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ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to; firstly, investigate the construct validity of a three dimensional perceived support construct; secondly, establish the direct relationship between perceived support and intention to quit as well as the indirect relationship when mediated by affective commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour and job satisfaction; and finally, explore the relative importance of the constructs in relation to intention to quit. Pearson’s Product Moment correlations, Standard Multiple Regressions and partial correlation were used to assess the above hypotheses using a sample of 187 bank employees. The results confirmed the construct validity of a two-dimensional perceived support construct, which was found to be negatively correlated to intention to quit. The perceived support-intention to quit relationship was also found to be partially mediated by job satisfaction, affective commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour. All items except for organisational citizenship behaviour made a unique contribution in the prediction of intention to quit. Practical implications include the fact that perceived support in the organisation is crucial in retaining key talent and managers should focus on mechanisms that elicit both job satisfaction and affective commitment. Recommendations for future research include a replication of the same study over a longer period of time to establish causality.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly knowledge based economy, organisations with the largest talent bank have a natural competitive advantage (Brown, Duncan, Harris & Kelly, 2003). Organisations that want to dominate their industries need to be able to attract and retain talented and critical employees because they are the key differentiator for any organisation ((Delloitte, 2004; Losky, 2007).

The South African Banking industry consists of a few key market players with similar products and services, competing mainly on pricing. This is not sufficient if a bank wants to gain and maintain a competitive advantage. The industry is under pressure to be creative and innovative in the development of new products and customer solutions and this requires an appropriate skills set. Athey (2004) found that it is not enough for an organisation to have loyal hardworking staff but rather, a mix of highly analytical people with technical savvy, creativity, global know-how, adaptability and great communication skills in order to drive superior performance.

A major challenge, however, is the scarcity of talented employees. Bakos (2007) found that the South African employment industry is currently facing a situation where the demand for highly skilled workers is greater than the supply. This phenomenon is compounded by the fact that most organisations are in search of this scarce resource and talent pools are rapidly becoming exhausted as globalisation increases and talent is highly mobile (Bakos, 2007). Given the high demand for talent globally, employees have more alternatives and, even in difficult economic times, have a choice about where, for whom, and how long they work (Stopper, no date).

In order to maintain a competitive advantage, it has become an imperative for organisations to understand and manage the psychological mechanisms that elicit both commitment and superior performance from talented employees (Bagraim, 2003). One of the main elements in effectively managing talent is being able to retain them. The terms 'retention' and 'turnover' are often used interchangeably in the literature on
employee turnover behaviour (Msweli–Mbanga, 2004). Labour turnover has historically been a concern for managers because it disrupts production schedules and is costly as new workers must be recruited and trained. This is especially problematic when an organisation loses its most talented and key employees (Boshoff, Van Wyk, Hoole & Owen, 2002; Taplin & Winterton, 2007). A dilemma faced by managers is how to prevent skilled, knowledgeable and engaged employees from contemplating to leave the organisation.

**Turnover and intention to quit**

Turnover is not necessarily bad, however a relatively high turnover rate may be a symptom of underlying problems in the organisation (Tang, 2005). If a reduction of turnover is the only concern for managers and researchers, this focus may be short sighted. According to Turnipseed (2005) talent retention can only be done effectively if managers understand the process under which the turnover decision is made.

Although actual turnover is the primary focus of many academics, determining the underlying factors that lead to the intention to quit are even more important as it is an important antecedent to turnover (Firth, Mellor, Moore & Loquet, 2003). Furthermore, organisations normally use exit interviews, as a tool, to understand employees’ reasons for quitting however, this method is retrospective. It is important to understand the cognitive process of intention to quit and to identify the variables that are related to the employees’ intention to leave or to remain within an organisation because this provides an opportunity for managers and researchers to proactively in retaining their talented employees (Pienaar, Sieberhagen & Mostert, 2007).

Although a lot of research has focused on attitudinal (e.g. job satisfaction) and tangible inducements (e.g. pay) to stay, a growing body of research recognises the importance that relational inducements such as support from the organisation and from one’s supervisor can play an important role in such decisions (Maertz, Griffith, Campbell & Allen, 2007).
According to Firth et al. (2003), even though it is reasonable to argue that intentions are an accurate indicator of subsequent behaviour, there is not much evidence of what determines such intentions. They concur that, to date, there has been little consensus amongst researchers about what really determines intention to quit. In their article, “How can managers reduce employees’ intention to quit?” Firth et al. (2003) investigated a number of variables, such as perceptions of social support, job satisfaction and commitment to the organisation that may be related to intention to quit.

To understand an individual’s intention to quit a job, it is important to understand why people work. According to Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson and Sowa (1986), monetary compensation may be the main reason why people work but other factors such as fulfilment of social and emotional needs play a critical role in the individual’s intention to quit or stay in the organisation.

The importance of perceived support in intention to quit

Three facets of perceived support have been identified to examine the exchanges that may exist in the organisation. Perceived Organisational Support (POS) examines the exchanges between an individual and the organisation, Perceived Supervisor Support (PSS), examines the exchanges between an employee and their supervisor and Perceived Co-Worker Support (PC-WS) examines the relationship between the employee and their co-workers (Cole, Schainger & Harris, 2002; Eisenberger, et al., 1986; Fuller, Barnett, Frey and Reylea, 2006; Self, Holt & Schaninger, 2005). Social exchanges rest on the notion that exchanges of goodwill will be reciprocated at some future time (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

In a review of literature, Firth et al, (2003) found that social support from supervisors indirectly reduced burn out which in turn reduced intention to quit. They also found that lack of supervisor support was the best predictor of job dissatisfaction and intention quit. On the other hand, peer support was found to be associated with higher job satisfaction while intention to quit was associated with social undermining by co-workers.
Recent research has focused mainly on POS and PSS and not much has been written about PCWS (Cole et al. 2002). Even so, there seem to be mixed results regarding the three exchanges. Some researchers, for example, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) and Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) concur that PSS forms part of POS. Yoon and Thye (2000) found however, that PCWS led to supervisor support. One commonality between the three constructs is that they all lead to positive outcomes for the organisation.

Social support has been shown to play an important role in mitigating intention to quit (Firth, et al. 2003). A growing body of research has demonstrated that support in the workplace has important implications for many aspects of organisational behaviour (Yoon & Thye, 2000). In reviewing the value of social relationships for competitive advantage, Uhl-Bien, Graen and Scandura (2000) concur that low quality relationships can have significant negative consequences for the organisation, which include high turnover.

Perceived support seems to play a significant role in determining intention to quit. It is on the basis of this assertion that this study seeks to investigate the relationship between perceived support in the workplace and intention to quit. However, this cannot be the only significant relationship. Firth et al., (2003) in their study on employee intention to quit, found that 30% of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by high levels of supervisory support and that another 30% of the variance in commitment to the organisation being explained by supervisory support and job satisfaction.

**Job satisfaction, affective commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour and intention to quit**

In the past a lot of the turnover literature focused on issues of employee dissatisfaction and turnover, because it is easy to measure (Stopper, no date). Recently, however, there has been a shift to examining how individuals evaluate their
alternative job opportunities (Taplin & Winterton, 2007) and what key employees want (i.e. what satisfies them) (Stopper, no date).

Job satisfaction is an important workplace construct that is linked to positive work outcomes. Organisational commitment is closely related to job satisfaction and although there are several definitions of commitment all of them include the attachment of an individual to an organisation (Silverthorne, 2005). According to Taplin and Winterton (2007), workers stay in an organisation because of the positive features associated with their jobs and that commitment is a function of managerial attitudes and work structure.

In order to prevent skilled knowledgeable workers from leaving, managers should understand the process under which the decision to quit is made. An employee’s intention to quit is strongly influenced by the two crucial job attitudes, (1) job satisfaction and (2) commitment. In other words, people stay if they are satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organisations and leave if they are not (Turnipseed, 2005).

Job satisfaction and organisational commitment are the two most frequently tested attitudes in turnover research. In fact almost all conceptual models of turnover research include these two constructs, indicating the importance of job satisfaction and organisational commitment in conceptualising the psychological processes underlying the employee turnover decision (Turnipseed, 2005).

Organisational effectiveness depends not only on maintaining a stable work force but also the willingness of such a workforce to perform beyond the call of duty (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Such behaviours are referred to as Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) and have been formally defined by Organ (1988, p4) as “...individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the reward system, and that in its aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation”.
Organisational citizenship, as a component of commitment, may result from employees’ perceptions of their obligations to the organisations and to the degree to which those obligations should be reciprocated, rather than resulting from attachment, loyalty, or satisfaction.

OCBs have been found to be an extension of commitment in that citizenship to an organisation implies commitment to the same and have been found to have positive outcomes for the organisation, including superior performance (Joubert, Crafford & Schepers, 2004).

High job satisfaction, commitment and OCBs will generally lead to higher productivity and better employee performance. Since individuals are different and experience motivation differently, the challenge is for organisation to develop a culture that is attractive and be able to attract and retain its very best performers.

**Rationale for the study**

Fulfilment of social and emotional needs play a critical role in the individual’s intention to quit or stay in the organisation. This study proposes an integrated approach that encompasses the three social exchanges that may take place within the workplace i.e. between the individual and (a) the organisation; (b) their supervisor; and (c) their work group. Cole et al. (2002) found that although exchanges between the individual and the organisation and their supervisor are well researched, the social exchanges between employees and their work groups have been somewhat overlooked. The result is a lack of research that simultaneously considers all three exchanges. An integrated social exchange model is therefore proposed (Cole et al., 2002).

Following the call for an integrated model, this study aims to examine the three key social exchanges of perceived support in the organisation and how these are related to employee motivation and attitudes and their subsequent relationship with intention to quit. The third objective of this study, therefore, is to assess the construct validity of
Perceived Support, which consists of POS, PSS and PCWS. The study will also assess the relative importance of each construct’s relationship with intention to quit.

The importance of talent retention in gaining and maintaining competitive advantage is well known, however, no study has undertaken to investigate intention to quit within the South African banking sector. This study aims to contribute to the growing body of research related to turnover cognitions more specifically intention to quit. The research questions proposed in this study will be investigated in a South African context and it is hoped that the results of this study will provide insights for managers and organisations who wish to maximise their employees’ potential but also retain the best employees. Recommendations from this study may result in higher job satisfaction, commitment, performance and increased productivity.

**Objectives of the study**

With the above rationale in mind, this study will examine; (1) The construct validity of the perceived support construct, which consists of three dimensions, POS, PSS and PCWS; (2) the direct relationship between perceived support and intention to quit; (3) the indirect relationship between perceived support and intention to quit when mediated by job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB and; (4) the relative importance of the constructs in relation to intention to quit.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section is a brief review of the background literature relating to the key constructs under investigation i.e. perceived support, OCB, job satisfaction, commitment and intention to quit. Each construct will be defined, followed by a theoretical overview thereof and arguments for each research question will be presented with specific hypotheses for each.

Perceived support

Social support has been found to play an important role in reducing intention to quit (Firth et al. 2003). According to existing research literature, the concept of perceived support is based mainly on: Social exchange theory (e.g. Cole et al., 2002; Fuller et al., 2006; Self et al., 2005); and Organisational support theory (e.g. Eisenberger et al., 2001; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vagendenberghe, Sucharski & Rhoades, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli 2001; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

Social exchange theory concentrates on the quality of exchange relationships in the organisation. This study specifically looks at one aspect in the exchange relationships, perceived support. The notion of perceived support was introduced by Eisenberger et al. (1986) and refers to an individual's evaluative judgement of discretionary actions towards such an individual. Perceived support is based on how an individual interprets actions directed towards him or her and is not necessarily objective.

Literature on the three dimensions of perceived support i.e. POS, PSS and PCWS is discussed below as follows:

Perceived organisational support

POS refers to an individual's perception of organisational treatment regardless of whether that treatment is explicitly or implicitly promised (Shapiro & Conway, 2005).
Employees tend to personify the organisation by assigning humanlike characteristics to it and form global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well being, and reciprocate such perceived support with increased commitment, loyalty and performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002) highlight three psychological processes underlying the consequences of POS: 1) On the basis of reciprocity, POS should produce a felt obligation to care about the organisation and the meeting of its objectives; 2) the caring, approval and respect connoted by POS should fulfil socio-emotional needs, leading employees to incorporate organisational membership and role status into their social identity; and (3) POS should strengthen employees’ beliefs that the organisation recognises and rewards increased performance. These processes should lead to positive outcomes to both the employee (e.g. job satisfaction) and the organisation (e.g. affective commitment).

In their study, Allen, et al. (2003) tested two independent samples and found that POS was significantly negatively related to intention to quit in both samples. The findings however were mediated by commitment and job satisfaction. These findings are consistent with those of other researchers e.g. Cole et al. (2002).

The relationship between POS and intention to quit has been well researched; Eisenberger et al. (2001) found a strong negative relationship between POS and intention to quit ($r = -.51, p<.001$).

POS has been hypothesized to influence employees’ general affective reactions to their jobs, including job satisfaction and positive mood; POS should contribute to job satisfaction by meeting socio-emotional needs, increasing performance reward expectancies and signalling availability of aid when needed (Eisenberger et al. 2001). In their studies, Eisenberger et al. (2001) and Eisenberger et al. (1997), found a strong positive relationship between POS and job satisfaction.
POS and overall job satisfaction are strongly related but distinct constructs, an employee may believe that the organisation strongly values his or her contribution and cares about his or her well-being yet have a low overall job satisfaction, because the employer does not have resources to prevent unfavourable treatment. The employee’s recognition of these resource restrictions may prevent a decline in POS but not stop a decline in overall job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al. 1997).

POS is assumed to increase the employee’s affective attachment to the organisation and his or her expectancy that greater work effort will be rewarded (Eisenberger et al. 1986). On the basis of the reciprocity norm, POS should create a felt obligation to care about the organisations welfare and increase affective commitment by fulfilling socio-emotional needs (Eisenberger et al. 1986). POS strengthens affective commitment through the process of reciprocation; POS would elicit employees’ felt obligation towards the organisation, this indebtedness could be satisfied through an increase in affective commitment (Eisenberger et. al, 2001). In their review of literature, Eisenberger et al. (2001), POS was found to have a consistently strong positive relationship with affective commitment, in fact, the consequence most linked to POS was affective commitment.

According to Eisenberger et al. (2001), POS should increase performance of standard job activities and actions favourable to the organisation that go beyond assigned responsibilities i.e. Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB). POS should, therefore, be positively related to OCB.

Based on the above findings and literature, the relationships with POS can be summated as follows:

1. POS is negatively related to intention to quit
2. POS is positively related to OCB
3. POS is positively related to job satisfaction
4. POS is positively related to affective commitment (affective reactions and positive mood)
**Perceived Supervisor Support**

Eisenberger et al. (2001), Eisenberger et al. (2002), Shanock & Eisenberger (2006), Yoon & Lim (1999), found that PSS is related to POS. Because supervisors act as agents of the organisation in directing and evaluating employees, subordinates tend to attribute this supportiveness in part to the organisation rather than rather than solely to the supervisors’ personal inclinations (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). This assertion confirms and suggests the further exploration of the notion that POS and PSS are both dimensions of the perceived support construct.

Research has found that PSS leads to job retention and therefore should have a negative relationship with intention to quit (e.g. Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Hay (2002) surveyed 330 organisations in 50 different countries and found that many people leave their jobs because they are unhappy with their boss. In fact, the results revealed that it was the second highest factor contributing to high turnover.

Research on PSS has yielded mixed findings. Yoon and Thye (2000) focused their study on supervisor support in the work place and found that despite the obvious importance of the supervisor-employee relationship, little is actually known about the causes or consequences of supervisor support.

In examining the impact of leaders on individual followers, most researchers tend to focus on the effects of leaders’ general behaviour or attitudes towards these subordinates, if these behaviours yield high quality relationships, they contribute to organisational effectiveness through the effect of that high quality relationships have on extra role behaviours (OCBs) (Ilies, Nahrgang & Morganson, 2007). This implies a positive relationship between PSS and OCB.

In their study of supervisors and subordinates working in an organisation, Erdogan and Enders (2007), found that employees with high quality relationships with their supervisors were more satisfied than those with low quality relationships.
According to Maertz et al. (2007), employees can distinguish relations with the immediate supervisor from relations from the organisation as an entity or its leaders. When this distinction is made, employees become independently attached to each focus and that attachments to supervisors have distinct effects on turnover cognitions. These theoretical arguments and findings strongly suggest that PSS should cause attachments directly to the supervisor, which should then influence turnover cognitions.

Based on the above literature, the relationships with PSS can be summated as follows:

1. PSS is negatively related to intention to quit
2. PSS is positively related to OCB
3. PSS is positively related to job satisfaction
4. PSS is positively related to affective commitment

*Perceived co-worker support*

Although POS and PSS are well researched, the social exchange between employees and their co-workers has been somewhat overlooked (Cole et al., 2002; Sherony & Green, 2002). In modern team-based organisations, employees are members of at least two entities, the team and the organisation, from which they could bestow commitment and perceive support (Bishop, Scott, Goldsby & Cropanzano, 2005).

Sherony and Green (2002), propose a that there is a distinction between Team Member eXchange (TMX), Work Group eXchange (WGX) and Co-Worker eXchange (CWX). Both TMX and WGX refer to an individual’s relationship with their team as a whole, while CWX refers to exchanges between co-workers who report to the same supervisor.

This study examines the CWX in terms of PCWS. PCWS was found to be a useful predictor of job satisfaction, identification and intention to quit (Cole et al. 2002). Rayton (2006) examined the relationship between PCWS and commitment and found that PCWS led to an increase in commitment.
Based on the above findings, the relationships with PCWS can be summated as follows:

1. PCWS is negatively related to intention to quit
2. PCWS is positively related to OCB
3. PCWS is positively related to job satisfaction
4. PCWS is positively related to affective commitment

Given the above review of literature, it is clear that POS, PSS and PCWS all result in positive outcomes for the organisation. Similar to Cole et al. (2002), this study proposes an integrated approach to investigate perceived support exchanges in the workplace and concurs that POS, PSS and PCWS are dimensions of the perceived support construct. This affirmation led to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

**H1 – Perceived Organisational Support, Perceived Supervisor Support and Perceived Co-Worker Support are dimensions of and constitute Perceived Support.**

**Measurement of perceived support**

Eisenberger et al. (1986) developed the survey of perceived support to test the globality of POS. The original SPOS scale consisted of 36 items, however shortened versions, 17 item and 8 item scales, of the survey have been used successfully by several researchers to measure POS with high internal reliability (e.g. Bishop et al., 2005; Eisenberger and Armeli, 2001; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 2001; Erdogan & Enders, 2007; Fuller et al., 2006). According to Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002, p. 699), “… the original scale is uni-dimensional and has high internal reliability, the use of shorter versions does not appear problematic. Prudence nevertheless dictates that both facets of the definition of POS (valuation of employees’ contribution and care about employees’ well-being) be represented in short versions of the questionnaire.”

Researchers have often measured PSS and PCWS using SPOS by replacing the words “my organisation” with “my supervisor” and “my co-workers” respectively (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This approach has been used successfully in previous studies
(e.g. Bishop et al., 2005) to measure team member support and Yoon and Thye (2000) to measure co-worker and supervisor support.

**Perceived support and its correlates**

Many studies have treated the PS construct and its dimensions as independent variables influencing outcomes such as intention to quit, job satisfaction, commitment and OCB e.g. (Allen et al. 2003; Cole et al., 2002; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Fuller et al. 2003; Ilies et al., 2007; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Self et al., 2005; Yoon & Thye, 2000). In these studies, the dimensions of PS have consistently been found to have positive relationships with job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB.

**Perceived support and job satisfaction**

Literature concerning job satisfaction indicates that across a variety of work settings, job satisfaction is an important work place construct that is of concern to management.

**Definition of job satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is defined as "...a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of ones job, including facets of that job" (Silverthorne, 2005, p 171). It refers to the favourableness of employee attitudes towards their jobs (Kleiman, 2007). Employees are likely to be satisfied with their jobs if they enjoy their work, have realistic promotion opportunities, like and respect their supervisors and if they believe that their pay is fair (Kleiman, 2007).

Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist (1967) identified various extrinsic factors (e.g. supervision, interpersonal relationships, company policies and working conditions) and intrinsic factors (e.g. variety, responsibility, recognition, achievement, and advancement) as potential sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These factors are consistent with Herzberg and Mausner’s (1959) two-factor theory of job satisfaction. According to them, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two separate phenomena. Extrinsic factors, also referred to as ‘hygiene factors’ were found to be dissatisfiers
and intrinsic factors, also referred to as ‘motivators’ were found to be satisfiers. Only the fulfilment of intrinsic factors could lead to positive satisfaction and the fulfilment of extrinsic factors can prevent dissatisfaction (Herzberg & Mausner’s 1959).

Silverthorne (2005) distinguishes between two types of job satisfaction; intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction. According to him, each individual is different and will therefore respond differently to different rewards i.e. intrinsic or extrinsic. Therefore, two individuals doing the same job may experience job satisfaction differently depending on what satisfies them for example monetary reward may satisfy one while the job complexity and content of the job satisfies another. Further more job satisfaction can be predicted situational characteristics and occurrences, however, situational characteristics are more likely to predict job satisfaction.

*Outcomes of job satisfaction*

According to Silverthorne (2005), job satisfaction has been linked to positive work outcomes such as increased organisational commitment, with workers having high levels of job satisfaction being more likely to be committed to the organisation. He adds, that employees with higher job satisfaction are less likely to seek different jobs or leave the organisation altogether. Consistent with this finding is that intention to quit is largely influenced by job dissatisfaction (Firth et al. 2003).

Organ (1984) asserted that although job satisfaction is weakly related to in role job performance, job satisfaction is significantly related to employees’ willingness to engage in extra role behaviours, consequently, an empirical link has been demonstrated between job satisfaction and a measure of OCB. Since its connection with a positive job attitude, job satisfaction, OCB has been predicted in a positive manner in subsequent research.

The level of job satisfaction has also been linked to the levels of productivity in the organisation. Greater productivity implies that non-material costs will remain the
same while output will increase. Such greater output while maintaining fixed costs would result in greater profits for the organisation (Silverthorne, 2005)

**Perceived support and organisational commitment**
Organisational commitment is closely related to job satisfaction and although there are several definitions of commitment all of them include the attachment of an individual to an organisation (Silverthorne, 2005).

**Definition of organisational commitment**
Although there are varied definitions of commitment, they seem to reflect three general themes: affective attachment to the organisation, perceived costs associated with leaving the organisation, and the obligation to remain with the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). According to Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer and Allen (1991) the above themes have been labelled: affective, continuance and normative respectively.

Affective attachment is the most prevalent approach to organisational commitment in literature (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and considers commitment as an affective or emotional attachment to the organisation. The strongly committed individual identifies with, is involved in, and enjoys membership in the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

For some authors, affect plays a minimal role in the conceptualisation of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Commitment is viewed as the continuation of an action (e.g. remaining with the organisation) resulting from the recognition of the costs associated with its termination (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Finally, a less common but equally viable approach is to view commitment as an obligation to remain in the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

One thing that the three different approaches have in common is a link between the employee and the organisation that decreases the likelihood of turnover, it is clear
however, that the nature of that link differs. Employees with strong affective commitment remain because they want to, those with strong continuance remain because they need to, and those with strong normative commitment because they ought to (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

If turnover is the only concern for researchers or managers, the differences between the different conceptualisations of commitment become somewhat irrelevant; one form of commitment may be as good as another (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Although remaining in the organisation is a necessary pre-condition for both in-role and extra-role behaviour, it is not a sufficient condition for either.

An employee's willingness to contribute to organisational effectiveness will be influenced by the type of commitment they experience. Employees who want to belong to the organisation (i.e. affective commitment) may be more likely than those who need to belong (i.e. continuance commitment), or feel obligated to belong (i.e. normative commitment), to exert more effort on behalf of the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Furthermore, the most prevalent approach to organisational commitment in literature is affective commitment and moreover, of the studies that have reported positive correlations between commitment and performance, most have used measures of affective commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Based on these variations, this study will focus on affective commitment.

Perceived support and organisational citizenship behaviour

Since its original connection with job satisfaction, OCB has almost always been depicted or defined in a positive manner. That is to say, that previous research frequently implies that citizenship behaviours result from supportive workplace practices, desirable employee attitudes and personality traits (Bolino, Turnely & Niehoff, 2004). The sections that follow explore literature specifically on OCB, its definition, outcomes and relationship with other key constructs.
Definition of organisational citizenship behaviour

Organ (1988, p. 4) defined OCB as "... individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes effective functioning of the organisation." In essence it involves the employee working towards the goals of the organisation beyond the call of duty; OCB refers to the general set of behaviours performed by employees that are helpful, discretionary, and go beyond what is expected in normal job descriptions (Organ, 1988; Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006).

Discretional behaviours are not enforceable by the individual’s job description and are rather a matter of personal choice and omission of such behaviours is not punishable (Organ, 1988). In their study, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) found that even though the definition of OCB includes the fact that these behaviours are not formally rewarded, supervisors do consider OCBs when conducting performance appraisals.

The most popular dimensions of OCB include (1) altruism – helping others at work; (2) conscientiousness i.e. work performance that goes beyond enforceable standards; (3) sportsmanship i.e. tolerance of impositions or inconveniences on the job; (4) courtesy i.e. touching base with others before taking actions that would affect their work; and (5) civic virtue i.e. active involvement in company affairs (Organ, 1988)

Bolino, et al. (2004) propose three general assumptions that have guided the research on OCB: 1) that OCBs result from non - self serving motives; 2) that OCBs facilitate the effective functioning of organisations; and 3) that promoting citizenship in the workplace creates a positive working environment for employees.

OCB as a component of commitment may result from employees' perceptions of their obligations to organisations and the degree to which those obligations are reciprocated, rather than resulting from attachment, loyalty or satisfaction (Silverthorne, 2005).
Joubert et al. (2004) gave a distinction between commitment and OCB. According to them, commitment is in-role behaviour and can reasonably be enforced by the employer while OCB is an extra-role behaviour that is less enforceable. They add that OCBs are a progression from commitment and that a definition for OCB should include behaviours exhibited committed employees. In other words, OCB to an organisation implies that there is commitment to the same. The relationship however does not flow the other way round. They conclude therefore that a citizen of an organisation behaves in a manner that exceeds that of a committed employee.

Research shows that different dimensions of OCBs have different consequences in the organisation (Podsakoff et al., 2000). For example, helping behaviour and sportsmanship have been found to be positively related to unit performance quantity and helping has been found to be positively related to unit performance quality, but the civic virtue dimension was not found to be related to any form of unit performance (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

OCB is a positive and desirable behaviour that organisations would want to promote and encourage (Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006). Some theorists have inferred that OCB influences organisational effectiveness and organisational performance, especially if OCBs take place in addition to in role behaviours (Bolino, et al. 2004; Turniseed, 2005).

Whether OCBs actually boost performance will also depend on the quality of OCBs exhibited rather than simply the quantity or frequency of such behaviours. If a group incorrectly identifies the problem, OCB behaviour might direct the group in the wrong direction resulting in an ineffective outcome (Bolino et al. 2004).

**Intention to quit**

Intention to quit is the strength of an individual’s viewpoint that she or he does not want to stay with her or his employer (Boshoff et al. 2002). People who intend to quit are usually psychologically detached, less motivated and unwilling to contribute effectively to the organisation as they are not engaged (Eisenberger, Armeli,
According to Maertz and Campion (2004), process models of turnover focus on how people quit while content models focus on why. Based on the process model, employees become dissatisfied with their jobs, think about quitting, search for better jobs and then form intentions to quit, and then finally quit. This is consistent with the findings of other researchers that intention to quit is a precursor to turnover (e.g. Firth et al. 2003). Such employees hold conditional plans to quit, but do not form a final decision until they perceive that the specified conditions have been satisfied. In order to retain talent, it is important for managers to ensure that this intention is not realised. Managers therefore need to understand the reasons why employees intend to quit.

In considering why people leave, Maertz and Campion (2004) highlighted eight motivational forces of attachment and withdrawal. These are summarised in table 2.1 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of force</th>
<th>Psychological motive for attachment or withdrawal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective:</strong> Current affective response to an organisation</td>
<td>A hedonistic approach – avoidance mechanism: an employee is more attached because membership currently provides enjoyment and positive emotions. Negative emotional responses to job or organisational membership cause a withdrawal response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual:</strong> Psychological contract obligations to an organisation and violations of contract</td>
<td>A desire to fulfil perceived obligations in the current psychological contract through staying. Or conversely, the desire to dissolve a psychological contract or respond to violations through quitting. This desire depends on an employee’s holding a norm of reciprocity to some extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent:</strong> Commitment to people or groups in an organisation</td>
<td>A desire to maintain, or conversely, to end, relationships with constituents by staying or quitting. This desire can stem from a number of motive forces. The net force (for staying or leaving) may depend on relationships between one or many constituents, and it may change direction if the constituents themselves leave the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative:</strong> Perceived alternatives to current job</td>
<td>An employee’s self-efficacy beliefs regarding capability to obtain alternatives, combining the perceived certainty and quality of alternative options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculative:</strong> Anticipated future satisfaction associated with continued organisation membership</td>
<td>An evaluation of future value attainment possibilities associated with continued membership. High expectancy of value attainment or a positive calculation increases psychological attachment, while low expectancy or a negative calculation increases withdrawal tendency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative:</strong> Pressures to stay or leave an organisation derived from expectations of others</td>
<td>A desire to meet perceived expectations of family members or friends outside the organisation with respect to staying or quitting. These pressures may come from one or many parties, and the motivation to comply varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural:</strong> Behavioural commitment to an organisation</td>
<td>A desire to avoid the explicit and/or psychological costs of quitting. These costs are brought on largely by membership related membership related behaviours in the past or by company policies regarding the value of tenure. Perceived costs can range from zero to a very high level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral:</strong> Moral/ethical values about quitting</td>
<td>A desire for consistency between behaviour and values with regard to turnover. Internalised values lie somewhere on a continuum from “quitting is bad and persistence is a virtue” to “changing jobs regularly is positive; staying too long leads to stagnation.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Maertz and Campion (2004)

Maertz and Campion (2004) confer that at the time of quitting, individuals have negative affect and low constituent attachment to and within the organisation. It is, therefore logical to conclude that individuals who intend to quit possess the same motivational force and cognitive processes of withdrawal. The actual decision to quit is made more eminent by the availability of alternatives.
According to Maertz et al. (2007), attitudinal and relational inducements play an important role in influencing an individual’s decision to quit or stay with an organisation.

Organisations may not be able to influence external pull forces e.g. availability of alternatives, but could influence internal push forces related to affect and constituency at a reasonable cost. No South African study has undertaken to investigate these motivational forces in relation to intention to quit. Based on this assertion, this study will investigate constituent and affective motivational forces of withdrawal in relation to intention to quit.

Constituency refers to an individual’s commitment to people or groups in an organisation (Maertz & Campion, 2004). These commitments act as relational inducements for the individual to remain in the organisation. Specifically, Maertz et al. (2007) highlights POS and PSS as examples of such inducements. This study will also examine the relational inducement of PCWS, which has received very little attention in previous research (Cole, et al. 2002).

The affective force refers to the current affective response to an organisation (Maertz & Campion, 2004). An employee is more attached to an organisation if they enjoy and experience positive emotions within the organisation. Such affective forces are attitudinal inducements and Maertz et al. (2007) specifically highlight job satisfaction and commitment as examples of such inducements. These have also been the most researched attitudes in turnover literature (Turnipseed, 2005). This study also examines OCBs, which are extra role behaviours that may result from positive affectivity but are also an extension of commitment (Turnipseed, 2005).

**Intention to quit and its correlates**

*The direct relationship between intention to quit and perceived support*

The importance of the perceived support relationship has been established and is highlighted in chapter one. When an individual perceives support, they will feel
-obligated to reciprocate with positive behaviours (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and individuals who perceive greater support will be less likely to seek alternative employment (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003). Therefore, the direct relationship between perceived support and intention to quit is a negative one. This study will investigate this relationship and proposes the following hypothesis:

\[ H2 \] - There is a direct negative relationship between Perceived Support and intention to quit.

**Job satisfaction, affective commitment OCB and intention to quit**

Several studies (e.g. Murphy, Athanasou & King, 2002; Turnipseed, 2005) found that both satisfaction and affective commitment a positive relationship with OCB and predict turnover. Also, job satisfaction, commitment and OCB have been tested and consistently been found to have statistically significant and negative relationships with turnover (Firth, et al. 2003; Jawahar & Hemmas, 2006; Loi, Hang-Yue & Foley, 2006; Turnipseed, 2005).

**Intention to quit and job satisfaction**

The job satisfaction-intention to quit relationship is important. Dissatisfaction seems to cause turnover cognitions because it influences the degree to which people feel their jobs will provide rewards they desire in the future and lead them to search for more attractive alternatives (Lee, Carswell & Allen, 2000). Research has consistently shown that job satisfaction is significantly related to turnover, in fact almost all conceptual models of turnover include job satisfaction (Chen, Aryee & Lee, 2005; Pienaar et al., 2007; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004).

DeConinck and Stilwell (2004) found that satisfaction with pay and supervisors were direct predictors of turnover cognitions. In their study of South African knowledge workers, Sutherland and Jordaan (2004) found that job satisfaction correlated significantly with intention to quit. They found that the components of job satisfaction that correlated most with intention to quit were satisfaction with promotion opportunities and the nature of work being carried out. Similarly, in another South
African study, Pienaar et al. (2007) found a strong negative correlation between job satisfaction and intention to quit. Job satisfaction is considered to be an important factor in most theories of intention to quit (Pienaar et al., 2007).

**Intention to quit and affective commitment**

However, job satisfaction and commitment have been tested and consistently been found to have statistically significant and negative relationships with intention to quit and actual turnover (Firth, et al. 2003; Jawahar & Hemmas, 2006; Loi, Hang-Yue & Foley, 2006; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004; Turnipseed, 2005).

**Intention to quit and OCB**

OCB is a good indication of ones’ attachment (i.e. commitment) and involvement (i.e. engagement) in the organisation (Saks, 2006). Therefore, low levels of OCB would be a strong indication of intention to quit (Joubert et al., 2004; Turnipseed, 2005).

Consistent with cognitive dissonance theory, intention to quit and high levels of OCB are inconsistent behaviour and thus one will take precedence over the other (Turnipseed, 2005).

Finally, job satisfaction and affective commitment represent the attitudinal antecedents to intention to quit and OCB represents a behavioural antecedent (Turnipseed 2005). Based on the above assertions, this study seeks to examine the three constructs confirm their relationships and also their independent effects on intention to quit.

**Indirect relationship between perceived support and intention to quit**

In examining the indirect relationship between perceived support and intention to quit, the nature of moderators and mediators was considered and is discussed in the section that follows.
**Mediation vs. Moderation**

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a variable functions as a mediator when (a) variations in the levels of the independent variable significantly account for variations in the presumed mediator variable; (b) variations in the presumed mediator significantly account for variations in the dependent variable; and (c) when the paths above are controlled for, a previously significant relationship between the independent and the dependent variable is no longer significant. Complete mediation is found if the correlation in the third step becomes zero when controlling for the mediator. If the relationship between the independent and dependent variable is reduced in absolute size, but does not become zero when controlling for the mediator, it is believed that partial mediation has been demonstrated.

A moderator is a qualitative or quantitative variable that affects the direction and/or the strength of the relation between an independent variable and a dependent variable. In other words, in a correlational analysis framework, a moderator is a third variable that affects the zero-order correlation between two other variables. A moderator-interaction effect also would be said to occur if a relationship is substantially reduced instead of being reversed (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Moderator variables specify when certain effects will hold whereas mediating variables speak to why or how such effects occur (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Throughout this chapter, the review of literature has revealed that perceived support has consistently been found to have positive relationships with and influence job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB. Also, job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB were consistently found to influence and have negative relationships with intention to quit. These relationships suggest an indirect relationship between perceived support and intention to quit which could be mediated by job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB considering the fact that the relationships meet conditions (a) and (b) of Baron and Kenny's conditions of mediation. It was therefore decided that a test of mediation would be more appropriate to verify the indirect relationships between perceived support and intention to quit.
It is on the basis this assertion that the hypotheses to investigate the indirect relationships between perceived support and intention to quit were formulated thus:

\[ H3 \] – *Job satisfaction completely mediates the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit.*

\[ H4 \] – *Affective commitment completely mediates the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit.*

\[ H5 \] – *OCB completely mediates the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit.*

The main focus of this study is the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit. However, it has been established from the literature that job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB are also related to intention to quit. It is on these grounds that the study will examine the importance of the constructs relationship with intention to quit and hypotheses thus:

\[ H6 \] – *Perceived support makes the strongest unique contribution to explain the variance in intention to quit.*
Based on the above review of literature and the hypotheses presented herein, a conceptual model is presented below to highlight the focus of this study and the subsequent hypotheses that will be tested.

Figure 2.1: Integrated conceptual model
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Chapter 3 focuses on the research design and provides a description of the method of data collection and analysis used in the study.

Research approach

The study made use of a descriptive research design to examine the relationships between perceived support, job satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour and affective commitment. It was further quantitative, cross sectional, and of the ex post facto variety.

Participants

A random sample was taken from permanent employees of a major retail bank in the Western Cape. Due to time and financial constraints convenience sampling was used. Four of the bank’s business units, which were in close proximity, were selected. These business units included: Home loans, Retail delivery, Human resources and the Credit Operations and Delivery units. A total of 300 individuals were targeted of which, after the incomplete questionnaires were removed, 187 completed questionnaires were captured for further analysis (giving a response rate of 67%).

The demographics section was optional and respondents were not obliged to complete the section. There were a number of demographics sections that were left blank. The Table 3.1 below summarises the demographics of the sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African language</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB BAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB (Technical Clerk)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC (Junior Technical Specialist)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT (Supervisor)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM (Manager)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP (Senior Technical Specialist)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Loans</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Delivery</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection procedures and measurement instrument

Data was collected using a survey consisting of already established scales. A consent form and a covering letter, assuring confidentiality, accompanied each questionnaire. In the covering letter, respondents were instructed to place the completed questionnaire in a sealed collection box placed in their respective business unit. The questionnaires for each unit were physically delivered by the researcher and emptied on a daily basis by an assigned volunteer on a daily basis. The questionnaires were
then collected from each business unit on a weekly basis for the duration of the data collection process (approximately two months). The measurement scales used in the questionnaire are explained in the sections that follow.

**Intention to quit scale**

There is a wide array of measurement scales for intention to quit with most scales having no more than three items (e.g. Bagraim, 2003; Cohen’s 1993; Firth et al. 2003; Jawahar & Hemnas, 2006; Podsakoff, LePine & LePine, 2007). In this study, intention to quit was measured using Cohen’s (1993) intention to quit scale. This scale comprised of three items: (1) “I think a lot about leaving the organisation”; (2) “I am currently searching for an alternative to this organisation”; and (3) “When I can I will leave the organisation”, responded to on a 7-point Likert scale. This scale was used in a South African study by Boshoff et al. (2002) and also by Schlechter (2006) who obtained a Cronbach alpha of 0.91.

**Perceived Support scale**

The Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (Eisenberger et al., 1990) was used to measure POS, PSS and PCWS. Full and shortened versions of the SPOS questionnaire have been used successfully by several researchers to measure POS with high reliability (e.g. Bishop, et al. (2005); Eisenberger and Armeli (2001); Eisenberger et al. (1986); Eisenberger et al. (2001); Erdogan and Enders (2007); Fuller et al. (2006).

PSS and PCWS were also measured using the SPOS by, each time, replacing the words “my organisation” with “my supervisor” and “my co-workers” respectively. This approach has been used successfully in previous studies (e.g. Bishop, et al. 2005) to measure team member support and Yoon and Thye (2000) to measure co-worker and supervisor support. Each scale comprised of 8 items responded to on a 7-point Likert scale.
**Job Satisfaction scale**
Chen, Aryee and Lee (2005) used the 20 item short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al. 1967) to measure job satisfaction and obtained a Cronbach alpha of 0.96. In a South African study, Visser and Coetzee (2005), used the short form of Weiss et al.’s MSQ to measure job satisfaction and obtained a satisfactory Cronbach alpha of 0.88. In another South African study, Maharaj and Schlechter (2007) obtained a Cronbach alpha of 0.79 using the short form of the MSQ. These findings indicate high reliability of the scale and hence it was decided to use this short form of the MSQ for the purposes of this study.

**Organisational Commitment scale**
Although several measures of affective commitment have been developed for use in specific studies, they have not been subjected to rigorous psychometric testing as the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Chen, Aryee, and Lee (2005), used Allen and Meyer’s (1990) commitment scale to measure the affective component of organisational commitment. The scale’s reliability in their study was found to be satisfactory (Cronbach alpha = 0.87).

Allen and Meyer’s (organisational) commitment scale was used by Bagrain (2003) in a South African study of commitment among actuaries and produced high Cronbach alphas of between 0.73 and 0.85. Similarly, in a study of South African accountants, Maharaj and Schlechter (2007) used the OCQ and obtained a Cronbach alpha of 0.83 on the affective component of the scale. These findings indicate a high reliability of the scale both internationally and locally. It was on this basis that a short form of Allen and Meyer’s (1990) organisational commitment scale consisting of 8 items responded to on a five-point Likert scale (ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’) was used to assess the construct of affective commitment.

**Organisational citizenship behaviour scale**
OCB was measured using Podsakoff and MacKenzie’s (1994) OCB scale consisting of 24 items responded to on a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’
to ‘strongly agree’. In their study, which included a sample of 987 insurance agents, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) reported high Cronbach alpha coefficients for all of the dimensions of OCB (0.89 for helping; 0.82 for civic virtue; 0.84 for sportsmanship and an overall performance rating of 0.92).

In a South African study that investigated the influence of transformational leadership on OCB in the banking sector, Engelbrecht and Chamberlain (2005) measured OCB using the Organisational Citizenship scale developed by Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1994). The 24 items were re-phrased to allow the questionnaire to be self-reported and to ensure the meaning was more accurate in a South African context. They used the five sub-scales conceptualised by Organ (1988): altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue.

Although the internal consistency coefficient of the total OCB scale was above the general acceptable level (Cronbach alpha = 0.78), some of the subscales were slightly below the acceptable level (conscientiousness = 0.66; sportsmanship = 0.49; civic virtue = 0.61; courtesy = 0.59; and altruism = 0.66). These findings are consistent with those of Maharaj and Schlechter (2007) who also reported a satisfactory Cronbach alpha coefficient for the total scale (Cronbach alpha = 0.72) but found that some of the subscales also had relatively low Cronbach alphas.

**Biographical data**

A biographical section was included in the questionnaire to collect demographic information of the sample. This section was optional for ethical reasons and it was not in the scope of this study to make any statistical inferences. This information would only be used to give the reader a better understanding of the sample. The biographical information requested included: race, first language, gender, age, department and tenure.
Data analysis approach
Once the data was collected, coded and captured in Microsoft Excel, and cleaned, it was then exported to the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 14 with which it was analysed further.

The validity and reliability of the scales were assessed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and calculating Cronbach alphas. Pearson Product Moment Correlations and Standard Multiple Regression were used to further investigate the direct and mediated relationships between the variables. The relative contribution of each of the variables in the research model was examined using Standard Multiple Regression. The results from this analysis are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Three research questions were investigated in analysing the data. The first research question addressed the reliability and validity of each scale. The second research question was concerned with the direct and indirect (i.e. mediated) relationships between perceived support and intention to quit. The third question explored the possibility of statistically significant differences in the importance of constructs in their relationship with intention to quit. Various statistical techniques were used to investigate the above research questions and are the results are presented in the sections below.

Internal reliability and validity of measurement scales

It was determined that a crucial part of the analysis was to firstly assess the validity and reliability of the measurement scales used in this study. For this, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed using SPSS (Version 14). EFA was the favoured over Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) as explained below.

EFA vs. CFA

CFA is normally conducted to confirm that the factorial configuration of the original measurement model, as proposed by the authors is the same across populations. EFA on the other hand determines the smallest number of factors that can be used to represent the interrelationships among a set of variables. Based on the fact that the sample used for the present study differed substantially (in terms of language, demographics and culture) from the sample on which the original measurement models had been developed and standardised. It could not be assumed that the factorial configuration would be replicated for the sample used in this study. In other words, metric equivalence could not be assumed. For this reason, EFA was favoured over CFA. Once the validity and reliability of the scales was established, they were used to study the relationships between the constructs. The results are presented in the sections that follow.
**Intention to quit scale**

The items of Cohen's (1993) intention to quit scale were tested for internal reliability using Cronbach alpha. Ideally, Cronbach alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.7 (Pallant, 2001). The scale comprised of three items; “I think a lot about leaving the organisation”; “I am currently searching for an alternative to this organisation”; and “When I can I will leave the organisation”, on a 7-point Likert scale.

The Cronbach alpha for Cohen's (1993) intention to quit scale in the current study was 0.902, which is well above the recommended value of 0.6, reflecting a very good internal consistency for this sample. The intention to quit scale was not subject to Exploratory factor Analysis (EFA) because this technique would not to be suitable due to the small number of items in the scale.

Table 4.1 below is a presentation of the Cronbach alphas for each item of the intention to quit scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think a lot of about leaving the organisation</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>14.219</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am Currently searching for an alternative to this organisation</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>13.065</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I can I will leave this organisation</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>12.855</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.1 above, it is clear from the corrected item total correlation column that each of the items in the scale contributes highly to the total Cronbach alpha. Removing any items from the scale would not lead to any increase in the Cronbach alphas and hence all items were retained for further analyses.

**Perceived support scale**

The 24 items of the Perceived Support scale (PS) were subjected to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using SPSS (Version 14). Prior to performing EFA, the suitability of data for Factor Analysis was assessed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value
was found to be 0.85, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1970 in Pallant, 2001). Furthermore, the Bartlett's test for Sphericity was statistically significant (p = 0.000) thus supporting the appropriateness of the data for EFA.

Principle Axis Factoring revealed the presence of five factors with eigenvalues of more than 1, explaining 65% of the variance. An inspection of the scree plot however revealed a break after the second factor (the so called scree test). Based on these findings, it was decided to consider two factors for further analysis.

To aid in the interpretation of the two factors, factor rotation was performed using a Direct Oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalisation. Direct Oblimin rotation was used because the factors were interrelated and this would allow general as well as narrower factors to emerge (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). Two rounds of rotation were performed on the two factors used in the analysis. Items with were retained for inclusion if their correlation loading was 0.3 and above. Furthermore, items with cross loadings of more than 0.25 were excluded to avoid duplication of the items. All items that did not meet the above criteria were rejected and the process was repeated until a “clean” or final structure was achieved. The remaining factors were examined and assigned a label depending on the highest number of factors remaining from each cluster. Based on this inclusion criterion, the following items were excluded after each round of rotation.

**Items eliminated after round 1:**
- Even if I did the best job possible, My supervisor would fail to notice
- My supervisor shows very little concern for me.
- My co-workers value my contribution to their well being.

No items were eliminated after round 2 and the final solution consisting of the remaining 17 items is presented in table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Final two-factor EFA for PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1: Perceived Leadership Support</th>
<th>Factor 2: Co-Worker Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation values my contribution to its well being</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, the organisation would fail to</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation would ignore any complaint from me</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me.</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor values my contribution to their well being.</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers fail to appreciate any extra effort from me</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers show very little concern for me.</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, My co-workers would fail to</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers would ignore any complaint from me.</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers care about my general satisfaction at work</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers take pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My co-workers really care about my well-being</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of variance explained</th>
<th>35.403%</th>
<th>10.386%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigen values explained</td>
<td>7.435</td>
<td>2.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFA: Principal Axis Factoring, Oblimin rotation

Based on the results presented in Table 4.2, it is clear that items relating to supervisors/leaders clustered together. Factor 1 contained all eight of the items from the original POS scale and six items from the PSS scale. Employees tend to assign humanlike characteristics to the organisation and interpret support from leadership as coming from the organisation. Likewise, because supervisors act as direct agents of the organisation in directing and evaluating employees, subordinates tend to attribute this supportiveness in part to the organisation rather than solely to the supervisors’ personal inclinations (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Organisations are not human, however, leadership drives policies. It is clear that individuals may find it difficult to distinguish between support from leadership and from the supervisor. It is on the basis of this assertion that factor 1 was labelled Perceived Leadership Support.
(PLS), representing the exchanges between the organisation and the supervisor and the individual.

Factor 2 contained seven of the eight items from the original PCWS scale.

The internal reliability of the Perceived Support scales was tested using Cronbach alpha coefficients. The Cronbach alphas for the derived measurement model were calculated and are presented in the table 4.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach alpha coefficients</th>
<th>EFA-derived solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Leadership Support</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Co-Worker Support</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach alphas for the derived measurement model are significantly higher than the 0.6 recommended range required and was therefore retained for further analyses.

The results above led to the rejection of Hypothesis 1. However, there is sufficient construct validity and reliability of a two dimensional perceived support construct, consisting of PLS and PCWS.

**Job satisfaction scale**

The Kaiser Meyer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for the job satisfaction scale was 0.804 and Bartlett's test for sphericity was also statistically significant (p<0.0001) supporting the appropriateness of the job satisfaction scale for EFA. The scree plot for the job satisfaction scale revealed a break after the second factor. Based on these findings, it was decided to consider two factors for EFA.

Three rounds of EFA were performed on the two factors extracted from the job satisfaction scale. The following items were excluded after each round of rotation. Items eliminated after round 1:
- Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience
- The way my job provides for steady employment.
- The way company policies are put into practice

Items eliminated after round 2:
- The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job
- The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities

No items were eliminated after round three. The final solution is presented in table 4.4 below.

**Table 4.4: Final two factor EFA for JS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 187</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Extrinsic job satisfaction</th>
<th>Intrinsic job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgement.</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The working conditions.</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job.</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The way my boss handles his or her workers.</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chance to be “somebody” in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of variance explained</td>
<td>31.305%</td>
<td>12.207%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eigen values explained</td>
<td>4.696</td>
<td>1.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFA: Principal Axis Factoring, Oblimin rotation

The internal reliability of the derived measurement model was calculated and is presented in table 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5: Cronbach alphas for the JS scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach alpha coefficients</th>
<th>EFA- derived solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The coefficients of the derived solution were well above the recommended .6 range. It was therefore decided that the EFA-derived solution would be suitable for further analysis.

*Organisational commitment scale*

A short form of Allen and Meyer's (1990) organisational commitment scale consisting of 8 items was used to assess affective commitment. The Cronbach alpha for Allen and Meyer's (1990) organisational commitment scale in the current study was 0.617, this was within the .6 range. It was therefore maintained that the .617 reliability value represents an acceptable level of internal consistency for this sample and thus the original short form of the scale was found to be appropriate for further analysis. Also, due to the small number of items in the scale, it was not subjected to EFA.

*Organisational citizenship behaviour scale*

The 24 items of the OCB scale were subjected to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Prior to performing EFA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .777, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970 in Pallant, 2001). The Bartlett test for Sphericity was also statistically significant (p=. 000) thus supporting the use of EFA.

Principle axis factoring revealed the presence of 3 factors with eigenvalues of more than 1, explaining 55% of the variance. Based on these findings, it was decided to consider three factors for further analysis.

To aid in the interpretation of the three factors, factor rotation was performed using a Direct Oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalisation. Three rounds of rotation were performed on the three factors used in the analysis. The following items were excluded after each round of rotation.
Items eliminated after round 1:

- I am mindful of how my behaviour affects other people’s jobs.
- I help others who have been absent.
- My attendance at work is above the norm.
- I am always in need of other’s assistance in my work.
- I am one of the most conscientious employees
- I attend meetings that are not mandatory, but are considered important.
- I help others who have heavy workloads.
- I am always ready to lend a helping hand to those around me.
- I keep abreast of developments in the organisation

Items eliminated after round 2:

- I read and keep up to date with organisation announcements, memos, etc.
- I attend functions that are not required but help the company image

No items eliminated after round 3 and the final solution is 12 items presented in table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6: Final three factor EFA for OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N =187</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Sportsmanship</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tend to make problems bigger than they are.</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always find fault with what the organisation is</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to focus on what’s wrong with my situation</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the impact of my actions on co-workers</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to avoid creating problems for co-workers</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in giving an honest day’s work for an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not take extra breaks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I obey company rules and regulations even when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take steps to try to prevent problems with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not abuse the rights of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help orient new people even though it is not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I willingly give my time to help others who have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work related problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of variance explained | 30.157% | 13.465% | 11.140% |
| Eigen values explained | 3.662 | 1.616 | 1.337 |

EFA: Principal Axis Factoring, Oblimin rotation

From table 4.6 above, the three-factor solution explained 55% of the variance with factor 1 explaining 30% and factor 2 explaining 14% and factor 3 explaining 11%. Based on the results from the factor analysis it is clear that the respondents in this
sample were unable to distinguish items relating to civic virtue and courtesy. As a result, all items measuring civic virtue were eliminated and those relating to courtesy were clustered with sportsmanship and conscientiousness. The three factors were labelled sportsmanship, conscientiousness and altruism respectively based on the fact that these items had most items in each factor and the higher factor loadings.

The internal reliability of both the original and derived measurement models was calculated and is presented in the table 4.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7: Cronbach alphas for the OCB scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach alpha coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the total Cronbach alpha for the original scale was higher than that of the derived scale the items individual Cronbach alphas were generally higher. Based on this, it was more appropriate to use the derived EFA solution for further analysis.

Based on the above analysis of the scales reliabilities and validities, the EFA-derived scales are appropriate to use in this sample for further analysis. Below is a summary of the scales used for further analysis.
Table 4.8: Summary of scales used for further analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>EFA-derived factors</th>
<th>Original factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support</td>
<td>Perceived leadership support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived co-worker support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intention to quit (Cohen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships between constructs

Having determined the reliability and validity of the measurement scale in this study, the next step was to explore the direct and indirect relationships between the constructs using the derived EFA and original measurement scales presented in table 4.8 below. For this, correlation analysis was used. Correlation analysis describes the strength and direction of the linear relationship between variables (Pallant, 2001).

Pearson’s Product Moment correlation ($r$) was used to analyse the bi-variate relationships between the constructs.

Pearson correlations can range between 1 and −1. The value indicates the strength of the relationship and the negative or positive sign indicates the direction of the relationship (Pallant, 2001). Although different authors suggest different interpretations of values, Cohen (1988) suggests the following guidelines:

- $r = .10$ to $.29$ Weak relationship
- $r = .30$ to $.49$ Medium relationship
- $r = .50$ to 1 Strong relationship

These guidelines will be used to interpret the correlations presented in table 4.9 below.
Table 4.9: Pearson correlation coefficients for all constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sportsmanship (EFA)</td>
<td>1</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>2. Conscienciousness (EFA)</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Altruism (EFA)</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OCB (EFA)</td>
<td>.852**</td>
<td>.764**</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Satisfaction Extrinsic (EFA)</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction intrinsic (EFA)</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.371**</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job Satisfaction (EFA)</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.909**</td>
<td>.740**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intention to quit</td>
<td>-.182*</td>
<td>-.198**</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.235**</td>
<td>-.440**</td>
<td>-.289**</td>
<td>-.453**</td>
<td>-.469**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. POS (EFA)</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>-.525**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PC-WS (EFA)</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>-.349**</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Perceived Support (EFA)</td>
<td>.199**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.202**</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>-.521**</td>
<td>.955**</td>
<td>.753**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed),
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N = 187

Key:

(EFA) – Exploratory Factor Analysis derived measurement model
POS – Perceived Organisational Support
PC-WS – Perceived Co-Worker Support
OCB – Organisational Citizenship Behaviour
Based on Cohen’s (1988) recommendations, the following correlations can be identified from table 4.9 above.

There was a strong positive correlation between total job satisfaction construct and the EFA-derived construct of perceived support (r = .530; p = .000). The total job satisfaction construct also had medium positive correlations with the EFA-derived construct of PLS (r = .482; p=.000) and PCWS (r = .472; p = .000).

A strong negative correlation of -.521 (p = .000) was also realised between intention to quit and the EFA-derived construct of perceived support. These results led to the acceptance of H2, and confirmed a negative relationship between PS and intention to quit. Furthermore, intention to quit also had a strong negative correlation with the EFA-derived construct of PLS. (r = -.525; p = .000) and a medium negative correlation with PC-WS (r = -.349; p = .000).

There were also medium positive correlations between the EFA-derived construct of extrinsic job satisfaction and the EFA-derived construct of perceived support (r = .491; p = .000) and the EFA-derived constructs of PLS (r = .458; p = .000) and PCWS (r = .408; p = .000). The EFA-derived construct of intrinsic job satisfaction had positive medium correlations with the EFA-derived constructs of PLS (r = .324; p = .000); PCWS (r = .383; p = .000); and perceived support (r = .377; p = .000).

Affective commitment had medium positive correlations with the EFA-derived constructs of perceived support (r = .430; p = .000); PLS (r = .380; p = .000) and PCWS (r = .415; p = .000).

The total EFA-derived concept of OCB had medium correlations with the EFA-derived constructs of perceived support(r = .337; p = .000); PCWS (r=.300; p = .000); and PLS (r = .302; p = .000). The EFA-derived construct of conscientiousness had medium positive correlations with the EFA-derived constructs of perceived support (r = .357; p = .000); PCWS (r = .330; p = 000); and PLS (r = .302; p = .000).
The EFA-derived construct of sportsmanship had weak positive correlations with the EFA-derived constructs of perceived support (r = .199; p = .006); PCWS (r = .151; p = .040); and PLS (r = .193; p = .008). Similar to sportsmanship, the EFA-derived construct of altruism had weak positive correlations with the EFA-derived constructs of perceived support (r = .202; p = .006); PCWS (r = .230; p = .002); and PLS (r = .156; p = .033).

Based on the above Pearson correlation coefficients, perceived support produced positive relationships with job satisfaction, OCB and commitment and a negative relationship with intention to quit. Intention to quit was negatively related to all constructs in varying degrees of strength.

According to Pallant (2001), if two items have a bi-variate correlation of 0.7 or above, this suggests the possibility of multi-collinearity. The correlations between the EFA-derived POS construct and PS (0.955) and that between the EFA-derived PCWS construct and PS (0.753) was high suggesting multi-collinearity. Although H1 was rejected, the EFA results confirmed sufficient construct validity and reliability of a two-dimensional perceived support construct. This assertion is further supported based on Pallant’s assumptions on multi-collinearity and therefore the two-dimensional construct PS was retained for further analysis.

The variables from the correlations from table 4.9 above are presented in the research model below:
Figure 4.1: Pearson Correlation Coefficients based on the research model.

Indirect relationships between perceived support and intention to quit
To determine the indirect relationships between PS and intention to quit, this study examined the mediating role of job satisfaction, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a variable functions as a mediator when:

a) Variations in the levels in the independent variable significantly account for variations in the presumed mediator

b) Variations in the mediator significantly account for variations in the dependent variable

c) When the relationship between the independent variable and the mediator and that between the mediator and the outcome variable are controlled, a previously significant relationship between the independent and the dependent variables is no longer significant, with the strongest demonstration of mediation occurring when path c is zero.
The relationship between perceived support and intention to quit as mediated by job satisfaction

To establish mediation, Baron and Kenny (1986) and Judd and Kenny (1981) recommend the following four-step process:

1. The independent variable is significantly correlated with the dependent variable.
2. The independent variable is significantly correlated with the mediating variable.
3. The independent and mediating variables are simultaneously used (i.e. as a model) in a regression equation to predict the dependent variable.
4. To establish complete mediation, the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable should be zero, when controlling for the mediator.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986) complete mediation is established if the four steps described above are met. Partial mediation is indicated if only the first three steps and not the fourth step are met (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

To test Hypothesis 3, Baron and Kenny’s four-step process was used and the results are presented below.

Step 1: As can be seen from the table 4.9, there is a significant positive relationship between PS and job satisfaction ($r = 0.530, p < 0.01$).

Step 2: From table 4.9 it can be seen that there is a significant negative relationship between PS and intention to quit ($r = -0.521, p < 0.01$).

The results from the Standard Multiple Regression analysis are presented in table 4.10 below:
Table 4.10: Results for the Standard Multiple Regression (PS, job satisfaction and intention to quit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Sig. T</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
<th>R square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.769</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.321</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>-0.392</td>
<td>-5.443</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
<td>-3.405</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependant variable = Intention to Quit
* Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction and Perceived Support

Step 3: From table 4.10 it can be seen that the model consisting of job satisfaction and PS, significantly predicted intention to quit and explained 31.5% of the variance in intention to quit. Both job satisfaction and PS were found to be significant predictors of intention to quit. Considering the Beta coefficients, PS made a stronger unique contribution in explaining intention to quit, when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled for.

Step 4: To assess this step of Baron and Kenny’s (1981) mediation steps, a Partial correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between PS and intention to quit, when controlling for job satisfaction. This relationship was found to be significant (r = -0.372, p<0.01). However, the fourth requirement, necessary to show complete mediation, was not satisfied (i.e. to show complete mediation this relationship should have been found to be zero when controlling for the mediator).

These results suggest partial mediation as the relationship between PS and intention to quit was reduced in size but was still different from zero when job satisfaction was controlled for.

Based on these findings, Hypothesis 3 was rejected, as complete mediation was not found. However, given that the first three steps of the process were satisfied and the conclusion can be made that job satisfaction only partially mediates the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit in this sample.
The relationship between perceived support and intention to quit as mediated by affective commitment

To test Hypothesis 4, the four-step approach was also used. The results are as follows:

Step 1: Based on table 4.9, there is a significant positive relationship between PS and affective commitment ($r=0.430, p<0.01$).

Step 2: From table 4.9, there is a significant negative relationship between PS and intention to quit ($r=-0.521, p<0.01$).

The results from the Standard Multiple Regression analysis are presented in table 4.11 below:

Table 4.11: Results for the Standard Multiple Regression (PS, AC and intention to quit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Sig. T</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
<th>R square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.533</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>15.364</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>-5.938</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>-4.543</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependant variable = Intention to Quit

* Predictors: (Constant), Affective Commitment and Perceived Support

Step 3: From table 4.11 it can be seen that the model consisting of affective commitment and PS, significantly predicted intention to quit. This model further explained 34.5% of the variance in intention to quit and both affective commitment and PS were found to be significant predictors of intention to quit. Considering the Beta coefficients, PS made a stronger unique contribution in explaining intention to quit, when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled for.

Step 4: A Partial correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between PS and intention to quit, when controlling for affective commitment. This relationship was found to be significant ($r = -0.401, p<0.01$). However, the fourth requirement,
necessary to show complete mediation, was not satisfied (i.e. the relationship should have been found to be zero when controlling for the mediator).

These results suggest partial mediation as the relationship between PS and intention to quit reduced in size but was still not zero when affective commitment was controlled for.

In this model, Baron and Kenny’s conditions for complete mediation were not met leading to the rejection of hypothesis 4. However, there is enough evidence to suggest partial mediation therefore concluding that affective commitment only partially mediated the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit for this sample.

The relationship between perceived support and intention to quit as mediated by job satisfaction

To test Hypothesis 5, the same process as above was followed and the results are as follows:

Step 1: From table 4.9, it can be seen that there is a significant positive relationship ($r=0.337, p<0.01$) between PS and OCB.

Step 2: Based on the results presented in table 4.9, there is a significant negative relationship between PS and intention to quit ($r=-0.521, p<0.01$).

The results from the Standard Multiple Regression analysis are presented in table 4.12 below:
Table 4.12: Results for the Standard Multiple Regression (PS, OCB and intention to quit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Sig. T</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
<th>R square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.056</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.125</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>-.7488</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-1.009</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependant variable = Intention to Quit
* Predictors: (Constant), OCB and Perceived Support

Step 3: From table 4.12 it can be seen that the model this model explained 27.6% of the variance in intention to quit and PS was found to be a significant predictor of intention to quit. Although OCB also predicted intention to quit in this model, this relationship was not significant. Considering the Beta coefficients, PS made a unique contribution in explaining intention to quit, hpfs

Step 4: A Partial correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between PS and intention to quit, when controlling for OCB. This relationship was found to be significant (r = -0.483, p<0.01). However, the fourth requirement, necessary to show complete mediation, was not satisfied (i.e. the relationship should have been found to be zero when controlling for the mediator).

These results suggest partial mediation as the relationship between PS and intention to quit reduced in size but was still not zero when OCB was controlled for.

In this model, Baron and Kenny's (1986) conditions for complete mediation were not met. Hypothesis 5 was therefore rejected. However, Baron and Kenny's conditions for partial mediation were met leading to the conclusion OCB partially mediated the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit for this sample.

Statistical importance of construct relationships with intention to quit
To determine the relative contribution of each of the variables in their relationship with intention to quit, Standard Multiple Regression was used.
Relative contribution of PS, OCB, JS and AC on intention to quit

When simultaneously regressed on intention to quit, PS, OCB, JS and AC explained 36.3% (see table 4.13) of the variation in intention to quit. Further analysis of the analysis of variance revealed that this variation was statistically significant (P< .000).

Table 4.13: Variance of intention to quit explained by PS, OCB, JS and AC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.603(a)</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>25.946</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), PS, OCB, AC, JS  
b Dependent Variable: Intention to quit

In order to compare the contribution of each independent variable, it was essential to analyse the Beta values. According to Pallant (2001), the beta values explain the unique contribution each independent variable makes on the dependent variable while controlling for the variation explained. A higher beta value indicates a stronger unique contribution to the dependent variable. The results of the analysis to assess the relative contribution of PS, OCB JS and AC are presented in table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14: Relative contribution of PS, OCB, JS and AC on intention to quit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig. Partial</th>
<th>Partial correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Intention to quit

From the results in table 4.14 above, perceived support (-.323) made the strongest unique contribution to intention to quit, followed by affective commitment (-.253) and job satisfaction (-.164). OCB contributed the least to intention to quit (β=-.011). Furthermore, the significance values of perceived support, p=0.000), affective commitment (p=0.000) and job satisfaction (p=0.027) were all less than 0.05 and therefore made a unique significant contribution to intention to quit. The significance
value of OCB (p=0.869) was well above the 0.05 recommended value therefore confirming that it did not have a significant contribution to intention to quit.

This chapter made use of various statistical techniques to investigate the research questions proposed earlier on in this research. The results of these investigations are discussed in the next section.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the findings obtained from the sample of bank employees and considers the proposed hypotheses and research questions this study aimed to investigate. Each research question will be discussed in relation to the current findings and previous research. The chapter will then conclude with a summary of the limitations, practical recommendations for managers and recommendations for future research.

The construct validity of the perceived support construct

Based on the EFA results presented in the previous chapter, items relating to POS and PSS clustered together forming one factor, which was labelled Perceived Leadership Support (PLS). Clearly, the sample did not distinguish between POS and PSS. These findings are consistent with previous research findings that PSS is associated with and also contributes to POS (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Eisenberger et al., 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Yoon & Lim, 1999). Supervisors act as agents of the organisation in directing and evaluating employees, and subordinates tend to attribute this support in part to the organisation rather than solely to the supervisor’s personal inclinations (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

The Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients between PS and PLS ($r=0.955$) and PS and PCWS ($r=0.753$) were above the recommended value of 0.6 and therefore suggesting multi-collinearity, meaning that they are one and the same thing. Therefore, POS and PCWS are dimensions of and constitute PS. This led to the rejection of Hypothesis 1. The three dimensional construct of PS could not be confirmed. However, there was sufficient evidence to support two-dimensional PS construct that constitutes the dimensions of PLS and PCWS.
**Intention to quit and its correlates**

The results of the study revealed that intention to quit was negatively related to all the constructs in varying degrees. Among all the constructs, PS and intention to quit produced the strongest negative correlation (-0.521). This finding is consistent with that of Allen, et al. 2003; Cole et al (2002); Eisenberger, et al. (2001); and Rhoades and Eisenberger, (2002) who also found a strong negative relationship between PS and intention to quit. This finding further justifies this study and confirms the importance of the relationship between PS and intention to quit in managing retention.

A medium positive relationship between the EFA-derived construct of Perceived Support and the EFA-derived construct of OCB was obtained (r=0.337) This finding is consistent with that of Eisenberger et al (2001); Ilies et al. (2007) as well as Cole et al (2002) who found that POS, PSS, and PCWS are positively related to extra-role behaviours (OCB).

A strong positive relationship between the EFA-derived construct of Perceived Support and the EFA-derived construct of Job Satisfaction was obtained. This finding is consistent with that of Erdogan and Enders (2007); Rayton (2006) as well Cole et al (2002) who found that POS, PSS, and PCWS are positively related to job satisfaction.

Consistent with the findings of Eisenberger (2001) and Rayton (2006) as well Cole et al (2002) PS was positively related to affective commitment.

From the results in table 4.9, there is a weak negative relationship between the EFA-derived construct of OCB and the original construct of intention to quit. This finding is consistent with that of Turnipseed (2005) who found that intention to quit and high levels of OCB are inconsistent behaviours and that one will take precedence over the other.

The results of this study revealed a negative relationship between job satisfaction and intention to quit. This finding is consistent with that of Silverthorne (2005) who
found that workers who have high levels of job satisfaction are likely to be more committed to the organisation and less likely to seek alternative employment. Firth et al (2003) also found that intention to quit is highly influenced by dissatisfaction on the job.

From the results in table 4.9, there is a medium negative relationship between the original construct of construct of affective commitment and the original construct of Intention to Quit. This finding is consistent with that of Firth et al (2003); Jawahar and Hemmas (2006) as well as Turnipseed (2005) who found that commitment consistently had a statistically significant and negative relationship with intention to quit and actual turnover.

These findings are consistent with those of Turnipseed (2005) who found that job satisfaction, commitment and OCB have consistently been found to be negatively related to intention to quit.

**Indirect relationships between perceived support and intention to quit**
Baron and Kenny's three step process was used to test the mediating roles of affective commitment, job satisfaction and OCB in the perceived support-intention to quit relationship. The results revealed that affective commitment, job satisfaction and OCB all partially mediated the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit for this sample.

**Relative importance of construct relationships with intention to quit**
Perceived support (-0.323) made the strongest unique contribution to intention to quit followed by affective commitment (-0.253) and job satisfaction (-0.164). OCB (-0.011) contributed the least to intention to quit. Furthermore, the significance values of perceived support (0.000), affective commitment (0.000) and job satisfaction (0.027) were all less than 0.05 and therefore made a unique significant contribution to intention to quit. The significance value of OCB (0.869) was well above the 0.05 recommended value therefore confirming that it did not have a unique significant contribution to intention to quit.
Limitations of the study
Like any research, this study has certain limitations. One limitation of the study was the sample size and composition. Data was obtained from one organisation and moreover in one geographic region (i.e. Western Cape). As a result, the findings from this study are limited in terms of generalisation. The generalisation of the findings could be further limited to organisations in the banking sector or more specifically to the bank used in this study. Whether the findings can be generalised to other geographic regions is also questionable due to the complexity of race and cultural distributions across South Africa.

The design of this study was cross sectional and as a result, it was not possible to determine causality. A longitudinal study with data being collected at different time intervals would have been more appropriate in predicting intention to quit. However, due to time constraints this was not possible. A recommendation for future research, therefore, is the replication of the same study over a longer period of time.

Another limitation is the mono method bias where the same individuals were used to assess a variety of constructs.

Recommendations for future research
This study attempted to contribute to a growing body of research specifically in a South African context. This study responded to calls by Cole et al. (2002) for an integrated model that looks at the three social exchanges between the individual and 1) the organisation; 2) supervisor and; 3) co-workers simultaneously. Based on the findings of this study, neither perceived organisational support nor perceived co-worker support had a statistically more important relationship with intention to quit and are therefore equally important. The recommendation therefore is a replication of this study to confirm these results.

The OCB construct did not make a unique contribution in it relation with intention to quit. The recommendation therefore is a further investigation of nature of the OCB intention to quit relationship.
A longitudinal study with better sampling techniques is highly recommended for a study of this nature.

**Practical implications for Organisations**

The role of leadership/managers is important. The results of this study have confirmed the importance of perceived support in mitigating intention to quit. If individuals do not perceive support especially from their supervisors and their co-workers, they are more likely to have turnover cognitions, which may translate into actual turnover behaviour.

Furthermore, managers need to pay special attention to affective commitment and job satisfaction as they play an important positive role in mediating the perceived support-intention to quit relationship. Employees' satisfaction with their jobs may positively improve their performance however, if they are also affectively committed, they will be prepared to show higher levels of performance (Sulaiman, 2002).

**Conclusion**

The first general aim of this study was to contribute to the growing body of research related to turnover cognitions more specifically intention to quit. Secondly, this study sought to expand the understanding of how POS, PSS and PCWS influence the turnover cognitions of intention to quit. Thirdly, this study proposed an integrated approach that encompasses the three social exchanges that may take place within the workplace i.e. between the individual and (a) the organisation; (b) their supervisor; and (c) their work group which had been some what overlooked in previous research.

With the above in mind, this study examined and presented results and discussed the findings on; (1) the construct validity of the PS construct; (2) the direct relationship between perceived support and intention to quit; (3) the relationship between perceived support and intention to quit mediated by the attitudinal inducements of job satisfaction, affective commitment and OCB and; (4) the relative importance of the constructs in relation to intention to quit.
It is hoped, that managers and organisations who wish not only to maximise their employees’ potential but also retain the best employees will make use of the recommendations herein to elicit higher job satisfaction, commitment, performance and increased productivity amongst their staff.
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