha$ 0.87. The scale has been used in many studies in POS for measuring turnover intentions. A sample item is “I will probably look for a new job in the next year”. Items were measured using 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

### 3.7 Sampling

#### 3.7.1 Sampling

At the first stage three banks, one each from government; private and privatized banks were approached who consented to cooperate in this study. The reason for selecting three different ownership structures was to ensure that the ownership structure did not affect the responses of employees. Human resource polices may vary from a government bank to a private bank, and thus including three different structures prevalent in the country will address the variation that may be generated due to the ownership structure.

During the second stage 14 geographically dispersed cities were selected. The cities were chosen based on convenience and access. Regional managers of different areas were contacted in the first instance, and those who agreed to cooperate in their respective area/city were included in the study as the cooperation of the regional head was
instrumental in accessing individual branches. Then 5 to 15 branches were selected in each city in proportion to the size of the city and overall branches therein. And lastly, branch employees who consented to complete the questionnaire were distributed questionnaires. On average 8 to 15 questionnaires were distributed in each branch. This sampling procedure was adopted to generate fairly representative data and to control for the potential effect of the city and branches. Due confidentiality issues, obtaining a list of all bank employees for random sampling was not possible; therefore employees in selected branches were requested to complete the questionnaires.

The sample was taken from 86 branches located in 14 cities across Pakistan. Large commercial cities including Lahore, Karachi, Sialkot, Islamabad and Multan have a greater number of branches and banking activity, thus a relatively greater number of participants belong to these cities in proportion to the banking activity there. Ten branches per city were chosen for two metropolitan cities Lahore and Karachi eight branches each for large commercial cities i.e. Sialkot, Multan and Islamabad and four branches per city were chosen for all other smaller cities. The target respondents were bank employees hired and paid directly by the bank. Detail of the cities, branches and number of respondents is given in table 3.9.

In the banking industry, there is a common practice to hire lower cadre employees particularly involved in manual work i.e. cleaning, security, etc. These employees are paid through a third party. Thus banks’ policies have a little influence on job conditions and developmental opportunities of these employees. As they are not direct employees of the bank, banks’ reward and promotion policies are not directly relevant for third-party
employees. Thus these employees were excluded. So the study focused on banking employees who were directly hired by the banks. All permanent employees directly hired by the bank are officer cadre employees. These employees generally hold at least degree level qualifications while most of them hold MBA or business related masters.
Table 3.9 Distribution of Sample in Different Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>No. of Branches Surveyed</th>
<th>Total Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Filled and Complete Questionnaires Received Back</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahawalpur</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burewala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dera Gazi Khan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujranwala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabirwala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khanewal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahim Yar Khan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahiwal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sialkot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehari</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 1002 questionnaires were distributed out of which 580 questionnaires were completed and returned representing a response rate of 58%. The response rate is well above that reported in similar studies in the POS domain (e.g. Settoon et al. (1996) 42%, Casper, Martin, Buffardi and Erdwins (2002) 41.5%, Loi et al. (2006) 40%, Wayne et al. (1997) 12%, Valentine, Greller and Richtermeyer (2006) 11.5%, Lazarova and Caligiuri (2001) 33%). However some questionnaires were largely incomplete. In some cases only the first page was filled out. Further, some questionnaires, which were completed by those employees who have less than one year’s tenure in the bank, were excluded as
they have not served long enough to be able to observe different HR practices. This is a widely accepted practice in sampling and widely used in the literature (see Rusli, Edimansyah & Naing, 2008; Benson, 2006; Hastings, Kiely & Watkins, 1988). In some cases, a few questionnaires were completed by the outsourced employees (those who were not on the bank payroll working in the bank). They were also excluded as the target respondents were employees on the banks’ payroll. Therefore, these questionnaires were discarded and a final sample of 505 respondents was used for analysis.

3.7.2 Respondents’ Demographic Characteristics

Respondents were employees of selected banks working in dispersed areas of Pakistan. Women’s work participation in Pakistan is on the rise. Nonetheless the number of working females in Pakistan is much less compared with their male counterparts. Female labour participation rate in Pakistan is 14.4 % compared with 70.3% for males (FBS, 2003). Accordingly females working in the banking sector are also substantially less than males. Out of the total responses, 488 respondents mentioned their sex, and out of them 82% were male while 18 % were female. Table 3.10 provides details of the gender distribution.

Table 3.10 Gender Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11 provides the distribution of the sample with regard to age. The 44 % of employees working in the banks were aged 30 or under. A total of 77.3 % of employees were aged 40 or below. That indicates that a large proportion of employees consist of
relatively young people. The possible reason for the high proportion of young workers is that banks in Pakistan have extensively recruited new graduates during the last 10 to 15 years. At the same time, older employees were offered a golden hand shake scheme whereby they were given incentives to retire early. Therefore a substantial proportion of employees is aged forty or below.

*Table 3.11 Age Pattern*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 30 year</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of designations, respondents included officers of different grades, managers, assistant vice presidents, vice presidents and regional heads. In terms of the duration employees have been working with that particular bank, this ranged from 1 year to 37 years. Employees who had less than 1 year of experience with that particular bank were excluded as they may not be suitably qualified to comment on organizational initiatives and policies as discussed above in section 3.6.1.

*Table 3.12 Qualification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Masters</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Com</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Com</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the respondents held professional qualifications like BBA, MBA, M.Com, Chartered Accountants. 62.3% of respondents had an MBA or M.Com or other business related master’s degree, 9% had bachelor degrees in business or commerce, 12% had bachelor degrees in other areas, and rest of the 17 % respondents had other qualifications. The figures show that a large majority of the workforce is well educated and hold business related degrees. This is in line with the argument presented above that banks have heavily recruited young qualified university graduates during the last one or two decades.

*Table 3.13 Duration with the Bank*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 Years</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 Years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 Years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Years and above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.3 Questionnaire Administration Procedure

Data was collected from 86 branches of different banks spread across the country. During the first stage, approval was sought from head offices/ regional offices of respective banks and the regional heads were requested to inform the branch managers about the bank’s consent. Then each branch manager was contacted via phone or personal visit to gain access to employees in the branch. Questionnaires were distributed in two ways. Firstly, the researcher visited the branch and with the consent of branch managers, distributed paper and pencil questionnaires to all employees in the branch who agreed to participate in the study. Questionnaires were left with employees to complete during break times or in the evening after office hours. Second and third visits were made to the branches subsequently to collect completed questionnaires. Respondents who did not return questionnaires were reminded to do so, on second and third visits. On the third visit, respondents who had not returned their questionnaires were requested to post them to the researcher when they had completed them. Three visits to branches and personal requests helped in securing the high response rate. Secondly, in remote cities where personal visits were not possible, the branch managers were sent questionnaires as an email attachment and were asked to distribute them to all employees in the branch who were on bank’s payroll. The branch managers were first asked over the phone about the total number of employees working in the branch and directly hired by the bank in order to have an idea about the total sample size. The reason for sending questionnaires as an email attachment was that using online questionnaires like SurveyMonkey was not possible because bank employees in Pakistan don’t have access to the internet due to security concerns. They can only access the bank’s own network (intra-net) and internal email, so external sites like survey monkey were not accessible from the banks’ networks. The list of employees’ individual email addresses was not available so branch managers were sent an email with the questionnaire attachment with a request to forward it to
employees. Although blank questionnaires were distributed through branch managers, they were not collected by branch managers. Questionnaires had clear instructions that completed questionnaires should be returned directly to the researcher’s email address to avoid any potential bias that might have been caused by returning them to their own managers. Respondents were provided with both the postal and email addresses of the researcher for this purpose. Follow-up telephone calls were made to managers to ensure that they had forwarded questionnaires to branch employees. A week later follow-up emails were sent to managers, asking them to request branch employees to return questionnaires to the researcher if they had not done so by that time. The procedure ensured the confidentiality and anonymity of respondents as completed questionnaires did not pass through any branch manager or other bank employees.

As two different methods for data collection i.e. paper and pencil, and email attachments were used, there was a possibility of potential bias due to data collection method. Some recent studies in the organizational behaviour literature have used both methods simultaneously and reported that minimal measurement differences were found (Campos, Zucoloto, Bonafé, Jordani & Maroco, 2011; Cole, Bedeian & Feild, 2006). To test the measurement equivalence, One Way ANOVA comparison of means for online and paper-based questionnaires was used, as is typical in the literature (Knapp & Kirk, 2003; Eaton & Struthers, 2002; King & Miles, 1995). Results of the ANOVA are presented below in Table3.12. As the results in table 3.14 indicate the value of $\eta^2$ (Eta-squared) is less than 0.1 in all cases, and hence there are the effects of the data collection method are negligible. As a rule of thumb, Cohen (1988) suggested that if the value of $\eta^2$ is less than .10, the effect is small. In this case, the effect size of data collection method on all dependent variables is less than .10 and thus indicates that the choice of data collection method i.e. paper based or online, did not affect the results.
Table 3.14 One way ANOVA Comparison of Means for Online and Paper Based Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>882.44</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>886.40</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1368.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>998.76</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>932.48</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1105.70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>979.50</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRG</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1065.82</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1286.91</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>939.82</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.4 Translation of the Questionnaire

The national language of Pakistan is Urdu and many other vernacular languages are spoken in different regions. However being a former British Colony, the official language in government and private offices has been predominantly English although sometimes Urdu is also used as the official language. The medium of instruction at university level is
generally English. All business, management, engineering and medicine degrees are
c Conducted in English. Thus university graduates working in offices are generally
Comfortable in communicating in English. The target population was bank officers who
Have attained a certain level of university or professional education before joining a bank
And are able to effectively conduct all written communication and documentation in
English. Thus respondents were comfortable with the English version of the
Questionnaire. However some English terms may have slightly different connotations in
Pakistan. So through pilot testing it was ensured that employees did not have any
Confusion about any of the questions. The questionnaire could have been translated into
Urdu, however there were some practical and linguistic issues associated with it. Many
English words have been taken up and widely accepted in spoken Urdu. For example, the
Word “motivation” or “commitment” is used in Urdu in the same way as in its English
Form. Urdu words for commitment or motivation are rarely used in spoken language and
They are considered too literary or poetic to be used in day to day conversation. Mostly
These words have poetic connotations or they are found in non-contemporary Urdu
Literature. Thus using the English version of the questionnaire was an appropriate choice
In the context where target respondents were comfortable with English. However, during
The pilot study, it emerged that some words could potentially have slightly different
Connotations in the Pakistani context (detail is given in section 3.6 Pilot Study). The
Matter was discussed with some managers and two academics in a local university. On
Their recommendations, the Urdu translation of some questions was also placed in front
Of the English question.
3.8 Second Wave of Data Collection

Approximately 2 and half years after the first wave of data collection a second study was conducted, exploring whether the respective person had left the organisation or was still with the organisation.

As cross sectional studies have many limitations the possibility of collecting a second wave of survey data was explored. Out of the total 182 of the 505 respondents from the original study who provided any sort of personal details, only 47 had provided contact details. Upon conducting a preliminary investigation to assess the possibility of collecting a second wave of survey data, the researcher found that many of these 47 respondents whose email addresses were available had already left the job. Since most of them had given their organizational email addresses, their email addresses were no longer valid, and their current contact details were not available. The realistic estimate was that if these respondents were to be contacted again, the tentative number of responses would not be more than 30 which was insufficient to enable any reliable statistical analysis to be conducted.

While it was possible to identify whether an employee had or had not left the bank through branch manager/ bank region office records, it was not possible to collect a second wave of survey data.

Secondly, as the second wave of data would have been collected after 2 and half years, there were some management changes in one bank. The management of that bank informed me that they had set a limit regarding how many researchers were allowed access to branches in one year as management believed that answering research surveys constitutes a significant distraction for staff. The quota for that year (2014) had already been used and thus the bank refused to allow access to employees in the branches.
However, the bank agreed to confirm at regional office level whether an employee was still working in the bank or had left. All three banks agreed to provide data for actual turnover as it involved substantially less time. Therefore, a second wave of survey was not collected. Instead data about actual turnover was collected.

The data was collected to explore if employees who completed questionnaires in the first wave of data collection were still working with the same bank. In the first wave of data collection, undertaken in 2011, respondents were requested to provide their names, email addresses, and branch names. In the second wave of data collection, undertaken in 2014, the regional offices of the respective banks were contacted to check if the person was still working with the same bank or had left the organization. In some cases, where the branch name was not available but the respondent had provided an email contact, they were contacted by email and requested to provide information about whether they were working with the same organization. A total turnover data of 182 responses was collected. Table 3.13 indicates that almost 69% of employees were working with the same organization, 13 % had retired, and a further 18% had switched jobs to another bank.

Table 3.13 Actual Turnover after two and half Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still Working with the bank</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switched to another organization</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.14 Actual Turnover in Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still Working with the bank</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switched to another</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.15 Actual Turnover At different Qualification Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MBA/Business Masters (%)</th>
<th>M.Com (%)</th>
<th>B.Com (%)</th>
<th>B.A. (%)</th>
<th>Others (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still Working with the bank</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>73.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switched to another</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.16 Actual Turnover At different Age Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Working with the bank</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>73.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switched to another</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>26.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These demographic tables indicate that respondents with MBAs and business related Masters qualifications have a relatively higher switching rate compared with to participants with other qualifications. The lowest switching rate is for those participants with BA and other degrees. This seems plausible as those employees who have obtained MBAs business Masters likely have greater employability. Switching to the other organizations is highest for those aged under 30 and lowest for employees above 51. Again, this seems plausible since as employees near retirement, they tend to stay in the same organization.

### 3.9 Data Preparation

The data from the questionnaires and the actual turnover data was analysed using SPSS and MPlus. Questionnaires that were substantially incomplete and those completed by outsourced employees were discarded. There was, in addition, missing data from some questionnaires. Different methods are used to deal with missing values including pair-wise deletion, list-wise deletion, and maximum likelihood imputations including expectation maximization. Each approach has certain pros and cons and the suitability of the approach depends on the data itself and the number of missing cases. For the purpose of analysis in this thesis, list-wise deletion was adopted.

### 3.10 Ethical Considerations

The research was approved by The University of Sheffield Ethics Committee. The research was designed in light of the code of ethics given by the British Psychological Society (BPS, 2009) that gives four broad principles to meet ethical responsibilities in research namely respect, competence, design, methodology and integrity.
Respondents’ respect was given foremost importance. Respondents were provided with detailed explanations of the purpose of the research and informed consent was sought. Participation in the study was completely voluntary and based on the free will of employees. While sending reminders and making repeat visits, employees’ free-will was respected and polite reminders were given to persuade them without putting any unfair pressure on them. As per BPS guidelines about competence, the researcher acquainted himself thoroughly about the ethical issues and dilemmas involved. The research design and procedures were discussed with the supervisory team to get valuable feedback regarding ethical issues. The research design and data collection procedure was submitted to the University of Sheffield Ethical Committee and changes were made in light of its recommendation to achieve the highest ethical standards before getting final ethical approval. Various courses of action that might have affected respondents were thoroughly evaluated. Respondents were assured that the data would be used only for academic purposes and that no individual case would be reported. Instead, statistical representation of the whole data set would be reported for academic purposes only. Not only was the respondents’ identity kept anonymous but banks’ names and branch names were also kept confidential.

To meet the third principle, ‘responsibility’, the researcher thoroughly evaluated any potential risk to respondents and tried to avoid such risk beforehand through creating buffers in the research design. All respondents were provided with the email address of the researcher to contact if they needed any kind of professional advice relating to the questionnaire or their personal well-being. And regarding ‘integrity’, the researcher adhered to the professional relationship with respondents. An honest and accurate description of the research was provided. Respondents were offered the chance to receive a summary of the findings of the research and those who opted for this, were told
they would be provided with honest and accurate findings of the study in an abridged form at the end of the study.

3.11 Reliability and Validity

3.11.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To validate the constructs used in this study, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was run using MPlus. Four different models were tested to explore the model that best fits the data. In Model 1, all items were loaded onto their expected constructs and the constructs were correlated in the analysis. In testing the model all factor loadings were significant ($p < 0.001$). However, one item from the distributive justice scale (DJC4) had a low loading (.44). Similarly, one item of POS (POS7) also had a relatively low loading (0.61). The results of model one were $\chi^2 = 1726.052$ df = 686, $\chi^2$/df = 2.52, RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) =0.06, NFI (normed fit index) = 0.917, TLI (Tucker Lewis index) = 0.906.

Model 2 was run after excluding the two items (POS7 and DJC4) that showed low loadings in the first model. The results of the model were $\chi^2 = 1555.811$ df = 611 $\chi^2$/df = 2.54, RMSEA =0.06, NFI = 0.923, TLI = 0.912. TLI and NFI improved in model 2 compared with model 1. A test of comparison was conducted to check if there were significant differences between model 1 and model 2, and results from the chi square distribution table suggested that the difference is <.01, indicating that there are significant statistical differences between model 1 and 2.

Model 3 generated two higher order constructs. Procedural justice (PJC) and distributive justice (DJC) theoretically fall under the construct “organizational justice”. Thus a higher order construct was created by combining these two variables. Secondly, growth opportunities (GRO) and Training were combined as they represent developmental opportunities for employees in the organization. In addition, like Model 2, the low loading
items DJC4 and POS7 were excluded. The results of model 3 were \( \chi^2 = 1576.979 \) df = 626, \( \chi^2/df = 2.52 \), RMSEA =0.06, NFI = 0.923, TLI = 0.913. Chi Square comparison tests indicated that \( P = 0.132 \). Since \( P > 0.5 \) this indicates that there is no significant difference between the two models. There is a very slight improvement in \( \chi^2/df \) and TLI. As the results were not adversely affected, and it is a simpler model compared with Model 2, this model became the preferred choice.

The data in the first wave of the study was collected with the help of a questionnaire, which uses self-report measures only. As with all self-report measures, this comes at the risk of increased common method variance. In other words, some of the relationships between the variables in this study might be caused by the shared method of assessment rather than indicating a true relationship. To control for this bias and get more accurate estimates of the relationships, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee and Podsakoff (2003) suggest a variety of statistical remedies. To control for the potential influence of an unmeasured latent factor include a common factor was added to Model 3, to see whether this improved its structural fit. In this procedure all the items were allowed to load on a common factor. In addition, these loadings were fixed as equal across all items – if there was an unmeasured third factor influencing the results, then this factor would have affected all items equally. The results of Model 4 were \( \chi^2 = 1437.175 \) df = 616, \( \chi^2/df = 2.33 \), RMSEA =0.056, NFI = .933, TLI = 0.924. Chi Square comparison tests with Model 3 indicated that \( \Delta \chi^2 = 139.80 \), df= 10, \( P < 0.001 \) thus indicating that there is a significant difference between the two models. There was a very slight improvement in \( \chi^2/df \) and TLI as well. The relationship between CMF and individual items is 1.041, \( p < .001 \). That indicates that CMF was significantly correlated with the items indicating common method variance, however, it is controlled for in the model.
As this model is simpler, utilises the higher order constructs and has slightly better fit indices, and in addition controls for a common methods variance influence; this model will be used for further analysis and to report factor loadings.

As this model is simpler, utilises the higher order constructs and has slightly better fit indices, and in addition has a common factor; this model will be used for further analysis and to report factor loadings.
### Table 3.17 Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 - All Items</td>
<td>1726.05</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 (Without POS7 and DJC4 items)</td>
<td>1555.81</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 (Higher Order Constructs)</td>
<td>1576.97</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4 (With CMF)</td>
<td>1437.17</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fit Indices of model 4 (as well as those of the other models) are within the limits deemed acceptable in the literature. The literature suggests that $\chi^2$/df less than 5 is acceptable (Hair, Black, Barry & Anderson, 2010; Marsh & Hocevar, 1985; Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin & Summers, 1977). Values of goodness of fit indices including NFI and TLI are considered acceptable when they are above .90 (Hair et al., 2010; Bentler & Bonett, 1980). Although some writers insist on the 0.95 cut-off point, Hair et al. (2010) argue that sticking with the 0.95 cut-off point when the sample size is large and a large number of measured variables are entered into the model is unrealistic. All values in this CFA are in the range widely recognized as acceptable in the literature. RMSEA should be less than the 0.06 (Hair et al., 2010; Browne, Cudeck, Bollen & Long, 1993). All goodness of fit indices are in the range that indicates a good model fit of CFA for independent variables. These indices are also summarized in Table 3.17.

Cronbach alpha reliability analysis was conducted for the final scales. The final items retained after the CFA were used to calculate Cronbach alpha coefficients. Scores of Cronbach alpha for scales are given in Table 3.18 next to their factor loadings. Reliability
coefficients of all scales are above 0.80 except for the autonomy scale which is 0.75. Although the alpha coefficient for the autonomy scale is relatively low compared with the other scales, it is still well above the threshold recommended by Nunnally (1978). The results of CFA and reliability analysis presented above collectively represent valid and reliable scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS 1</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS 2</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS 3</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS 4</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS 5</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS 6</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS 1</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS 2</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS 3</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS 4</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 2</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 3</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 4</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 5</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 6</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST 1</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST 2</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST 3</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI 1</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI 2</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI 3</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter outlined the research approach and research methods that were used to test the hypotheses developed in the last chapter. The philosophical approach of the study is positivist and is in line with the theoretical framework discussed in the last chapter. A cross sectional survey was conducted in multiple branches of three banks in Pakistan. A large sample of 1000 employees was targeted and personal visits and follow-up telephone/ email reminders resulted in a response rate of 58%.
The questionnaire was developed by adapting different scales that have already been used, tested and validated in different studies. The Scales used were highly cited in the literature.

A rigorous pilot study was conducted with a total of 32 respondents. In the questionnaire used in the pilot study, some open ended questions were added, in addition to the closed ended questions intended to be used in the final study, to provide participants an opportunity to make comments about any confusing item or any difficulty they faced while completing the questionnaire. The pilot study confirmed that people were comfortable with the English version of the questionnaire, however certain terminologies were found to have different connotations which were then changed in the final version of the questionnaire and Urdu versions of a few questions were introduced with them.

Based on factor loadings in CFA, reliability coefficients were calculated. All scales showed high reliability.

Having described research approach, research process, data collection, questionnaire development, and CFA and reliability analysis in this chapter, the next chapter will move on to analysis and hypothesis testing.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

4.1 Chapter Introduction

In the last chapter reliability analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was presented to set a foundation for further data analysis. Items and variables finalized in the CFA are used for analysis in this chapter. This chapter analyses hypothesized relationship between those variables presented in Chapter 2. Besides the hypothesized model, some alternative models were also tested in order to find the best model.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Pearson Correlation analysis was performed to examine the interrelationships among all independent, mediating, moderating and dependent and demographic variables. All these variables are interval scaled variables. In addition, the demographic variables are included in the correlation analysis.

Table 4.1 displays bivariate Pearson correlations. All independent variables significantly correlated with POS and the dependent variables except with actual turnover. Among independent variables on organizational justice is found related with actual turnover. POS is significantly correlated with all dependent variables except actual turnover. Demographic variables were found to be uncorrelated with both the dependent variables and POS with the exception of a few variables (e.g. age is related with affective commitment and turnover intentions, work duration is related to affective commitment, turnover intentions and actual turnover). Gender is correlated with job satisfaction. Age is negatively related to turnover intentions although the correlation is relatively weak. This is theoretically plausible as older people tend to have greater need for stability and lower intentions to leave the organization (Blankertz & Robinson, 1997). Age was also found to
be related to affective commitment. Older workers are found to be more committed to the organization (Salami, 2008; Gallie, Felstead & Green, 2001). Work duration was correlated with affective commitment, turnover intentions and actual turnover. All other independent and dependent variables were unrelated with demographic variables.
### Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics, Standard Deviations and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GND</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDN</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEX</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJC</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATO</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGE= Age (1=Less than 30 , 2= 31 to 40, 3=41 to 50, 4 = 51 and over ) , GND= Gender(0=Female, 1=Male), WDN= Work Duration (1= 1 to 10 Years, 2= 11 to 20 Years, 3= 21 to 30 Years, 4= 31 and above) , MRS=Marital Status (0= married , 1= non-married) , OJC = Organizational Justice, DEX = Developmental Experience , POS =Perceived organisational support, SEC = Job Security, AUT= Job Autonomy, PSS= Supervisor Support, JST=job satisfaction, TOI=turnover intentions, ACM= affective commitment, **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level , *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level
The correlation table indicates that all independent variables are significantly related with POS and in turn POS is significantly related with the dependent variables affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. The correlation between the mediating and the independent variables provides the required condition for mediation (MacKinnon, Coxe & Baraldi, 2012) i.e. for a mediation model, X (independent variable) causes Y (dependent variable) through the mediating variable (M).

4.3 Model and Hypothesis Testing

Chapter 2 discusses the idea that high commitment HR practices have a positive relationship with perceived organizational support (POS) and a negative relationship with job turnover. The model proposed in Chapter 2 discusses that the HR practices (organizational justice, developmental experience, job security, and job autonomy) influence perceived organizational support. However, it was proposed that the relationship between HR practices and perceived organizational support would likely be moderated by perceived supervisor support, given that supervisors are the agents most likely to engage in activities and processes related to these practices. In turn, it was mooted that perceived organizational support positively influences affective commitment and job satisfaction which in turn may lead to a reduction in turnover intentions. It was argued, however, that the relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions was unlikely to be direct; rather it was suggested that relationship would be mediated by job satisfaction and affective commitment. Further, it was proposed that turnover intentions may indirectly lead to actual turnover through its mediating relationship with job satisfaction. Nine hypotheses were proposed in order to test these relationships.

Structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to test the proposed relationships between the independent variables, the mediating variable (POS), the moderating variable
(perceived supervisor support) and the dependent variables (turnover intentions, job satisfaction and affective commitment). This was done using MPlus (Muthen & Muthen, 2010). Demographic variables, gender, age, marital status and work duration within the organization were used as control variables in order to ensure that they did not distort the results.

In light of the results of confirmatory factor analysis, a higher order variable “developmental experience” was created by combining “training” and “growth opportunities”. Similarly, a higher order variable, organizational justice was created by combining procedural justice and distributive justice. These two higher order variables (i.e. developmental experience and organizational justice) and two other variables (i.e. job security and job autonomy) were modelled as predictor variables to predict perceived organizational support. At the same time, these four predictor variables were modelled to predict “affective commitment”, “job satisfaction” and “turnover intentions”. Perceived organizational support was modelled to predict “affective commitment”, “job satisfaction” and “turnover intentions”. And lastly, affective commitment and job satisfaction were modelled to predict “turnover intentions”. This sequence of paths creates a mediated path from HR practices to turnover intentions via POS, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. Demographic variables gender, marital status, work duration, and age were used as controls. MPlus by default allows the independent variables to covary, so all independent variables were allowed to covary accordingly. To assess the potential for common-method variance a fictional variable “common method factor” (CMF) was created and included in the model. It has been estimated that up to a third of the variance in measures and observed relationships in the psychological and management research may be attributable to CMV (Johnson, Rosen & Djurdjevic, 2011; Doty & Glick, 1998; Williams, Cote & Buckley, 1989). As data collected in the first wave of the study was self-reported, and the same format of the questionnaire was used for all respondents,
there was possibility of common method bias. Podsakoff et al. (2003) mentioned that sources of common method variance could be many. From the list of potential sources of common method variance suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003), three sources were particularly relevant to the current study i.e. common rater effects, common scale formats, predictor and criterion variables measured in the same location. Thus in order to control the common method bias, the variable CMF was modelled to have direct effects on all of the manifest items in the model. This effect was restrained to be the same for all the variables. Results indicate that the common factor CMF has a significant relationship with all the items in the model. The variable “common method factor” is controlled in the model. The use of variable “common method factor” is recommended in the literature (Biderman, Nguyen, Cunningham & Ghorbani, 2011; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Thus common method variance has been controlled for statistically by adding a latent common method factor that loads equally on all the items in the study. In that way, the estimated relationships between variables are cleaned of any potential common method source. What this method does not show, however, is what the source of the common method variance would be (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

The same model was repeated by replacing actual turnover with turnover intentions in order to compare the results of two models. The actual turnover data was collected at a different point, in the second wave of data collection. The rest of the model was the same, and thus the relationship of HR practices and mediating variables was tested with the new outcome variable, actual turnover.
4.3.1 Moderation Effect of Supervisor’s Support

The overall measurement model discussed above includes supervisor support as a moderating variable between the independent variables and perceived organizational support. The hypothesis testing proceeded by first testing, whether supervisor support did indeed have a moderating effect. This was also done to ascertain whether this moderating variable should be included in the measurement model used for rest of the data analysis. Therefore, hypothesis 5 is tested in this section. In order to test hypothesis 5, “Supervisor support (PSS) moderates the positive relationships between high commitment HR practices and POS”, the moderating effects of PSS on the relationship between the independent variables (organizational justice, developmental experience, job security, and job autonomy) and perceived organizational support were calculated. The moderating role of perceived supervisor support was tested separately for each independent variable (IV). Four models were created, which were identical except for the included interaction effect, as it was not possible to test all the variables together due to the limited calculatory power of the software. Testing for moderating effects on all IVs-POS paths at once would have resulted in a model too complex to be estimated.

Table 4.2 presents the estimated interaction effects of perceived supervisor support (PSS) with all four independent variables for the full model. As can be seen, all interaction effects were nonsignificant. Perceived supervisor support (PSS) does not, therefore, moderate the relationship between any independent variable and POS. Thus hypothesis 5 “PSS moderates the positive relationships between high commitment HR practices and POS.” is not supported.
### Table 4.2 Test of Moderation of Perceived Supervisor Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSS x OJC</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS x DEX</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS x SEC</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS x AUT</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized estimates. (OJC = Organizational Justice, DEX = Developmental Experience, POS = Perceived organisational support, SEC = Job Security, AUT = Job Autonomy, JST = Job satisfaction, TOI = Turnover intentions, ACM = Affective commitment, PSS = Perceived supervisor support)

Since, as illustrated in Table 4.2 hypothesis 5 is not supported, supervisor support was dropped from the model in the subsequent analyses. In the next stage the hypothesized model presented in chapter 2 was tested but the variable “supervisor support” was omitted. Additionally, a small variation between the model tested and the theoretical model given in chapter 2 was introduced. In the hypothesized model, turnover intentions were taken as a precursor of actual turnover. However due to the limitations of the data collected and the difficulty of running a complex model, turnover intentions and actual turnover were used as two different indicators of employee turnover.
4.3 Direct relationships and mediated paths

Hypotheses 1 to 4 presumed that HR practices (IVs) i.e. Developmental Experiences (DEX), Organizational Justice (OJC) (Job Autonomy (AUT) and Job Security (SEC) would have a positive relationship with perceived organizational support (POS). The direct effects of these IVs are reported in table 4.2.

Mackinnon et al’s (2012) recommendations were followed to test all mediation hypotheses (i.e. H1, H2, H3, H4, H6, H7). They noted that modern methods of mediation analysis use “structured equation modelling, to quantify the mediated effect as a single number of confidence intervals and a significance test are calculated. The theory of mediation states that there is a causal relation in a mediation model, such that X causes M and M causes Y. Therefore, the mediated effect of X to Y via M can be quantified as the product of a regression coefficient relating X to M and the regression coefficient relating M to Y.” (p.8). This method of testing indirect effects is more powerful than Baron and Kenny (1986) whose four step method tests the effect of X on Y when a mediation variable M is controlled. The Baron and Kenny (1986) method does not test the significance of the indirect pathway—that X affects Y through the compound pathway of a and b. In addition, it tends to miss some true mediation effects (MacKinnon et al., 2007). As the analysis for the current research was performed using MPlus in which the significance of indirect paths is calculated; it follows the Mackinnon et al. (2012) method.

Hypothesis 1 “Developmental experience are positively associated with POS” is not supported as the relationship between job developmental experience and POS is not significant p>.05
Hypotheses 2a (Procedural Justice is positively associated with POS) and 2b (Distributive Justice is positively associated with POS) were tested simultaneously as the present model combined distributive and procedural justice into the composite or higher order variable Organization Justice (OJC). The results indicate that organizational justice (OJC) has a non-significant relationship with POS at significance level of .05. Thus hypotheses 2a and 2b are not supported.

Hypothesis 3 “Job autonomy is positively associated with POS” is supported as the relationship between job autonomy and POS is significant p<.05.

Hypothesis 4, “Job security is positively associated with POS” is supported as the relationship between job security (SEC) and POS is significant p<.01)

Thus out of the four HR practices tested here, training and development and justice do not have a significant relationship with perceived organizational support while job autonomy and job security are positively associated with perceived organizational support.

Table 4.3 Unstandardized Estimates of Direct Effects of Developmental Experiences (DEX), Organizational Justice (OJC) (Job Autonomy (AUT) and Job Security (SEC) on Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEX</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJC</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next step of the analysis, it was tested whether the relationship between POS and turnover intentions would be mediated by affective commitment (ACM) and job satisfaction (JST). The following two hypotheses were tested related to mediation:

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by job satisfaction

Hypothesis 7: The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by organizational commitment

This was done by estimating the specific and total indirect effects of POS on TOI through these two variables. Table 4.4 presents the two effects. The results indicate that the relationship between perceived organizational support-job satisfaction and turnover intentions is non-significant indicating that job satisfaction does not mediate the relationship between POS and TOI. Thus hypothesis 6, which states “The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by job satisfaction” is not supported. Similar results are also found for the relationship between perceived organizational support, affective commitment (ACM) and Turnover intentions (TOI) which indicates that ACM does not mediate the relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions. Thus hypothesis 7, which states that “The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by organizational commitment”, is not supported.
Table 4.4- Indirect effects of perceived organizational support (POS) on Turnover Intentions (TOI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through JST</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through ACM</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.1.18</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined effect through JST and ACM</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized estimates.

JST=job satisfaction, TOI=turnover intentions, ACM= affective commitment

As both hypotheses 6 and 7 which are related with mediation were not supported, some further analysis was carried out to explore possible reasons for the absence of the mediation. The direct effects of POS on affective commitment, job satisfaction (mediating variables) and turnover intentions (outcome variables) were analysed. The direct effects of perceived organizational support on “job satisfaction” were nonsignificant (B=.1.37, SE B 1.00, P>.05). Likewise, the direct effects of POS on affective commitment were nonsignificant too (B=.1.37 SE B 1.02, P>.05).

Table 4.5, meanwhile, shows estimates of the direct effects of the mediating variables (Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment) on the outcome variables as mentioned in condition 2 above.

The results presented in the last paragraph indicate that the estimates of the direct effect of POS on job satisfaction and affective commitment are non-significant. On the other hand, table 4.5 illustrates that the estimate of the direct effect of job satisfaction on turnover intentions is marginally significant (p<.10), while the direct effect of affective commitment on turnover intentions is significant (p<.05). This suggests that the absence of mediation (hypothesis 6 and 7) is mainly due to the absence of direct effects of POS on both the mediating and outcome variables. This is a very interesting finding which
suggests that POS does not have an effect on affective commitment and job satisfaction. The results appear to indicate that positive perceptions about the organization do not translate into affective commitment or job satisfaction.
Table 4.5 Unstandardized Estimates of Direct Effects of Job Satisfaction Affective Commitment and Perceived Organisational Support on Turnover Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JST</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis was conducted by replacing “turnover intentions” with “actual turnover” in order to check whether modelling “turnover intentions” as the outcome variable produced the same results as modelling actual turnover as the outcome variable. The direct relationship of POS with job satisfaction (JST) and affective commitment (ACM) was calculated. The direct effect of perceived organizational support on “job satisfaction” was significant (B=-.49, SE B .25, P<.05 (p=.046)). Similarly, the direct effect of POS on affective commitment was significant too (B=-.94 SE B .34, P<.05 (p=.007). There is an interesting contrast. When turnover intentions are substituted for actual turnover, the direct effects of POS on job satisfaction, affective commitment become statistically significant (p<.05).

Similarly, table 4.6 presents the results analysing the direct effects of job satisfaction and affective commitment on actual turnover (while table 4.5 presents results with turnover intentions as the outcome variable). The results indicate a marginally significant relationship between job satisfaction and actual turnover (p<.10) similar to turnover intentions while the direct effect of affective commitment on actual turnover is non-
significant. Compared to the relationship with turnover intentions, Perceived organizational support has a marginally significant relationship with “actual turnover”.

Table 4.6 Unstandardized Estimates of Direct Effects of Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment on Actual Turnover

| Direct effect of Job Satisfaction (JST) and Affective Commitment on Actual Turnover (ATO) |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|
| **Estimates** | **S.E** | **P Value** |
| JST | .78 | .46 | .090 |
| ACM | .05 | .622 | .927 |
| POS | 4.04 | 2.09 | .054 |

Unstandardized estimates.
POS = Perceived organisational support, JST = job satisfaction, TOI = turnover intentions, ACM = affective commitment.

Hypothesis 8 states that “The relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover is mediated by turnover intentions” and hypothesis 9 states that “The relationship between job satisfaction and actual turnover is mediated by turnover intentions”. As the number of responses obtained for the measurement of actual turnover (ATO) were insufficient, incorporating ATO in the model could suppress the results, and thus testing hypotheses 8 and 9 was not possible.

Instead, a separate model was run in which turnover intentions were substituted by actual turnover in order to calculate the total indirect effects of the independent and mediating variables and whether these results corresponded with the total indirect paths calculated for TOI. Replacing turnover intentions with ATO provides an opportunity to test the model with an alternative measure of employee turnover behaviour. Further, as the data about the actual turnover was collected at a different time scale, it would potentially verify the results of the data collected in the first wave.
As testing hypothesis 8 and 9 was not possible through the structured equation model run through Mplus, correlation results were used to test these hypotheses. Although correlation results are not a very good measure for testing hypotheses, in the current study this is the only possible way of testing hypothesis 8 and 9.

As discussed in preceding paragraphs, all mediation hypotheses (H1, H2, H3, H4, H6, H7) are tested using procedure recommended by Mackinnon et al. (2012). However, Mackinnon et al. (2012) warned that sample size is very important in mediation models. Small samples can distort the results of mediation models. As explained in the previous paragraphs, for testing hypotheses 8 and 9, the number of responses for actual turnover (ATO) were insufficient for a mediation model, and incorporating ATO into the model could potentially suppress the results. Therefore hypotheses 8 and 9 were tested using correlations. For mediation, predictor variables should have correlations with outcome variables, and mediating variables should have relationships with the outcome variables. The correlation table indicates that turnover intentions are correlated with actual turnover, however neither job satisfaction nor affective commitment have significant relationships with the actual turnover. Therefore, hypothesis 8 and 9 are not supported.
Table 4.7 Total Indirect Effect of Independent Variables via perceived organizational support (POS), Affective Commitment (ACM), Job Satisfaction (JST) on Turnover Intentions (TOI) / Actual Turnover (ATO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect effects of Independent Variables on Turnover Intentions (TOI) Via POS, ACM and JST</th>
<th>Indirect effects of Independent Variables on Actual Turnover (ATO) Via POS, ACM and JST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEX</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJC</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OJC = Organizational Justice, DEX = Developmental Experience, POS = Perceived organisational support, SEC = Job Security, AUT = Job Autonomy, JST = Job satisfaction, TOI = turnover intentions, ACM = affective commitment)
### Table 4.8 Total Direct Effects of Independent and Mediating Variables on Turnover Intentions (TOI) / Actual Turnover (ATO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct effects of Independent and Mediating Variables on Turnover Intentions (TOI)</th>
<th>Direct effects of Independent and Mediating Variables on Actual Turnover (ATO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimates</strong></td>
<td><strong>S.E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEX</td>
<td>-5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJC</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OJC = Organizational Justice, DEX = Developmental Experience, POS = Perceived organisational support, SEC = Job Security, AUT = Job Autonomy, JST = Job satisfaction, TOI = Turnover intentions, ACM = Affective commitment)
Table 4.7 outlines the indirect effects of the independent variables on turnover intentions and actual turnover through perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction (JST) and affective commitment (ACM). Results for turnover intentions (TOI) and actual turnover (ATO) are presented side by side in this table. The total indirect effects of all the independent variables via perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction (JST) and affective commitment (ACM) were found to be nonsignificant in terms of their relationship to both turnover intentions and actual turnover. The results of the analysis of the total indirect effects on Actual turnover (ATO) present a comparison with the total indirect effects of HR practices on Turnover intentions (TOI).

As the total indirect effects of the independent variables on turnover intentions and actual turnover through perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction (JST) and affective commitment (ACM) were nonsignificant, it was worthwhile to look at the total direct effects of all the variables. The results are presented in table 4.8 which indicates that only job security and affective commitment have significant relationships with turnover intentions and actual turnover while organizational justice has a marginally significant relationship with turnover intentions (P<.10). On the right hand side of the table, the direct effects calculations indicate that job autonomy and perceived organizational support have significant relationships with the actual turnover. Meanwhile developmental experience (DEX), organizational justice (OJC), job security (SEC) and job satisfaction (JST) have a marginally significant relationship with actual turnover (P<.10). These marginally significant results may be due to the small sample size available for actual turnover. The significance level may increase if the sample size is increased.

A summary of the hypotheses is given in table 4.11 which indicates that H3 and H4 were supported while H1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 were not supported.
Table 4.9 Summary of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported/Not Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. Developmental experience is positively associated with POS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2a Procedural Justice is positively associated with POS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2b Distributive Justice is positively associated with POS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3 Job autonomy is positively associated with POS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.4 Job security is positively associated with POS</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.5 Supervisor support (PSS) moderates the positive relationships between high commitment HR practices and POS</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6. The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by job satisfaction</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7. The relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by organizational commitment</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8. Relationship between organizational commitment and actual turnover is mediated by turnover intentions</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and actual turnover is mediated by turnover intentions</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total indirect effects of the independent variables via the path through perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction (JST) and affective commitment (ACM) on turnover intentions were nonsignificant. Similarly, the total indirect effects of the independent variables through the same path on actual turnover were nonsignificant too.

Thus the results of both measurement models (utilising either turnover intentions or actual turnover) support each other. However, the results varied between the two models (with TOI and with ATO) when the direct effects of the independent variables were calculated on TOI and ATO. The difference in results may be due to the difference in sample size. Further, there could be theoretical reasons for the difference in the results which will be discussed in the next chapter.

4.4 Summary of the Chapter

The correlation matrix indicates that all independent and dependent variables are correlated. Then the data was analysed using structured equation modelling to test the theoretical model and hypothesized relationships. Supervisor support was examined as a moderating variable. The results indicate that supervisor support did not have an
influence on the relationship between HR practices and perceived organizational support. Among the four HR practices tested, only two practices job autonomy and job security were found to have predicted POS while justice and developmental experience did not predict POS. Further analysis reveals that POS does not mediate the relationship between any HR practice and turnover intentions or actual turnover. The next chapter will discuss theoretical and methodological explanations of the results presented in this chapter.
Chapter 5: Analysis and Discussion

5.1. Introduction

The last chapter presented the results of the correlations and hypothesized relationships. As the last chapter presented the statistical results, the next logical step is to discuss these results in the light of theory and the context of the study. Thus, this chapter will discuss the results presented in the previous chapter relating to the relationship between HR practices and perceived organizational support; the influence of supervisor support on the relationship between HR practices and POS; and the relationship between POS and turnover intentions/actual turnover through mediating variables. In addition, the direct effects of HR practices on turnover intentions and actual turnover will also be discussed. The results are compared with previous studies and similarities and differences between the current study and the POS literature are discussed. The chapter also discusses the findings with a backdrop of contextual and situational factors that can potentially influence the relationship between HR practices, POS and turnover intentions. Toward the end of the chapter, contributions, limitations and future areas of research are discussed. As the aims of this research were to examine the role of perceived organizational support in the relationship between HR practices and turnover processes and to further examine the role of perceived supervisor support as a moderating variable between these variables, the discussion focuses on these aims. In addition, as the research also aims to investigate the generalizability of Allen et al’s (2003) model in the Pakistani context, the results are also discussed in light of this cultural context.

The discussion in this chapter should be read in light of the research methodology and statistical models explained in the previous chapters. In contrast with some of the previous studies in the POS literature, the current study tested a complete model using
MPlus in which the effect of HR practices on turnover intentions was tested through the mediating variables Perceived Organizational Support (POS), job satisfaction and affective commitment. In addition, the statistical model includes direct paths from HR practices to affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions/turnover. This is consistent with Eisenberger et al. (1986) and Steers and Mowday (1981) who proposed that HR practices can have a direct impact on turnover besides indirect effects. Thus the results present a comprehensive picture in which important HR practices, potential moderators, and potential mediators were modelled together. This may also have impacted on the results as it is a different approach from the simple regression models reported in some other studies.

5.2. HR practices and POS

5.2.1 Overall Experience or Individual Components?
HR practices have long been believed to have an impact on employees’ perceptions about the organization and job outcomes. A number of studies argue that high commitment HR practices are linked to positive perceptions and job attitude outcomes as they signify an investment in employees (Sun et al., 2007; Guthrie, 2001; Huselid, 1995; Arthur, 1994).

The POS literature has examined the impact of a number of HR practices on employees’ perceptions about the organization. In the current study training, growth opportunities, procedural justice, distributive justice, job security and job autonomy were proposed to have an impact on perceived organizational support and through POS, on turnover behaviour. Based on the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) presented in chapter 3, two higher order variables were created. First a higher order variable “developmental experience” was created by combining “training” and “growth opportunities”. This was deemed appropriate since the CFA does indicate that training and growth opportunities load onto a higher factor, but it is important to examine if this is theoretically plausible.
The results of the CFA are in line with contemporary literature on training and growth opportunities in the POS stream. Over the last decade, there has been an increasing trend in the literature to focus on assessing employees’ perceptions about the whole developmental experience rather than assessing “basic training” in relation with POS (Kraimer et al., 2011; Armstrong-Stassen & Ursel, 2009; Tansky & Cohen, 2001; Wayne et al., 1997; Cleveland & Shore, 1992). If training is not part of the overall developmental experience, it would be perceived as an extra burden on employees rather than one which contributes to the development of positive feelings about the organization.

Caligiuri, Lazarova and Tarique (2005) noted that training tends to be individually-focused with a present (or near-future) orientation while development has a broader organizational focus with a future-oriented time frame. Training addresses particular deficiencies in individuals, develops specific competencies, and focuses on more tangible aspects of improving performance, while development, on the other hand, tends to be broader and linked to improving organizational competence to fulfil a strategic need in the future. Thus training that is focused mainly on fulfilling skills deficiencies may be viewed as an organizational requirement by employees while the overall developmental experience is more likely viewed as a favourable HR practice that is potentially beneficial for both the organization and employees. Armstrong-Stassen and Ursel (2009) combined training and development activities as a single HR practice. Tansky and Cohen (2001) noted that developmental opportunities and employee’s development goals go side by side. Thus development opportunities provided through job training and employees’ development goals provided through growth opportunities formulate the overall developmental experience. The results of the current study are therefore in line with the emerging trend to use overall the developmental experience as a favourable HR practice in POS and related streams of studies.
These results have both theoretical and practical implications. Using a higher order construct, developmental experience, potentially provides a more integrated and comprehensive measure representing developmental practices in the HR literature. At the same time, managers need to pay attention to the overall developmental experience while designing training programmes for employees.

Similarly the other higher order variable Organizational Justice created by combining procedural justice and distributive justice is also in line with the previous literature. Although there is some disagreement as to whether dimensions of organizational justice should be used on their own or as an integrated construct, the recent literature treats procedural and distributive justice as dimensions of a higher order construct, organizational justice (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Hauenstein, McConigle & Flinder, 2001; Törnblom & Vermunt, 1999). Some researchers have focused on measuring specific dimensions of organizational justice (i.e. procedural and distributive) as different constructs; others have questioned the benefits of focusing exclusively on specific types of justice. A number of researchers have favoured using overall justice perceptions instead of individual dimensions (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Hauenstein et al., 2001; Törnblom & Vermunt, 1999). Lind (2001) states that it is an overall sense of justice rather than individual components of justice that drives employee behaviour. Similarly, Shapiro (2001) also favours using an integrated measure of justice perceptions as she argues that victims of injustice react to their general experience of injustice rather than its individual components. The results of the current research are therefore in line with the recent trend in which overall justice perceptions are used in relation to job outcomes (Ambrose, Wo & Griffith, 2015; Barclay & Kiefer, 2014; Priesemuth, Arnaud & Schminke, 2013).

It may be argued that focusing on an integrated evaluation of justice not only offers a robust and holistic picture in terms of theory but also helps managers and policy makers to design their policies by keeping in mind broader implications of general experiences of
justice instead of going into minute, difficult to manage, details. This would potentially result in policies that are easier to implement with less practical complications.

5.2.2. Developmental Experience and POS

The results presented in chapter 4 indicate that developmental experience was not found to be related to perceived organizational support (POS). This finding contrasts with some previous studies which suggest training and development is related with positive perceptions about organizations. These studies argue that as developmental experience represents training, growth and personal development opportunities within the organization, they signify positive discretionary treatment that enhances positive perceptions about the extent of organizational support (Armstrong-Stassen & Ursel, 2009; Mullen, Kroustalis, Meade & Surface, 2006; Pack, 2005; Aryee & Chen, 2004; Wayne et al., 1997). Joarder, Sharif and Ahmmed (2011) argued that employees make a positive evaluation of the organization only if the development opportunities offered are seen as a ladder to climb up to higher positions. Organizations may have well documented policies about training and growth, yet practical implementations may be different than those of documented policies. Organizational policies alone do not lead to the development of a positive perception about the organization unless they are accompanied by their effective implementation. Employees’ perceptions tend to develop on the basis of what they experience in reality rather than what is documented in policies. In other words, actual developmental experience is likely to develop POS rather than documented growth policies.

Although the majority of the literature reports a positive relationship of developmental experience and positive job outcomes, an interesting study by Chow (2002) has somewhat different findings. It is important to pay special consideration to this study due to its context. The study was conducted in five Asian countries, namely, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan and Thailand. The study found that growth and learning
opportunities are negatively related with positive job outcomes (i.e. job commitment). A similar study conducted in China by Chow, Lo, Sha and Hong (2006) found no relationship between developmental opportunities and sense of pride. Although sense of pride is not, on the face of it, theoretically close construct to perceived organizational support, nonetheless, the absence of a relationship between developmental experience with positive outcomes may warrant careful analysis. Both of these studies were conducted in different Asian countries and have produced contradictory findings compared with those conducted in the West. A study conducted in the Middle East (Israel) mentioned that employees attach more importance to social relations with peers and the respect they gain from peers compared to their level of professional development (Bogler & Nir, 2012). This suggests that the importance attached to developmental experience may be relatively low in certain contexts and thus may not contribute towards positive job outcomes.

The potential absence of a relationship in the current research between developmental experience and perceived organizational support may also be due to trust-deficit and low transparency in the training and development system. Employees experience a trust-deficit when they have low confidence in an exchange partner's (employer's) reliability and integrity and thus they are less willing to respond to the employer's actions (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). In turn, low confidence in the organization may stem from low transparency. Transparency is defined as the extent to which the organization provides relevant, timely, and reliable information, in written and verbal form, to its employees. A low level of transparency is common in many Asian countries where favouritism/nepotism often overshadow formal training and growth systems (Islam, 2004). As a result, employees may not have faith in the fairness of the developmental system leading to a weak or no link with positive organizational practices or job outcomes, an interpretation supported by the current study as discussed in the next section.
5.2.3. Organizational Justice and POS

Organizational Justice was not found to be related to perceived organizational support (POS). This finding is in contrast with some notable studies which suggest that organizational justice is positively related to perceived organizational support as it creates a positive perception about the organization. Employees feel that they are treated fairly and they are getting the compensation and rewards that they deserve when there is transparency in the procedure embedded in reward distribution (Lavelle, Rupp & Brockner, 2007; Masterson, 2001; Morris & Leung, 2000; Moorman, 1991). These studies indicate that unfairness in reward and reward procedures is not acceptable to employees and thus perceptions of justice lead to positive perceptions of the organization and positive job outcomes. However, some other studies report different findings. Farh, Earley and Lin (1997) reported that the effects of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour were stronger for those employees with non-traditionalist (modern orientation) than those of traditionalists. Traditionalist employees are those who tend to stick with conventional cultural values and are less inclined towards more contemporary trends. Such people are less welcoming to changing cultural values and modern trends. Their actions are influenced by their inclination towards conventional values and they are more influenced by such conventions rather than material objectives. On the other hand, non-traditionalists are inclined towards modern values and pay more attention to material objectives than upholding conventions. Farh et al (1997) argued that the importance attached to justice in rewards and reward distribution procedures is influenced by the extent to which employees value materialism that is the relative importance placed on the acquisition and possession of income, wealth, and material goods. In relatively less material societies, organizational justice may be less strongly
associated with positive outcomes, such as POS, simply because employees are less likely to develop such values.

Another comparative study between the US and three Asian countries Japan, Korea and China produced similar findings. The study noted that the effect of justice was stronger on positive job outcomes in the US compared with Korea and China due to the different levels of materialism these cultures experience (Kim & Leung, 2007)

Another explanation for the absence of a relationship between organizational justice and positive job outcomes in the current study is “tolerance towards injustice”. Discussing the Chinese culture, Zhang, Farh and Wang (2012) argued that neutrality is the key component of organizational justice. ‘Guanxi’ (the system of social networks and influential relationships which facilitate business and other dealings) on the other hand, which emphasizes interpersonal relationships, harmony, and favourability, is prevalent in China which may in turn weaken employee trust in formal justice systems. Employees tend to focus more on building Guanxi than expecting conformity to distributive and procedural justice system. As in China, Guanxi or personal relationships overrule formal systems; favouritism and nepotism are also widespread in the Indian Subcontinent (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh). The caste system “Bratheri” (meaning brotherhood due to member of a caste, clan or tribe”) is widely prevalent and managers’ decisions to promote employees are often influenced by nepotism or loyalty to the group. Thus maintaining cordial relationships with seniors in order to obtain benefits is common as many employees believe that informal personal relationships are more important than sticking to the documented rules and regulations in the organization. As a result, a lower level of importance is attached to the formal justice system, and “tolerance towards injustice” is high as employees generally do not see any efficient legal forum to address their concerns (IMF, 2010). This reasoning is in line with Islam (2004), Vanhanen (1991) and Wilson (2003)
5.2.3 Job security

Job security (SEC) was found to be a significant predictor of POS which is consistent with previous studies (Rosenblatt, Talmud & Ruvio, 1999; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996; Shore, Tetrick, Sinclair & Newton, 1994). Although POS does provide evidence that job security is positively related with POS, surprisingly, not much attention is paid to job security in the POS literature. With the exception of a very few studies (e.g. Lee and Pecci, 2007), most studies use job security as part of an umbrella construct and thus analyses in these studies do not pay sufficient attention to job security (see Bogler and Nir (2012), Kinnunen, Feldt and Makikangas (2008)). For example, Bogler and Nir (2012) did not measure job security as an independent construct, and only one item relating to satisfaction with job security was included in the overall measure of “extrinsic job satisfaction”. Since job security was not analysed separately as a construct, it is not feasible to use the results from this study to develop realistic theoretical implications for the role of job security in the experience of POS. Not only has job security not been sufficiently analysed as a construct in itself instead of being measured as one dimension of an umbrella construct, but there is a lack of attention to the possible relationship subsisting between job security and POS (see review of Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011).

I propose that in order to better explain the positive relationship between job security and perceived organizational support, we need to pay attention to four broad factors namely economic conditions, “attractiveness of alternatives”, social protection programmes and cultural factors. Each of these factors will now be discussed.

The perceived organizational support literature regards job security as a discretionary practice that indicates care and trust in employees. This line of argument may need further discussion. It may be argued that in tough economic conditions when unemployment rates are high, employees value job security relatively highly than when
there are favourable economic conditions prevailing (Clark, Knabe & Ratzel, 2010). In line with social exchange theory, if employers provide job security at a time of unfavourable economic situations when organizations themselves are pressured, then it is regarded as a discretionary favourable practice by employees leading to higher POS. However if the economic conditions are favourable, creating sizable new jobs, then job security is not so much of a concern for employees, since demand for employee talent may exceed its supply. Looking at the Pakistani economic conditions and overall economic conditions of the region characterized by slow economic recovery after the recession, it may be expected that job security is an important contributor towards POS.

The value employees attach to job security is also influenced by the “attractiveness of alternatives” available. The banking industry is considered one of the top paying industries in Pakistan. There is stiff competition among banks and thus banks are investing heavily to upgrade their human resources. Over the last two decades, the banking sector has become a preferred choice for young graduates (Hussain, n.d.). Due to the growing banking sector in a relatively weaker overall economy, the desire to maintain jobs with banks may increase. This reasoning is in line with Heaney et al. (1994) who argued that the relative importance of job security and its relationship with work outcomes is influenced by industry and contextual factors.

Social protection programmes also influence the importance attached to job security and the extent to which job security contributes towards positive perceptions of the organization (Anderson & Pontusson, 2007). Lack of social protection programmes (i.e. unemployment allowance, children benefits for low income people or free medical for jobless people) puts employees at higher risk in case of unemployment, thus employees are likely to have higher POS for those organizations who provide job security. There is not much research in this area. Future research may compare contexts with varying levels of social protection and its impact on work outcomes. Since social protection in
developing and underdeveloped countries is very low, the results of the study are plausible to the arguments.

And lastly, the cultural factors in the Pakistani including large families, joint family system, and responsibly for looking after financial and care needs of elderly parents mean that individuals are likely to attach higher value to job security. Elderly parents generally live with one of their children who look after their financial and other living needs. Thus an employee is not only responsible for looking after his wife and children but also elderly parents who in many cases do not receive any pension or other state benefits. If a person becomes unemployed, it not only has consequences for the spouse and children but also for elderly parents. Given that such an employee is financially responsible for the needs of the extended family, the value attached to job security is likely to be higher as job loss may bring about an adverse financial situation for the whole family. Thus job security leads to positive perceptions about the organization. Future studies may look into the role of family size and structure in the job security – POS relationship.

5.2.4 Job Autonomy

The results indicate that job autonomy is a significant predictor of perceived organizational support. The relationship between job autonomy and POS is consistent with Yoon and Thye (2002) and Yoon and Lim (1999). Neither study reported the direction of the relationship or causal relationship; however a positive correlation between POS and job autonomy was reported.

Like job security, the literature on job autonomy in the POS stream is under developed. No studies in the POS literature were found that reported a causal relationship between job autonomy and POS. However the results of the current study, that job autonomy predicts POS, seem logically plausible as job autonomy empowers employees to be able to take decisions on their own. Empowerment to make decisions signifies trust in
employees and thus it would contribute towards the overall positive perception about the organization. Moreover some studies in related streams of literature also found job autonomy to be the predictor of positive job outcomes including job satisfaction (DeCarlo & Agarwal, 1999; Abraham, 1998), commitment (Ahuja et al., 2007; Ito & Brotheridge, 2005; Mannheim & Schiffri, 1984) and turnover intentions (Ahuja et al., 2007; Ito & Brotheridge, 2005). However, some other studies reported no correlation between autonomy and positive job outcomes (Bhuian, Al-shammari & Jefri, 2001; Weaver, 1977). The current study confirms the findings of the studies that reported a positive relationship between job autonomy and perceived organizational support.

Au and Cheung (2004) analysed data from 42 countries and concluded that there were considerable variations in the level of job autonomy employees enjoy and its effects on job outcomes. It is argued that the value attached to job autonomy may be contingent on the cultural context as well as industry requirements. In industries where employees are required to deal with customers directly, employees tend to attach high value to job autonomy and this leads to higher perceptions of organizational support. For instance, customer’s pressure to get their issues resolved in the shortest possible time requires a certain degree of autonomy. Similarly, a lack of autonomy will result in inefficient working in customer driven industries which can incur negative effects. By giving autonomy to employees in such industries, the organization shows confidence in their ability to independently deal with customers as well as confidence in the employee’s capabilities. This, therefore, has a direct bearing on the employee’s ability to perform. As this study was conducted in the banking sector where most employees are extensively involved in customer relationships, job autonomy is therefore likely to directly affect their ability to deal with customers.

Secondly, employees in the banking industry are well educated, given that a large majority of such employees are university graduates. It can be argued that the value
attached to job autonomy is higher for educated workers who are capable of handling situations independently in contrast with blue collar workers who are engaged in more repetitive jobs. This is in line with the findings of Ross and Reskin (1992) who found that job autonomy was related to job satisfaction for all workers, but that the effect was much stronger for better-educated workers. POS and closely related streams have not paid attention to exploring the effects of job autonomy on job outcomes for different hierarchical levels, different levels of education and different types of jobs. Yet it seems theoretically plausible that employees working in low skilled jobs requiring repetitive action may attach low importance to job autonomy due to the nature of the work. Blue collar jobs generally have a greater focus on efficiency and output rather than creativity and breadth of job tasks. Job autonomy may have relatively less appeal in efficiency-driven jobs because such workers require well defined, well-structured job procedures that can potentially help them increase efficiency and output. This argument is in line with classical efficiency theories (see Taylor & Towne, 1911) which suggest that efficiency requires clearly defined roles that leave less room for workers’ discretion. On the other hand, white-collar jobs such as those which characterise the banking industry require more influence over job tasks as their functioning involves diverse job situations requiring greater discretion and customer responsiveness (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Sekaran, 1989). Thus job autonomy will contribute more towards positive job outcomes as it can facilitate effective performance of the job. This reasoning is in line with Chiaburu and Byrne (2009) who argued that job satisfaction is linked with role enlargement and that role enlargement itself involves more job autonomy. It is proposed that future studies may extend work in this area to identify whether job autonomy affects all workers alike or whether it generates favourable perceptions only for certain types of jobs and certain levels of hierarchy.
5.2.5. HR Practices and POS – Universally Generalizable?

Although the analysis indicated significant correlations between all the HR practices measured i.e. developmental experience, job security, job autonomy, and organizational justice and POS, the structural equation modelling (SEM) indicated that out of the four HR practices measured in this study, only two of these practices, job security and job autonomy were found to be related with POS. The differences in the results of these two analyses may be due to statistical reasons, or they may indicate differential effects of contextual factors on reactions to certain HR practices as discussed in the previous section. I could not find any previous study that investigated all these practices together in relation to POS and job turnover. As the current study incorporates four different HR practices in one model, the results could reflect methodological rather than theoretical issues.

Some previous studies undertaken in the West have reported a positive relationship between the majority of high commitment HR practices including organizational justice and developmental experience and POS, yet there are contradictory findings suggesting the need to test the generalizability of some of the previous studies in different contexts. Zhang et al. (2012), for instance, found that China has some unique HR practices affecting POS along with some practices common with Western countries. They argued that some HR practices, like career or self-development, are not mature enough in China and thus contribute little to perceived organizational support. They added that self-development was never taken into account before economic reforms were introduced in China due to the fact that employees’ training and self-development was not linked with career advancement and thus had little impact on positive perceptions about the organisation. However, as the market is getting more competitive and the developmental function is maturing with time, there is evidence that this is having an incremental effect on POS and positive job outcomes.
The HR function in Pakistan is also in state of infancy where developmental policies and reward distribution procedures are underdeveloped (Khilji, 2004, 2003). Thus these practices do not have the impact that might be expected when they are neutrally applied to employees across the organization. In other words, in organizations where these HR practices are not mature enough, they may not lead to positive consequences. This reasoning is in line with Farh, Hackett and Liang (2007) who found that cultural factors can moderate the impact of HR practices on job outcomes.

Another potential explanation for the positive relationship between job security and job autonomy and POS, is that one group of practices is highly influenced by contextual and cultural factors while the other group of practices is less culturally contingent. It is suggested here that HR practices having a positive impact can, therefore, be divided into two broad categories. One culturally embedded “more culturally-contingent” set of practices and secondly a “less culturally contingent” set of practices.

It is suggested here that job security and job autonomy belong to the group of practices that are relatively “less culturally contingent” as they are more driven by individual needs and work requirements. Job security, for instance, demonstrates a degree of universality. In line with the classical motivational theory of Maslow (1943), job security is one of the basic human needs linked with the survival instinct. The need for survival has universal attributes and job security is linked with the need for survival (Benson & Dundis, 2003). Job insecurity leads to fear of uncertainty and negative consequences (Dekker & Schaufeli, 1995). Although the value attached to job security varies across cultures and countries due to job market conditions and financial responsibilities on the incumbent (Au & Cheung, 2004), yet the variation and the value attached to job security does indicate that the need for job security is a fundamental need across cultures. So based on this reasoning, it is argued that job security is “less culturally contingent”.
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Similarly, the need for the job autonomy arises from job requirements and the role being performed. For example, managerial roles generally require greater autonomy as low autonomy may seriously undermine managers’ ability to respond to business situations in a timely manner. Ryan and Deci (2000) provide compelling evidence that individuals have a need for autonomy which arises from job roles. Thus job autonomy like job security is individually-focused and “less culturally contingent”. The practices that are individually focused (whether individual needs for survival or individual needs for performance), tend to have greater generalizability across different cultures.

On the other hand, the positive effect of some HR practices may be “more culturally contingent”. Both training and development and organizational justice are influenced by cultural factors as both constructs are underpinned by the extent to which there is cultural tolerance for unequal and unfair treatment. In some cultures, for instance, merit is often ignored to favour employees who are obedient and docile. Given that this study is conducted in Pakistani culture where giving personal favours is widely practiced, the literature suggests that employees tend to show obedience and loyalty to their bosses in Pakistan (Banuri & Eckel, 2012; Islam, 2004). Another factor that promotes injustice in organizations is the collective nature of the society whereby membership of a caste and clan can affect career growth. If the subordinate belongs to the same caste as that of the boss, it may positively affect his/her performance assessment and growth within an organization, even though there is some evidence that this situation is changing (Islam, 2004). Hence, it may be concluded that HR practices do not have a universal impact on job outcomes as some HR practices are highly influenced and shaped by cultural factors.

5.3. Supervisor Support – A moderator or antecedent to POS?

The results presented in the last chapter suggest that supervisor support does not moderate the relationship between any of the HR practices measured (i.e. developmental
experience, organizational justice, job security, and job autonomy) and POS. This is in contrast with the expectations and reasoning presented in chapter 1 and chapter 2. In previous chapters, it was argued that the relationship between HR practices and POS would be moderated by supervisor support as the supervisor’s treatment of employees affects their perceptions of favourable organizational initiatives. In line with this argument, it was reasoned that abusive or unfair supervision may moderate the subordinate’s perception about positive organizational initiatives. This reasoning is in line with Maertz et al. (2007) who suggest that the role of supervisor support goes beyond that of a predictor of POS. They reported that supervisor support has an interaction effect with POS. This reasoning was particularly relevant as the data used in the current study was conducted from different branches of banks that participated. Moreover, it was assumed that the branch climate would be influenced by the branch managers, a relationship that is reported to have a moderating impact on HR practices-job outcome relationship (Den Hartog, Boon, Verburg & Croon, 2013; González-Romá, Fortes-Ferreira & Peiró, 2009).

The absence of a moderating relationship between supervisor support and POS may, therefore, suggest that supervisor support may instead be an antecedent of perceived organizational support or mediator between HR practices and perceived organizational support. A number of studies in the POS literature have reported that supervisor support predicts perceived organizational support (Dawley et al., 2010; Erdogan & Enders, 2007; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Hutchison, 1997; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). In most of these studies perceived supervisor support is seen to be a predictor of POS which then leads to different job outcomes like organizational commitment, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, positive mood and in-role and extra-role behaviour. In other words, the relationship between perceived supervisor support and job outcomes is mediated by POS.
However, some closely related streams of literature indicate that perceived supervisor support may mediate the relationship between HR practices and job outcomes. Kuvaas, Dysvik and Buch (2014) reported that the relationship between perceptions of enabling HR practices and turnover intentions is mediated by supervisor support. In another study, Pan and Yeh (2012) studied the impact of person-organization value congruence on work-family conflict and found that the relationship between the two is mediated by supervisor support. Supportive supervisors acknowledge and accept employees’ desires to balance work and family and support workers with resources to help them fulfil their dual responsibilities. The supplementary analysis given in Appendix 3 of the current study indicates that the relationship between HR practices and perceived organizational support is mediated by supervisor support. All four HR practices included in the current study (i.e. job autonomy, job security, organisational justice, and developmental experience) have a relationship with perceived organizational support via perceived supervisor support. This is possibly because supervisors play an important role in the delivery of HR practices. For example, the job autonomy of subordinates is influenced by a supervisor’s willingness to delegate responsibilities to them. Thus employees come to perceive that the effective delivery of high commitment HR practices is due to supervisor support. Thus they develop positive perceptions about supervisory support that in turn leads to perceived organizational support. This reasoning is in line with Armstrong-Stassen and Schlosser (2010) who studied HR practices tailored to older nurses and found that supervisor-administered HR practices led to perceived supervisor support that in turn led to perceived organizational support.

A possible cultural explanation for the mediating role of supervisor support is the influence of a paternalistic culture. As the study was conducted in Pakistan where relationships between supervisors and employees are very strong, employees are even more likely than their Western counterparts to view organizational actions through their
supervisors. Employees expect a great deal of support from their supervisors (Nadeem, 2013). In an organizational setting where supervisors’ authority is more valued than organizational rules, the value associated with supervisor’s support is likely to be substantial.

Based on the results, therefore, it may be argued that the impact of HR practices on perceived organizational support is not moderated by supervisors; rather supervisor support may potentially be an antecedent of perceived organizational support as suggested in some previous POS literature or even a mediator between HR practices and perceived organizational support as suggested by the supplementary analysis presented in Appendix 3. However, this claim requires further investigation. As the current study was cross sectional in nature, it cannot make any claims regarding the direction of causality. Longitudinal research is needed to verify these results.

Another explanation for the lack of moderation effects of supervisor support is the strength of organizational culture. It can be argued that in organizations with mature cultures, well defined regulations, and supervisory scope, employees may ascribe the majority of supervisors’ actions to the organization’s as it would be difficult for managers to drift from organizational policies to a large extent. Employees regard managers as agents of the organization and actions of the managers are regarded as organization’s own Levinson (1965). This idea of personification has been repeatedly discussed in the POS literature, to suggest that an accumulation of employee experiences concerning rewards and punishments received from agents of the organization over a period of time represent the employer’s commitment to employee wellbeing, termed POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The behaviour and actions of the supervisor are considered to be the organization’s own actions, and affect job outcomes through perceptions of organizational support rather than directly influencing job outcomes. Based on arguments of personification, it may be suggested that if employees believe that their supervisors’
actions are representative of organizational policies, supervisor support will lead to perceptions of organizational support. However if the organizational culture is not mature enough, and supervisors actions violate organizational policies and norms, then in this case, employees are likely to view the organization and supervisors as two separate entities. Superior’s action would not then be considered as actions of the organization yet they would have an impact on employee’s perception of organizational support. It may be suggested that in this situation supervisor support and organizational support may have interaction effects. Future studies, therefore, need to compare the role of supervisor support in organizations with strong cultures and weak cultures. As the banking sector in Pakistan is one of the most developed sectors and the banks included in this study are supposed have strong cultures, it may be argued that the lack of moderating effects found in the current study are a consequence of this strong culture where employees tend to consider supervisor’s actions to be the actions of organization.

5.4. POS and Turnover Intentions/ Turnover

The current study indicates that the direct relationship between POS and turnover intentions is not significant. However the direct relationship between POS and actual turnover is marginally significant (p<.10). The literarture generally suggests that perceived organizational support is likely to have negative effects on turnover behaviour (Allen & Shanock, 2012; McCarthy et al., 2012; Newman et al., 2011a; Riggle et al., 2009). Further, that the relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated through job satisfaction and affective comment.

Contrary to expectations and the evidence in the literature, the results indicate that POS did not predict turnover intentions through the mediating variables job satisfaction and affective commitment since POS was not found to be related to these mediators. When
the variable “actual turnover” was substituted for the variable “turnover intentions”, the results were the same. POS was not found to predict actual turnover in the model. The findings are in contrast with many previous studies which report that the relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover is mediated by affective commitment (Newman et al., 2011a; Allen et al., 2003; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and job satisfaction (Filipova, 2011; Baranik et al., 2010). Allen et al. (2003) reported that the relationship between POS and turnover intentions is mediated by both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. These studies reasoned that POS generates a positive perception of support that generates an obligation on employees. This obligation leads to higher commitment and job satisfaction which in turn lead to lower turnover intentions or turnover.

Thus the finding that there is no relationship between POS and turnover intentions is an interesting finding that does not correspond with the existing literature. More research is needed to explore these relationships in Pakistan. The reason for the results obtained in this study may be due to an underlying psychological variable that moderates the relationship between POS and positive job outcomes in the context of the current study. A possible explanation for the absence of this relationship may be the role of exchange ideology.

Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch and Rhoades (2001) found that the relationship between POS and felt obligations is moderated by social exchange ideology. Exchange ideology refers to an employees’ belief that it is appropriate to base their efforts and concern for the organization on how well the organization treats them (Eisenberger and Stinglhamber, 2011). The relationship between POS and felt obligation (or other job outcomes including commitment) is based on norms of reciprocity. Eisenberger et al (2001) found that although all employees accept the norm of reciprocity to some degree, a stronger relationship between POS and felt obligation was found among employees
with a stronger exchange ideology compared to those with a weaker exchange ideology.

The role of exchange ideology in moderating the POS-felt obligation relationship is consistent with the assumptions of organizational support theory i.e. that POS leads to felt-obligation through norms of reciprocity. Using the same principles, it could be argued that the relationship between POS and affective commitment, job satisfaction or turnover intentions and actual turnover is moderated by exchange ideology.

Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) noted that exchange ideology is influenced by a number of factors including personal history of direct experiences, observation, or colleagues’ attitudes towards reciprocity of the relationship between them and the organization. It could be argued that besides the factors mentioned by Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011), exchange ideology may be influenced by cultural socialization, institutional impact, and overall trust level in the country. Lin (2001) discussed exchange ideology in the Chinese context and noted that individuals and organizations in a society share similar exchange ideologies which is influenced by historical, cultural and institutional factors. In some cultures, reciprocating the favours of others is considered important. A strong exchange ideology enhances the relationships between POS and felt obligations as those who hold strong norms of reciprocity tend to experience a stronger moral obligation to reciprocate organizational favours.

The results of the current study show that the direct effect of affective commitment on turnover intentions is significant while the direct effect of job satisfaction on turnover intentions is marginally significant. However, the direct effect of POS on turnover intentions is not significant, indicating that positive perceptions of support do not lead to a reduction in turnover intentions. This may be because the exchange ideology may be low for the targeted respondents. The potential explanation for low exchange ideology could be low trust of employees in the institutions and the employer. Because of low
trust levels, they may not believe that the positive initiatives by the organizations are deliberately designed to benefit them and thus they do not feel an obligation to reciprocate those initiatives. Further research is needed to explore the antecedents of low exchange ideology in a particular cultural context.

Exchange ideology has not been studied in the current research, however future research could measure exchange ideology to see whether any unexpected, nonsignificant relationships might be due to the influence of that variable. Although the nonsignificant relationship between POS and job outcomes is inconsistent with previous studies, the reasoning above regarding the role of exchange ideology and norms of reciprocity is well founded in the literature.

5.5. Direct effects of HR practices on turnover intentions/ Actual Turnover

When the total indirect effects of HR practices on turnover intentions and actual turnover were compared, both models gave similar results. The indirect effects of all four HR practices were insignificant for both turnover intentions and actual turnover, due to the fact that the mediating variable, perceived organizational support, did not have a significant relationship with affective commitment, job satisfaction, turnover over intentions and actual turnover. The explanation for this relationship is provided in the preceding paragraphs. However, when the direct relationship of HR practices is examined with turnover intentions and actual turnover, the results reveal inconsistencies.

The direct effects of HR practices on turnover intentions were insignificant for developmental experience, organizational justice and job autonomy whereas job security had a significant direct effect on turnover intentions. This latter finding is in line with Sousa-Poza and Henneberger (2004) who reported in a 25 countries study that job
security is the strongest predictor of turnover intentions. On the other hand, in the current study, when turnover intentions are replaced with actual turnover in the model, the direct effects of all four HR practices become significant or marginally significant. As the sample size for actual turnover is fairly small, it may be expected that the significance of these relationships may increase if the sample size was larger. Nonetheless, the difference between the models in which turnover is measured as an intention versus a reality raises some very interesting questions. Specifically, it emphasizes the need to collect actual turnover data in studies looking at the turnover behaviour of employees. As Sverke et al. (2002) observed, actual turnover is often substituted with turnover intentions in empirical research because data on actual turnover are hard to collect. However the results of the current study suggest that substituting turnover intentions for actual turnover may not be entirely appropriate.

Turnover is an important decision that may involve risk (e.g., uncertainty about alternative opportunities), financial costs (e.g., pensions), transaction costs (e.g., moving), and psychological costs (e.g., loss of valued work relationships) (Allen, Weeks & Moffitt, 2005). In tighter economic conditions where job alternatives are low and the cost of leaving a job is very high for the employee and his family, employees do not develop turnover intentions very easily. Rather they develop tolerance to their working conditions, which likely include HR practices. Psychologically, employees want to stay away from the risks associated with actively searching for new jobs that may turn out to be even more unfavourable in terms of working conditions. Thus as long as a job is secure, the impact of those conditions that ordinarily influence turnover intentions, such as supportive HR practices are not given much consideration by employees. In this process, employees may perform a realistic analysis of the possibilities of obtaining alternative employment in tough economic conditions. When they realize that the potential for switching is not very promising, they may lower their expectations about
organizational justice, autonomy and developmental potential and avoid developing turnover intentions, instead experiencing satisfaction with those HR practices that minimally meet their needs for positive regard from the organization.

However, if the job is not secure, the magnitude of the risk associated with losing the job is quite high, and thus job insecurity leads to turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2005). In such a situation the employees want to secure a more stable job before they are made redundant from the current organization. These arguments are in line with the results of the current study which indicates that only job security has a significant direct relationship with turnover intentions. These arguments further support the results of a meta-analysis by Carsten and Spector (1987) who noted that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover was less significant during times of high unemployment and limited employment opportunities and higher during times of low unemployment and expanded opportunity.

A slightly different but related explanation could be the influence of a third variable “employability”. Those who are more employable, when they find their job insecure, are likely to switch to a more secure job while those who are less employable tend to stay with the organization even if the job is not secure (Berntson, Näswall & Sverke, 2010). A further potential explanation is related to the economic situation. Most of the countries in the world were affected by economic recession between 2007 and 2012. The literature suggests that recession may have medium to long term effects on employees’ behaviour and job outcomes (Solberg et al., 2014). Thus it may be argued that the significant relationship between job security and turnover intentions may be due to the effects of economic recession when job security becomes more important than in more economically stable periods.
Nonetheless, when the direct effects of HR practices with “actual turnover” are examined, different results emerge. In this model, all four HR practices have significant or marginally significant (P<.10) negative relationships with “actual turnover”. It may be prudent to include these marginally significant results in this discussion due to the fact that the sample size for actual turnover was very small (n =158), as this may indicate that a larger sample would have increased the effects. The negative relationship between all four HR practices with “actual turnover” is in contrast with the results modelling the relationship between these practices and “turnover intentions”. As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, a possible explanation for the positive relationship between only one high commitment HR practices (i.e. job security) and turnover intentions, is that employees tend to attach relatively low importance to other HR practices (e.g. developmental opportunities) in relation to developing turnover intentions when the possibility of leaving organization is very low. However when they actually find an alternative job, they become more analytical about HR practices like job autonomy, developmental opportunities and organizational justice. This is in line with arguments presented by Direnzo and Greenhaus (2011) who argued that employees’ decisions to voluntarily leave an organization are influenced by their evaluation of opportunities to develop additional competencies in the next job. By weighing up the relative advantages of HR practices of the current organization in relation to the expected HR practices in the potential organization, this may help them make a decision about leaving the job. If employees feel that the current organization offers lower opportunities for development than the next organization, s/he is likely to quit the job. At the time of job switching, the employee tries to make a very cautious analysis of the high commitment HR practices before making a decision to leave the organization. Pelkowski and Berger (2003), for example, noted that employees compare their current job conditions and prospective job conditions at the time of switching. The worker switches jobs if the utility associated with
his current job is low relative to what s/he expects to receive (Barron, Black & Loewenstein, 1993). Thus, the different results obtained from using turnover intentions versus actual turnover as the outcome variable, may be due to how employees evaluate different levels of the positive contribution of HR practices in different employment situations.

The literature suggests turnover intentions are the strongest precursor of actual turnover (Lee & Mowday, 1987; Michaels & Spector, 1982). However the results of the current study indicate that the relationship between HR practices and turnover intentions is not significant while that between HR practices and actual turnover is significant (p<.10). This may potentially imply that turnover intentions may not be a precursor to actual turnover (although turnover intentions are not modeled as precursor of actual turnover in the current study). These results may raise a question about how, in the absense of turnover intentions, actual turnover takes place. What, in other words, persuade employees to switch when they have no turnover intentions or they are not actively searching for jobs?

There are two potential explanations. First, employees may not actively look for another job in normal circumstances, yet sometimes new attractive opportunities arise in the market due to the entry or expansion of large competitors. As employees see lucrative opportunities in the market arising due to the influence of such factors, they may try to take advantage of that opportunity even if they were not considering moving jobs at an earlier stage – that is, employee withdrawal behaviour may be more dynamic than is currently thought. Further, and as discussed above, it is possible that employees’ perceptions about the availability of alternatives may influence the relationship between HR practices and turnover behaviour. The POS and turnover literarture has largely ignored the role of availability of alternatives and job market conditions. Future studies should further expand our understanding of turnover processes by incorporating external conditions into study designs.
A second explanation is related to culture. In many Asian cultures, including Pakistan, India and Bangladesh, job switching is influenced by ex-supervisors or ex-colleagues. In many cases, employees have developed personal relationship/friendships with their supervisors/colleagues due to the collective nature of the culture as reported in a study conducted in China (see Cheung, Wu, Chan & Wong, 2009). In the Pakistani banking sector it is a well-known practice that if a supervisor switches job to another bank, s/he would help his or her ex-subordinates to also switch to the new organization. In these situations, employees may not be actively looking for jobs unless an informal offer is made by their ex-colleagues or ex-supervisor to switch to their current organization. Once an employee recognizes that an opportunity to switch exists, the psychological process starts that re-connects perceptions about HR practices with a decision to switch.

The turnover literature has considered turnover intentions as a precursor of actual turnover and thus the studies which gathered data for both turnover intentions and actual turnover used turnover intentions as the mediating variable leading to actual turnover. These models assume that turnover is the result of negative attitude towards the job (e.g. low commitment, low job satisfaction, high turnover intentions) and thus turnover is seen as a consequence of these job attitudes. In a way, these models ignore the effect of external variables (like the economic situation, job market conditions) and of spontaneous occurrences. By testing “actual turnover” in a separate model instead of examining it as a consequence of turnover intentions in the same model, it is possible to compare the impact of HR practices on “turnover intentions” with the impact of HR practices on “actual turnover”. In the current study, HR practices do not predict turnover intentions, but they do predict actual turnover. One potential reason could be the time gap between measurement of turnover intentions and actual turnover. But there could be other potential reasons. For example, the impact of HR practices on turnover behaviour may change over the time due to changes in the organization itself or changes
in the job market conditions that I have already outlined. More research is needed as to why this difference is found.

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, it is common in Asian countries that if one colleague switches to another organization, she tries to employ/refer his/her colleagues from the previous organization. For example, if a manager switches to a new bank, s/he may try to bring his/her old colleagues to the new bank and thus offer them much better jobs in the new organization. This is sometimes inspired by the collectivist culture and Bratheri (Clan-brotherhood) mentioned earlier. In such cases, even if the employee did not have turnover intentions earlier, when they find a concrete job offer with lucrative job prospects through an ex-colleague, they may decide to switch to the new job. Thus, in such cases, turnover intentions may not predict actual turnover. Further research should explore this important phenomenon by which support of an ex-colleague/ex-supervisors helps employees switch their jobs. It is a widespread practice in a number of Asian countries, yet not studied in the literature.

**5.6. Contributions**

The study makes a number of contributions to theory and practice. The contributions are divided into three categories i.e. theoretical, methodological and practical. These contributions are discussed in the following paragraphs.

**5.6.1. Theoretical Contributions**

A large body of literature indicates that high commitment HR practices lead to lower employee turnover rates (Huselid, 1995). However the literature has not sufficiently accounted for the mechanisms that explain this relationship. In the POS literature there is only one notable study conducted by Allen et al. (2003) which examined the mechanism by which HR practices translate into POS which in turn leads to lower employee turnover through affective commitment and job satisfaction. The current study contributes to this
body of knowledge by examining the effects of high commitment HR practices on turnover intentions via the mediating variables perceived organizational support, affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Although some important work was done by Allen et al. (2003) in this direction, yet the work needs further expansion and is in need of further evidence due to at least three reasons. First, Allen et al. (2003) studied three HR practices fairness, participation in decision making and growth opportunities, even though there are other high commitment HR practices that have been widely reported to be related with POS and turnover (e.g. job security, job autonomy). Further, “justice” as examined in this study was not limited to exploring the separate roles of distributive justice and procedural justice. Second, the Allen et al (2003) study did not examine the effects of any moderating variables. Third, there is emerging evidence that economic recession engenders job uncertainty which might have short to medium term impacts on employees’ turnover behaviour. Thus the model requires re-examining in the post-recession economic environment. Fourth, Allen’s study was conducted in 2003. During the last ten years, however, there has been enormous improvement in the calculative capacity of statistical software and it has become possible to test complex models combining moderating and mediating effects simultaneously. Lastly, it was important to gather further evidence to verify the findings of Allen et al (2003) in a different cultural context. The current study not only identified possible mediating mechanisms linking high commitment HR practices with job turnover, but also examined the moderation process.

In order to enhance our understanding of turnover processes, it is important to include factors that can potentially moderate the relationship between HR practices and POS. Frazier et al. (2004), for instance, mentioned that identifying the important moderators of relations between predictors and outcomes indicates the maturity and sophistication of a field of inquiry. Despite a thorough literature search, no study could be found that used
supervisor support as a moderator in the HRP-POS-Turnover Process. The current study fills this gap by examining supervisor support as a moderator. The potential role of supervisory support as a moderator has previously been studied in related streams (Galletta et al., 2011; Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2010). For example, Snir, Harpaz, Burke, Russo and Waters (2006) studied the moderating role of supervisor support in work-family conflict; and Kuvaas and Dysvik (2010) studied the moderating role of supervisor support in employee development and work performance. However, it has not been studied in the POS stream of literature. Besides these studies in related streams, there were theoretically strong arguments for studying the role of supervisor support in the HR Practices-POS-Turnover process. An example of such an argument is that if supervisors are abusive or unfair with their subordinates, the subordinate’s perception about positive organizational initiatives may be affected despite the fact that the organization may genuinely care about its employees. Although the results suggest that supervisor support is not a moderator of the relationship between HR practices and POS this might be due to cultural factors and low exchange ideology in the Pakistani culture. The current study not only fills a gap by incorporating supervisor’s support as a moderator, but also points out the need for further verification of this possible relationship via cross-cultural studies which can compare contexts in which the strength of exchange ideology differs.

To the best of my knowledge, no other study has examined job security and job autonomy in the HRP (HR practices)-POS-Turnover process. The current study contributes to the POS literature by testing the role of job autonomy in the turnover process, in addition to other influences that have been established. Thereby, this study is the first to allow for a comparison of influences – by assessing them all at once. As the results show when this is done, only some of the influences established in previous literature actually have an independent impact.
Eisenberger and Stinglhamber (2011) recommended that managers should give more autonomy to their workers for increasing positive job outcomes. However, this recommendation was not based on any empirical evidence. The results of the current study provide such evidence and indicate that job autonomy has a positive relationship with perceived organizational support, though an indirect relationship with turnover intentions and actual turnover. The empirical evidence provided by the current study will help researchers and practitioners to reconsider the role of job autonomy. The results indicate that job autonomy plays an important role in building positive perception about the organization even in those cultural contexts where power is generally concentrated at the top and employees in the middle and lower cadre are given low job autonomy (Islam, 2004). Similarly, job security has not been examined in the HRP-POS-Turnover process. Indeed, job security has not, in general received sufficient attention in the POS literature. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) meta-analysis reported that job security has a strong relationship with POS. However, the literature remains limited to testing correlations between the two variables and the role of job security as predictor of job turnover via POS has not been studied. It is somewhat surprising that job security has not been examined earlier in this process despite the fact that a large body of literature suggests that job security is one of the strongest predictors of employees turnover. The results indicate that job security is related to POS but this relationship does not predict turnover intentions. Rather job security directly predicts such intentions, indicating that this particular HR practice operates via different mechanisms than the generation of positive views of the organization. The current study fills an important deficiency in the literature by incorporating job security in this HRP-POS-Turnover process as job security is the only variable that was found to have significant direct relationship with both POS and turnover intentions.
Further, the results of the study suggest that POS does not have a significant relationship with positive job outcomes including affective commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions, which is in contrast with the majority of studies in the POS literature. This contradictory evidence warrants further inquiry into the generalizability of some of the findings of previous studies in different contexts. The current research contributes by proposing that the lack of relationship between POS and positive job outcomes may be due to underlying psychological constructs (potentially exchange ideology), that may highlight need for further verification.

The current study also offered valuable contextual influences to assist with the interpretation of the results. Rousseau and Fried (2001) noted that paying attention to the context is more important in contemporary organizational behaviour research than it was in the past. Having awareness of cross cultural/contextual differences enables researchers to find differences in the underlying processes and practices in different contexts. As some of the results presented here conflict with those of previous studies conducted in the West, this indicates that care should be taken in generalizing such models in different cultural contexts.

The current study also brings important post-recession evidence to the literature. As most organizations were financially squeezed in the years during which this study was conducted, it is safe to assume that this affected job security and the developmental opportunities organizations offered in the past. Employees were affected by the fragile job conditions at the time of recession. The literature provides evidence that the recession of 2007 has had medium to long term effects on employee behaviours and job outcomes (Solberg et al., 2014; Brewer et al., 2012b; Kaur, 2012; Vuolo et al., 2012; Direnzo & Greenhaus, 2011). The literature in the POS stream has not paid sufficient attention to gathering post-recession evidence about the relationship between HR
practices and employee turnover behaviour. A customized search on Google Scholar and Web of Science to find articles published from 2010 onwards was conducted, however no notable study could be found that examined the possible relationships between HR practices and turnover. The current study brings important evidence about this relationship in post-recession years. Specifically, the direct path found between job security and turnover intentions may indicate the increasing importance of this HR practice in the post-recession context.

Sverke et al. (2002) observed that data on actual turnover is hard to collect, thus it is often substituted with turnover intentions to represent turnover behaviour. Although there is evidence in the literature that “turnover intentions” may lead to “actual turnover”, yet it may not always predict it. The impact of actual turnover is much higher in an organization than employees having turnover intentions. Thus it is important to study HR practices in relation with actual turnover rather than simply substituting “actual turnover” data with “turnover intentions” data. The POS literature is seriously deficient in studies that use actual turnover data to look at relationships within this literature stream. To the best of my knowledge, with the exception of Allen et al. (2003), no other study has used both turnover intentions and actual turnover data as outcome variables. The current research makes up this vital deficiency by incorporating actual turnover data. The results indicate that the relationship between HR practices and turnover intentions may not be the same as the relationship between these practices and actual turnover. This is suggestive that future studies should be cautious in assuming that turnover intentions can be treated as a proxy for actual turnover.

Secondly, the literature generally does not examine the relationship of HR practices or POS with actual turnover directly, rather it is examined first by looking at the relationship between HR practices or POS with “turnover intentions” and then in the next stage, the
relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover is examined (see Allen et al. 2003). In other words the impact of HR practices on actual turnover is studied via turnover intentions only. However, as this study shows, there is a need to examine the direct impact of HR practices on actual turnover (without the mediating role of turnover intentions). This will help us separately compare the effects of HR practices on turnover intentions and actual turnover.

Another contribution is bringing evidence from Pakistan to the POS literature. Due to its unique socio cultural set up, studying Pakistan offers a unique contribution to this body of literature. As discussed in Chapter 1, the major influences on Pakistani culture are varied and include at least three major dimensions, such as 1) historical factors (i.e. Indian origin and British Colonial history), 2) contemporary factors (strong American influence, English medium educational system emulating American/ British systems) and 3) strong religious affiliation (Mehdi, 2013; Qadeer, 2006; Khilji, 2004, 2003). The World Value Survey reported that 93.3 % people in Pakistan described themselves as religious in (WVS, 2001). The interplay of these historical, contemporary and religious factors creates a unique case where HR practices and job outcomes are influenced by this unique combination. Despite being a unique cultural context, little attention has been paid to Pakistan in the management literature (Khilji, 2004). On the one hand, it has similarities with India which also shares a common history with Pakistan, and on the other hand, it is very distant from some other aspects of Indian culture. Thus, some of the management literature that focuses on India does not fully represent Pakistan.

I could not find any published studies about perceived organizational support in Pakistan, and hence the current study fills this deficiency by offering evidence from Pakistan. The current research contributes to the management literature about Pakistan in a number of aspects a) the current study examines social exchange theory in Pakistan b) the study
tests four human resource practices in relation with POS and job turnover c) the role of supervisor support is explored both as a moderator and mediator of the relationship between human resource practices and perceived organizational support. In this way it contributes to at least three streams of literature i.e. HRM, perceived organizational support and job turnover.

The evidence gathered from Pakistan through this study provides vital comparisons with existing Western literature. For example, a large body of the literature suggests that POS mediates the relationship between HR practices and positive job outcomes (Kurtessis et al., 2015; Allen & Shanock, 2013; Gavino, Wayne & Erdogan, 2012; Yoon & Lim, 1999). However the current study did not find a mediated relationship between HR practices and job outcomes (i.e. affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions) which is in contrast with most Western originated studies. So the new evidence presented in the current study will allow future studies to discern whether HR practices lead to positive job outcomes only in a certain contexts. For example, developmental experience is found to be a predictor of POS in many Western studies, however developmental experience was not found to be related with POS in the current study. Similarly, the results of the current study suggest that job security significantly predicts perceived organizational support which is not only in line with previous studies (Rosenblatt et al., 1999; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996; Shore et al., 1994) but also reflects the socio-economic context of the country. Pakistan is a developing country with high unemployment rates and job opportunities are extremely competitive. Tight job market conditions coupled with a joint family system whereby one person may be responsible for the living costs of the whole family, makes job security a highly important employment condition that contributes to positive perceptions of organizational support. The findings of this study have theoretical and practical
significance for developing and underdeveloped economies facing tight job market conditions and extended family responsibilities.

Organizational justice was not found to be related with POS in the current study. This may be due to the fact that employees may be insensitive to injustice due to widespread injustice in the broader society such as the fact that the judicial system is crippled and implementation of laws in organizations and in society in general is very weak (IMF, 2010). The evidence from the current study may therefore also be relevant to other developing countries characterised by widespread cultural injustice coupled with tight economic conditions. Due to the cultural similarities with other South Asian countries, the current study also provides some preliminary evidence about which HR practices lead to positive organizational perceptions in the South Asian context.

Although perceived organizational support has been studied in different Asian countries, most of these studies were conducted in Korea, China, Malaysia and other Far Eastern countries. The subcontinent or South Asia is considered to be a cultural cluster that is distinct from Far East Asia and China (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004; Gupta, Hanges & Dorfman, 2002; Keyes, 1995). Because of the cultural proximity among South Asian countries, the results of the current study can, therefore, be replicated and extended, to other South Asian countries. Thus the study fills a gap in the South Asian literature on perceived organizational support. It is important to bring evidence from South Asia as it represents approximately 24% of the world population (World Bank, n.d.). Because of the serious deficiency of South Asian studies in the POS and turnover literature, a large chunk of the world population is unrepresented or under-represented in the literature. Both academicians and practitioners make inferences about South Asia based on Western literature. The current study fills this gap by providing empirical evidence about the relationship between HR practices, POS and turnover in the Asian
context. Future researchers will be able to compare and contrast the South Asian cluster with the rest of the world. For example, research could focus on investigating whether the influence of HR practices on job turnover corresponds to the relationship between these variables that has been found in Western countries. This would highlight regional differences in employee attitudes and enable cross-cultural explanations to be generated and tested.

Second, in the last decade, the economic growth in the South Asian region was one of the highest in the world and the trend is expected to continue (Abbas, 2012; Batra, 2012; Khilji, 2012). Because of its anticipated economic importance in the coming years, there should be greater research interest in this geographical area. In high growth economies, where organizations start expanding there is greater need of skill development, training and employee development in order to keep pace with the growing skill needs. Thus organizations pay more attention to issues related to human resources (Burke & Ng, 2006). Third, if future studies in the domain of POS and job attitudes find similarities among other South Asian countries, it could lead towards a South Asian Model of employee management.

Finally, confirmatory factor analysis was used to test the distinctiveness and validity of the constructs used in this study given that these constructs had not previously been tested in Pakistan. The results of both of these factor analyses indicated that the variables used in this study are indeed distinct constructs. Although some items overlapped with each other, generally most of the items loaded onto their respective factors. The study thus provides further support for the validity and distinctiveness of the constructs including supervisor support, perceived organizational support, developmental experience, distributive and procedural justice, job autonomy, affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions.
5.6.2 Methodological Contributions
Since Eisenberger et al’s (1986) seminal study, a huge body of literature has developed in the POS domain. Researchers have tested a variety of antecedents and consequences of POS. However, most studies tested only two or three antecedents in one model. To the best of my knowledge, no study has tested four HR practices, POS, affective commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions and actual turnover in one model. By testing these variables together, the study presents a more comprehensive picture of the influence of HR practices on turnover through POS. By including a wide variety of HR practices into the prediction of POS, their respective influence could be compared. This is different to the majority of previous studies that tested only a limited selection of HR practices in relation to POS. The all-inclusive test in the present study shows that once shared variance between HR practices is controlled for, only two variables continue to have an independent impact on POS: job autonomy and job security. This might indicate that the earlier stated influence of other variables that were not significant, might actually have been over stated – these variables lose their influence once the variance is shared with other HR practices.

The current study provides a comprehensive picture by incorporating four important HR practices three mediating variables and one outcome variable in a moderated/mediated model.

5.6.3 Practical Contributions
The current research will enable managers to better understand factors contributing to the development of positive perceptions about the organization and positive job outcomes. It may help them redesign and realign their human resource management and human resource development strategies so that they can contribute to higher POS and positive job outcomes. For example, job autonomy in developing countries is often overlooked in organizations and not carefully incorporated in job design. By empowering
employees, employers can enhance employee perceptions of organizational support and organizations may experience lower employee turnover. Similarly, as job security is related with POS and lower turnover, managers need to assure (when feasible) employees that their jobs are secure in the organization. In particular, in tough economic times, the organization has to be more reassuring to employees to enhance their perception of organizational support. Generally, managers view support in a very narrow sense and regard organizational support as technical support or support in the provision of resources. The results of the study will help managers to change their focus and view support in a broader sense.

The results indicate that training and growth opportunities translate into overall developmental experience. While designing training policies, managers should pay attention to the overall developmental experience of employees rather than purely focusing on more technical aspects of training, since this may not induce positive feelings from employees about organizational initiatives. However when training is part of the overall developmental experience for an employee, the employee is likely to have greater interest in training and it may result in positive job outcomes.

Supervisor support was not found to have a moderating effect on the relationship between HR practices and POS, which has important implications for those organizations which have multiple branches with a branch manager, including organizations such as banks and multi-national corporations with many subsidiaries in particular geographical locations. The study indicates that supervisor support does not change the effect of organizational policies on employee perceptions or organizational support and thus it is mainly organizational policies instead of supervisor behaviour that is largely responsible for job outcomes. However, the results presented in the supplementary analysis indicate that supervisory support could mediate the relationship between HR practices and
perceived organizational support. This suggests that high commitment HR practices enable managers to offer better support, which could potentially lead to perceptions of supervisor support. This perception, in turn, leads to perceived organizational support. This is suggestive that employees believe that supervisors have a vital role in the implementation of high commitment HR practices. More evidence, through longitudinal studies, is needed to disentangle relationship between HR practices, supervisor support and perceived organizational support.

Because of a deficiency of research literature originating from Pakistan, educational institutions in Pakistan generally use American literature and curricula in undergraduate and MBA classes (Khilji, 2004). Because of the stark contrast in the contexts of the USA and Pakistan, American models taught at Pakistani universities do not meet the needs of local business organizations. There is, hence, a disconnect between business schools and business organizations there. The current study will help bridge this gap by incorporating indigenous researches in the curricula of business schools, enabling business graduates to develop greater awareness of job attitudes in the Pakistani context that might help them develop more customized human resource strategies.

The Pakistani government is trying hard to attract foreign investment in different sectors of the economy and the number of multinational organizations investing in Pakistan is increasing (Imaduddin, 2014). A recent article states that Pakistan has enormous long-term growth potential and the tumultuous country is making real progress. Despite political turmoil and a precarious law and order situation, the country has enormous growth with a current GDP growth rate of 4.5% (Defotis, 2016). As the country is having high economic growth and foreign direct investment is increasing at an impressive rate, a number of multinational companies and foreign investors are opening businesses in Pakistan. The current study has, therefore, a special practical relevance for multinational
organizations either entering or already operating in Pakistan. The successful establishment and operation of a multinational company in a country requires a better understanding of those human resource practices that appeal to employees in the national or local context. For example, the current study indicates a positive direct relationship between job security and POS, as well as with turnover intentions. Multinational companies may adapt their HR policies to suit the local needs for winning commitment and loyalty of employees.

5.7. Limitations

The study has a number of limitations and the results presented need to be interpreted in light of these limitations.

First is the design of the study. This study used a cross sectional design and self-reported data similar to many other studies in this area of literature (Fu & Lihua, 2012; McCarthy et al., 2012; Kumar & Eng, 2011; DeConinck, 2010; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Wayne et al., 1997; Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davislamastro, 1990). Although actual turnover data was collected 2 and half years later, the remainder of the constructs were measured at the same time. Because of this design, I am unable to determine the direction of causality among the variables in the first part of the model (i.e. leading up to POS, leading to turnover intentions) tested, and can only make inferences about the possible direction of causality regarding the various relationships. I cannot be sure, for instance, that HR practices cause perceived organizational support or other outcome variables. Thus, even though the inferred directions of causality suggested in the current study are consistent with the literature (Erdogan & Enders, 2007; Masterson, 2001; Morris & Leung, 2000; Moorman, 1991; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988), it is possible that POS may lead to, rather than be a consequence of the HR practices tested. For example, an employee with high
levels of POS may develop a positive perception about organizational justice because of their overall perception about the organization (POS).

Another limitation is that the current study measured HR practices only through the perceptions of employees. The practices have not been measured from an employer’s perspective and the employer’s policies regarding these practices have not been taken into account. Thus the analysis is based on employees’ perception of HR practices only. Future studies should measure HR practices more directly in order to provide more clarity and certainty about the precise influence of these practices.

The study was conducted in the banking sector. Data were collected from multiple branches of three banks. Various authors have suggested that the impact of human resource practices on job outcomes (e.g. productivity) is influenced by industry context (Datta, Guthrie & Wright, 2005). The context of the industry should, therefore, be kept in mind while generalizing the results to other sectors of the economy. That is, it is possible that the results obtained here pertain only to the Banking sector in Pakistan and may not generalize to other industries or to the country in general; hence any cultural explanation must be treated with caution.

The current study tests a complex model in which the effects of four HR practices on turnover intention/actual turnover through POS, job satisfaction, and affective commitment are measured. There is the possibility of some suppression effects because of the high number of variables. Further analysis may be required to confirm these findings. Similarly, the sample size for actual turnover is very small (n=158) which may be insufficient for such a complex model, potentially distorting the results. Although theoretical explanations have been provided where the results contradict expectations, it is entirely possible that the lack of an indirect effect between HR practices and turnover intentions/ actual turnover is due to suppression effects and methodological limitations.
Results should be interpreted keeping these factors in mind. Further research is desirable to ascertain the generalizability of the findings of the current research.

The current study did not use probability sampling. Due to data confidentiality reasons, it was not possible to get a list of all the employees working in the target banks. Thus non-probability convenience sampling was used in the current study, whereby participants could decide themselves whether to take part or not. While this is consistent with previous studies (see Hu, Wang, Yang & Wu, 2014; Neves & Eisenberger, 2014; DeConinck, 2010; Shelton, Waite & Makela, 2010; Chen, Lin, Tung & Ko, 2008; Makanjee, Hartzer & Uys, 2006; Allen, 1995), this certainly poses some questions on the representativeness of the sample.

5.8. Future Areas of Research

A number of future areas of research can be suggested. Many of them stem from the limitations mentioned in the preceding paragraphs.

The results of the current study indicate that POS does not mediate the relationship between HR practices and job outcomes (affective commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions). The reason was that POS was not found to have a significant relationship with affective commitment and job satisfaction. I explained this with reference to exchange ideology. However, it is critical that the relationship between perceived organizational support and affective commitment continues to be a focus of future research given that a large body of POS literature suggests that the overall perception about the organization produces positive job outcomes, including affective commitment. Employees need to develop a sense of belongingness with the organization if they are to reciprocate positive organizational initiatives. Although exchange ideology has been studied as a moderator of the relationship between perceived organizational
support and felt obligation, it has not been studied as moderator of the relationship between POS and affective commitment or turnover intentions. Future studies can measure exchange ideology and its moderating role on the POS-job outcomes relationships. I propose that the strength of exchange ideology varies across cultures and thus the POS-job outcomes relationship may be moderated by exchange ideology. In a cross-cultural design, the role of exchange ideology in different cultures will offer a valuable contribution to this body of literature.

The current study used supervisor support as a moderating variable between HR practices and POS, but I did not find evidence to support this relationship. Nonetheless, it is possible that some other contextual/cultural variables may moderate the relationship between HR practices and POS or other job outcomes. For example, perceptions about job opportunities outside the organization may moderate the relationship between job security and POS/Turnover Intentions. Likewise, there is greater segregation of roles between the genders in the Indian Subcontinent. Female employees may have greater need for stability than career growth as they are mainly responsible for care of the family. Gender may well moderate the relationship between developmental experience and POS.

Similarly, job autonomy has not been studied in relation to hierarchical level in POS and related streams including commitment, job satisfaction and turnover streams. As managerial employees need to make timely decisions within their roles for smooth functioning, the effect of job autonomy on job outcomes might be stronger than for non-managerial employees. Thus future research may use hierarchical level as a moderating variable to examine the relationship between HR practices and POS/job outcomes.

The POS literature is greatly deficient in terms of cross cultural studies and indeed I was unable to identify any cross cultural study in the POS literature. Future studies need to
pay attention to cross cultural issues to document differences among different countries for the reasons discussed above.

In order to establish convincing causal relationships, future studies should attempt to use longitudinal designs, assessing POS and the access to certain HR practices at various time points. New outcome variables may also be tested. For example, proactive behaviour has not been tested in the POS literature even though this appears to be one consequence of favourable HR practices and positive perceptions about the organization. In the intensive competition which characterises today’s business world, mere feelings of commitment or intention to stay are not enough for the organization. Those employees who demonstrate innovative and proactive behaviour may contribute a lot more than their other colleagues. Testing innovative or proactive behaviour would not only expand the POS literature but it will also have greater significance for practitioners as well. Moreover, it may also help in integrating other streams (e.g. proactive behaviour) of literature with POS.

The sample size for actual turnover of employees was relatively small for the model I have tested. I propose that future researches should use a larger sample size to verify findings of the current study.

Finally, most of the studies in the POS literature have been conducted in large organizations. After a careful and thorough review of the literature, I could not find any study performed in a small or medium sized (SMEs) organization. Future studies need to obtain evidence from SMEs, since it could be argued that antecedents and consequences may be different in small organizations. For example, the organizational hierarchy in small organizations is relatively flat as they have fewer hierarchical layers compared with larger organizations and in such contexts employees may not expect substantive internal growth or development opportunities. Also HRM might work differently in SMEs and the
role of the supervisor might be more pronounced. Evidence from SMEs may provide more insights into the similarities and differences in POS mediated relationships between antecedents and consequences.

5.9. Summary

The current study aimed to examine the role of perceived organizational support in the high commitment HR practices and job turnover relationship. A number of additions were made to the earlier work of Allen et al. (2003). Two high commitment HR practices, job security and job autonomy that are frequently reported in the literature to have a significant impact on perceived organizational support and employee turnover, but not yet studied in the HR practices-POS-turnover process, were included also in the model. The study further aimed at exploring the moderating role of supervisor support on HR practices and POS. It was expected that POS would mediate the relationship between all four practices (developmental experience, job autonomy, fairness and job security) and turnover intentions/actual turnover. However, the results indicate that none of these practices has a significant relationship with turnover intentions/actual turnover via POS, affective commitment and job satisfaction. While job security and job autonomy predicted POS, POS did not predict affective commitment, job satisfaction or turnover intentions. This may be due to the influence of cultural factors, such as low exchange ideology, where by employees have reduced tendency (when compared to contexts with a high exchange ideology) to reciprocate the employers’ favour with positive job outcomes. Contrary to expectations, supervisor support did not moderate the relationship between high commitment HR practices and perceived organizational support. These non-significant relationships may be due to statistical reasons. As the current study examines the impact of four HR practices on turnover intentions/actual turnover via POS, affective commitment and job satisfaction paths, the absence of these
relationships may be due to the complexity of the model and relatively smaller sample size. Nevertheless, the study makes important contributions by presenting a theoretically comprehensive model that may warrant further verification in other cultures.
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Appendix 1 – Questionnaire

Thank you very much for participating in this research study. This questionnaire is part of a Doctoral Research Study “Perception of Organizational Support” at University of Sheffield, UK. It seeks Non-Sensitive data about your opinion regarding different organizational initiatives and the working environment.

None of your individual response will be disclosed to your own bank, any other organization or any other individual. All the data will be kept strictly CONFIDENTIAL by all means. Only averages of collective responses and statistical representations will be used for academic purposes. So please feel free to give your fully independent and honest opinion. The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes.

Ahmad Qammar (Ph.D. Candidate University of Sheffield UK) Email: a.qammar@shef.ac.uk
Project Supervisor: Dr. Penny Dick, University of Sheffield UK)

How to Complete Questionnaire: Kindly read the statement at the left column and click the appropriate box from 1 to 7 in front of each statement. The responses are from 1(Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). (If a box is clicked in error, just click it again it would be unchecked, then click the box of your choice). Please keep saving the document time to time to avoid data-loss due to electricity breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The bank gives value to my opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from my bank when I have a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my job is secure at this bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank is willing to help me when I need a special favour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank shows a lot of care and concern for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of freedom as to how to do my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank would forgive a mistake on my part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job allows me to take part in making decisions that affect me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am allowed to participate in decisions regarding my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank provides me the opportunity to improve my skills and knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a significant degree of influence in decisions regarding my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager usually asks for my opinions and thoughts in decisions affecting my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank has stated policies about how much training each employee will receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a lot of opportunities for employees to grow here in this bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Manager gives value to my opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager shows a lot of care and concern for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here in this bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This bank provides training opportunities for employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree 2</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree 3</td>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree 4</td>
<td>Slightly agree 5</td>
<td>Agree 6</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will actively look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting this bank.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have any problem at home, the bank tries to help me.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank’s support in education of employees’ children is really good.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The medical facility provided by bank for my family is really good.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The loan policy for employees is really good.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank facilitates me if I want to improve my education.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the bank supports me in my personal matters.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to my bank.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel that problems faced by my bank are also my own problems.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a sense of obligation to stay with this bank</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be happy to work at this bank until I retire.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this bank.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working at this bank has a great deal of personal meaning to me.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell others I work at this bank.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At present, staying with this bank is a matter of necessity apart from desire.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I want to.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much of my life would be disturbed if I decide to leave my bank now.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have too few job options to consider if I leave this bank.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had not already put so much of myself into this bank, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if it is in my benefit, I feel it would not be right to leave this bank now.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort that I put in the bank (Money and recognition are examples of rewards).</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am rewarded fairly considering the responsibilities I have.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel guilty if I leave my bank right now.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank has formal procedures to ensure that officials have accurate information for making decisions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bank’s formal procedures are carried out in the same way for everybody.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the bank deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not leave my bank right now because of favours of people working in it my colleagues and seniors on me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I should work hard to pay back favours of my organization.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bank has formal procedures for employees to challenge decisions that they feel are wrong.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal procedures exist in my organization to ensure that officials do not allow personal biases (personal likes and dislikes) to affect their decisions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are formal channels to express their views and opinions before decisions are made.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am rewarded fairly in view of my experience.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An independent observer from outside the organisation would have made a similar judgment about my performance.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender 1. Male ☐ 2. Female ☐
Age 20 to 30 ☐ 30 to 40 ☐ 40 to 50 ☐ Above 50 ☐
Qualification MBA/MPA ☐ M.Com/MBE ☐ B.Com ☐ B.A/BSc ☐ Others Please specify
Marital Status Married ☐ Unmarried ☐
No. of Children None ☐ One ☐ Two ☐ Three ☐ More than three ☐
Stages in IBP Diploma No stage passed ☐ Stage 1 Passed ☐ Stage 2 Passed ☐ Completed ☐
Have you worked for another bank before joining the current bank Yes ☐ No ☐

Please click on the shaded area below to fill-in
Your Name Please
City
Designation Grade
No. of Years You have been working with this bank
As a token of thanks for participating in this study, I would like to share summary of research findings (non-personal, collective results) at the completion of this research. Do you want to receive summary of research results? If yes, kindly provide an email address below:
Email:
Any other comment:
Thank you very much for your time and attention
Appendix 2 – Measurement Scales Used in the Main Study

The scales in below paragraphs contain items that were retained after confirmatory factor analysis. In front of each item, the abbreviation used for that item in Chapter 3 and 4 are stated to make it easier for reader to track it. For example, the abbreviation used for procedural justice item 1 in Chapter 3 is PJC1, it has been reproduced here in front of relevant item.

**Procedural Justice**
My bank has formal procedures to ensure that officials have accurate information for making decisions.  
(PJC1)
My bank's formal procedures are carried out in the same way for everybody.  
(PJC2)
The bank has formal procedures for employees to challenge decisions that they feel are wrong.  
(PJC3)
Formal procedures exist in my organization to ensure that officials do not allow personal biases (personal likes and dislikes) to affect their decisions.  
(PJC4)
There are formal channels that allow employees to express their views and opinions before decisions are made.  
(PJC5)

**Distributive Justice**
I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort that I put in the bank (Money and recognition are examples of rewards).  
(DJC1)
I am rewarded fairly considering the responsibilities I have.  
(DJC2)
I am rewarded fairly in view of my experience.  
(DJC3)

**Supervisor Support (Manager Support)**
My manager really cares about my well-being.  
(PSS1)
My Manager gives value to my opinion.  
(PSS2)
My manager shows a lot of care and concern for me.  
(PSS3)
My manager strongly considers my goals and values  
(PSS4)

**Job Autonomy**
My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.  
(AUT1)
I have a lot of freedom as to how to do my job. \hspace{1cm} (AUT 2)

My job allows me to take part in making decisions that affect me. \hspace{1cm} (AUT3)

**Job Security**

I feel my job is secure at this bank. \hspace{1cm} (SEC1)

**Developmental Experience**

My bank has stated policies about how much training each employee will receive. \hspace{1cm} (DEX1)

This bank provides training opportunities for employees. \hspace{1cm} (DEX2)

The bank provides me the opportunity to improve my skills and knowledge. \hspace{1cm} (DEX3)

There are a lot of opportunities for employees to grow here in this bank. \hspace{1cm} (DEX4)

**Perceived Organizational Support**

The bank gives value to my opinion. \hspace{1cm} (POS1)

Help is available from my bank when I have a problem. \hspace{1cm} (POS2)

My bank really cares about my well-being. \hspace{1cm} (POS3)

My bank is willing to help me when I need a special favour. \hspace{1cm} (POS4)

The bank shows a lot of care and concern for me. \hspace{1cm} (POS5)

My bank strongly considers my goals and values. \hspace{1cm} (POS6)

My bank would forgive a mistake on my part. \hspace{1cm} (POS7)

**Affective Commitment**

I feel a strong sense of belonging to my bank. \hspace{1cm} (ACM1)

I really feel that problems faced by my bank are also my own problems. \hspace{1cm} (ACM2)

I would be happy to work at this bank until I retire. \hspace{1cm} (ACM3)
I feel "emotionally attached" to this bank.  
(ACM4)

Working at this bank has a great deal of personal meaning to me.  
(ACM5)

I am proud to tell others I work at this bank.  
(ACM6)

**Job Satisfaction**

In general, I like my job.  
(JST1)

In general, I like working here in this bank.  
(JST2)

Overall, I am satisfied with my job.  
(JST3)

**Turnover Intentions**

I will actively look for a new job in the next year.  
(TOI1)

I often think about quitting this bank.  
(TOI2)

I will probably look for a new job in the next year.  
(TOI3)
Appendix 3 - Supplementary Analysis: Supervisor Support as Mediator

In this supplementary analysis, the possible mediating as opposed to moderating role of supervisor support is explored (see section 4.3.1). A regression analysis was carried out; using POS as the dependent variable, Supervisor Support as the mediator and HRM practices (i.e. developmental experience, organizational justice, job autonomy and job security) as predictor variables. This was done using SPSS and Preacher’s PROCESS macro and 10000 resamples to estimate the indirect effects. To enable the estimation of the indirect effect of multiple independent variables, indirect effects were estimated separately for each of the independent variables. The instruction given by Hayes (2013, p 196) was followed for bootstrapping so that the bootstrapping was based on the same set of re-samples.

Perceived supervisor support (PSS) added to the prediction of POS, R2 = .70, F (5,494) = 228.18, p < .001, and also acted as a mediator of the HRM to POS relationship as the overall model was significant. Prediction of POS by HRM practices and supervisor support is given in table 10.1 and indicates that all HRM practices and PSS predicted POS significantly.

Table 10.2 indicates bootstrapping estimates for the indirect effects of HRM practices on POS via PSS. As the confidence intervals BootLLCI and BootULCI do not include zero, it indicates that mediation has occurred. Thus the values presented in table 10.2 indicate that supervisor support mediates the relationship between all four HRM practices and perceived organizational support.

Table 10.1 Prediction of POS by the HRM practices and supervisor support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.2 Bootstrapping estimates of indirect effects of HRM Practices on POS via PSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OJC</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEX</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardized Coefficients, PSS= perceived supervisor support, OJC= organizational justice, SEC = job security, AUT = job autonomy

In addition, to explore whether including PSS would add to the overall model fit, two new structured equation models were estimated in MPlus (both using ATO as DV for further exploration).
In Model 1 PSS was added, and predicted by its 4 items and allowed to correlate with a CMF. In addition, the paths between PSS and the four HRM variables, between PSS and POS, and between PSS, ACM, JST and ATO were added. In an alternative Model 2 these structural paths were set to zero. Although the Chi square values of these models cannot be compared (because they were calculated using a WLMV estimator (weighted least squares means and variance adjusted estimator), a look at the RMSEA fit indices shows that Model 1 fits seemingly better than Model 2 which presumed no relationship between supervisor support and the variables in the model. RMSEA for model 1 is .070 while RMSEA for model 2 was 0.078. Further research including longitudinal data is needed to explore the full potential of this mediating mechanism.