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ABSTRACT

In Dubai, United Arab Emirate (UAE), the Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in the construction sector have a shortfall of 500,000 skilled employees because of the lack of job satisfaction and top management support, which prompt workers to leave their places of employment. Existing literature shows that many studies had investigated the connection between job satisfaction and the intention to leave. However, the literature is limited to the effect of a moderator on this relationship. Hence, prior studies only investigated the effect of personal characteristics such as gender, age, tenure and qualification on the relationship between job satisfaction and the intention to leave. Thus, this study investigated the effect of top management support (TMS) as an organizational factor on the relationship between job satisfaction and the intention to leave among the middle level managers in the construction sector of Dubai, UAE. 12 research questions and research objectives were formulated. Accordingly, 12 research hypotheses were postulated. The first set of hypotheses were on the direct relationship between the 6 facets of job satisfaction (satisfaction with supervisor, satisfaction with closure, satisfaction with variety, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with compensation and satisfaction with HR policies) and the intention to leave. The second set of hypotheses was on the effect of top management support on the relationship between the 6 facets of job satisfaction and the intention to leave. To test the relationship among the variables, this study adopted a quantitative design and data was collected from 120 middle level managers of SMEs. The Partial Least Squares – Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) technique was adopted in the data analysis. According to the outcome, the relationship between 4 facets of job satisfaction and the intention to leave among the middle level managers of SMEs was established. The study also found statistical support for the moderating effect of TMS on the relationship between 2 facets of job satisfaction and the intention to leave among the middle level managers of SMEs. The study highlights the limitations and provides suggestions for future research direction.

Keywords: Intention to leave, top management support, job satisfaction.
ABSTRAK

Di Dubai, Emiriyah Arab Bersatu (UAE), Perusahaan Kecil dan Sederhana (PKS) dalam sektor pembinaan mempunyai kekurangan 500,000 pekerja mahir kerana kurang kepuasan kerja dan sokongan pengurusan atasan yang mendorong para pekerja untuk meninggalkan pekerjaan. Banyak kajian lepas yang telah meneliti hubungan antara kepuasan kerja dan niat untuk pergi. Walau bagaimanapun, kajian lepas terhad kepada kesan pengantaraan dalam hubungan berkenaan. Oleh itu, kajian lepas hanya menyiasat kesan ciri pribadi seperti jantina, umur, tempoh, kelayakan kepuasan kerja dan niat untuk pergi. Justeru itu, kajian ini meneliti kesan sokongan pengurusan atasan (TMS) sebagai faktor organisasi terhadap hubungan antara kepuasan kerja dan niat untuk pergi dalam kalangan pengurus peringkat pertengahan di sektor pembinaan Dubai, UAE. Sebanyak 12 persoalan kajian dan objektif penyelidikan telah dirumuskan. Sehubungan dengan itu, sebanyak 12 hipotesis penyelidikan telah dirumuskan. Set hipotesis pertama adalah hubungan langsung antara 6 aspek kepuasan kerja (kepuasan dengan penyelia, kepuasan dengan penutupan, kepuasan dengan kepelbagaian, kepuasan dengan rakan sekerja, kepuasan dengan pampasan dan kepuasan dengan polisi sumber manusia) dan niat untuk pergi. Sementara itu, set hipotesis kedua adalah kesan sokongan pengurusan atasan terhadap hubungan antara 6 aspek kepuasan kerja dan niat untuk pergi. Untuk menguji hubungan antara pemboleh ubah, kajian ini menggunakan reka bentuk kajian kuantitatif dan data dikumpulkan daripada 120 orang pengurus peringkat menengah PKS. Teknik Pemodelan Persamaan Berstruktur Kuasa Dua Terkecil Separa (PLS-SEM) telah digunakan dalam menganalisis data. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa hubungan antara 4 aspek kepuasan kerja dan niat untuk pergi dalam kalangan pengurus SME peringkat menengah telah dibentuk. Kajian ini telah menemui sokongan statistik mengenai kesan penyederhanaan TMS terhadap hubungan antara 2 aspek kepuasan kerja dan niat untuk pergi dalam kalangan pengurus SME pada peringkat pertengahan. Kajian ini menyerlahkan batasan dan cadangan untuk tujuan penyelidikan pada masa hadapan.

Kata kunci: Niat untuk pergi, sokongan pengurusan atasan, kepuasan kerja.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In this chapter, the overview of the research background is presented with respect to Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) sector of Dubai, United Arab Emirate (UAE), where focus has been made to introduce the topic in detail. In particular, the intentions are to present the research/problem, not only highlighting the gap in the existing literature but also the pertaining issues in the industry particularly related to the domains of job satisfaction and intention to leave among employees of SMEs in Dubai UAE. In addition, research questions, research objectives, the scope and significance of the study are addressed. Finally, outlines of the thesis were presented describing how different chapters of the study and the entire process of research were organized.

1.2 Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Dubai, UAE

Small Medium Enterprises have been a major economic vehicle of both advanced economies as well as economies in transition (Meghana, Asli & Maksimovic, 2011). The Northern Ireland 39th summit of great eight (8) Nations formally endorsed the importance of SMEs by highlighting the considerable contribution of the sector to employment and economic dynamism in the most industrialized countries in the world (G-8 Summit, 2013).

Accordingly, the United Nations Organizations for Industrial development (UNIDO, 2015) documented the findings of their series of research in different countries and emphasized the major roles of SMEs. Firstly, SMEs play a vital role in development, specifically due
The contents of the thesis is for internal user only
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Date: 1/11/ 2015

Dear Respondent,

I hope you are in good health.

I am currently undergoing a PhD degree in Management at Universiti Utara Malaysia. In partial fulfillment of the degree, I am required to conduct a research. Toward this, I intend to conduct a study on the moderating effect of top management support on the relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave among middle level managers of SMEs in the construction sector of Dubai, UAE.

I am pleased to inform you that you have been selected to participate in the survey. I hope that you could complete the attached questionnaire by answering all the questions as
honestly and objectively as possible. Therefore, be rest assured that all your responses will be treated as confidential and you will remain anonymous.

I need to stress here that your participation is voluntary. Should you feel uneasy to participate, you could always withdraw at any point of time. But I really hope that you could help me in my study, and for that I thank you.

Once you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to the person in charge, and for this I again thank you.

If you are interested to know the results of the study or about the study itself, please do not hesitate to contact me at the following address, or email me at: ______________________ or call me at: ________________________.

I wish to thank you again for your cooperation and participation.

Have a good day.

Yours’ Sincerely,

Basm a Kasmoula,

Dubai-UAE.
SECTION A – Assessment of Intention to Leave

This section asks your plan for the future. Please circle the correct response that reflects your honest and objective opinion on each of the statement below using the following scale in which 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

|   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1. | In the last few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Presently, I am actively searching for other job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | I intend to leave the organization in the near future. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

SECTION B – Assessment of Job satisfaction

Listed below are questions pertaining to your opinions about your work you are doing now. Please circle the correct response that reflects your honest and objective opinion on each of the statement below using the following scale in which 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

|   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|

Satisfaction with Supervisor

|   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1. | I am satisfied with the information I receive from my superior about my job performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | I receive enough information from my supervisor about my job performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | I receive enough feedback from my supervisor on how well I am doing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | There is enough opportunity in my job to find out how I am doing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Satisfaction with Variety**

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | I am satisfied with the variety of activities my job offers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | I am satisfied with the opportunity my job provides me to interact with others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | There is enough variety in my job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | I have enough freedom to what I want in my job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Satisfaction with Closure**

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | My job has enough opportunity for independent thought and action. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | I am satisfied with the opportunity my job gives me to complete tasks from the beginning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | My job has enough opportunity to complete the work I starting to end. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Satisfaction with Compensation**

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | Overall I am satisfied with the company’s compensation package. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | I am satisfied with the medical benefits. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | I received the security that is my job provides me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|   |                                                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. | I am satisfied with the retirement benefits.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | I am satisfied with the holiday (vacation) eligibilities.        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Satisfaction with Co-workers**

|   |                                                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. | My fellow workers are not selfish.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | My fellow workers are pleasant.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | The people I work with are very friendly.                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. | The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Satisfaction with the HR Policies**

|   |                                                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. | Company’s management has a clear path for employee’s advancement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | Decisions are made keeping in mind the good of the employees.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | Management is extremely fair in personal policies.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | Physical working conditions are supportive in attaining quality of work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
**Section C – Assessment of Top Management Support**

We are interested in learning about how you perceive your workplace and organization. Please circle the correct response that reflects your honest and objective opinion on each of the statement below using the following scale in which 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

|   |   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1. | My organization is quick to use improved work methods that are developed by workers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | In my organization, developing one’s own ideas is encouraged for the improvement of the corporation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Top management is aware and very receptive to my ideas and suggestions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | A promotion usually follows from the development of new and innovative ideas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Those employees who come up with innovative ideas on their own often receive management encouragement for their activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | The “doers on projects” are allowed to make decisions without going through elaborate justification and approval procedures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Senior managers encourage innovators to bend rules and rigid procedures in order to keep | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| promising ideas on track. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Many top managers have been known for their experience with the innovation process. |   |   |   |   |
| Money is often available to get new project ideas off the ground. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Individuals with successful innovative projects receive additional rewards and compensation beyond the participation and achievement in the work |   |   |   |   |
| There are several options within the organization for individuals to get financial support for their innovative projects and ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| People are often encouraged to take calculated risks with ideas around here |   |   |   |   |
| Individual risk takers are often recognized for their willingness to champion new projects, whether eventually successful or not. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The term “risk taker” is considered a positive attribute for people in my work area. |   |   |   |   |
| This organization supports many small and experimental projects, realizing that some will undoubtedly fail. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| An employee with a good idea is often given free time to develop that idea. |   |   |   |   |
17. There is considerable desire among people in the organization for generating new ideas without regard for crossing departmental or functional boundaries

18. People are encouraged to talk to employees in other departments of this organization about ideas for new projects

SECTION D – Respondent’s Information

This section asks about your personal information. Please tick the appropriate box ☐, or fill in the space ---- provided.

1. What is your sex? ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. What is your ethnic origin? ☐ Pakistan ☐ Emirati
☐ Indian ☐ Philippines
☐ Bangladesh
☐ Others, please indicate __________

3. What is your marital status? ☐ Single ☐ Married
☐ Separated/Divorced

4. How old are you? ________ Years old
5. What is the highest level of your education?  □ Diploma
   □ Bachelor’s degree
   □ Master’s degree
   □ Others, please indicate, ____________________

6. How long have you been working in the company?  Approximately ________ years

7. What is your job title?  ________________________________

8. Which Department are you working in?  □ Finance/Administration
   □ Project Management
   □ Engineering & Design
   □ Infra Structure Construction
   □ Building Construction
   □ Industrial Construction
   □ Others, please indicate, ____________________
9. What is the size of your company? □ Not more than 20 employees
□ 21-100 employees
□ 101-250 employees
□ More than 250 employees

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
AND HAVE A GOOD DAY
Appendix C

Profile of Respondents

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid  | Male      | 116     | 96.7          | 96.7               |
|        | Female    | 4       | 3.3           | 100.0              |
|        | Total     | 120     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

| Ethnicity | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid     | Pakistan | 12      | 10.0          | 10.0               |
|           | Emirati   | 48      | 40.0          | 50.0               |
|           | India     | 29      | 24.2          | 74.2               |
|           | Philippines | 8    | 6.7           | 80.8               |
|           | Bangladesh | 4     | 3.3           | 84.2               |
|           | Others    | 19      | 15.8          | 100.0              |
|           | Total     | 120     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

| MaritalStatus | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid         | Single    | 64      | 53.3          | 53.3               |
|               | Married   | 56      | 46.7          | 100.0              |
|               | Total     | 120     | 100.0         | 100.0              |
### Age

| Age   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 20-29 | 60        | 50.0    | 50.0          | 50.0               |
| 30-39 | 36        | 30.0    | 30.0          | 80.0               |
| 40-49 | 24        | 20.0    | 20.0          | 100.0              |
| Total | 120       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Education

| Education   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Diploma     | 20        | 16.7    | 16.7          | 16.7               |
| Bachelor Degree | 84      | 70.0    | 70.0          | 86.7               |
| Masters     | 16        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 100.0              |
| Total       | 120       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Tenure

| Tenure | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1-5    | 88        | 73.3    | 73.3          | 73.3               |
| 6-10   | 20        | 16.7    | 16.7          | 90.0               |
| 11-15  | 12        | 10.0    | 10.0          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 120       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| Job Title                          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid                             |           |         |               |                    |
| Technical Office Eng.             | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 3.3                |
| Draughtsman                       | 17        | 14.2    | 14.2          | 17.5               |
| Civil Eng.                        | 16        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 30.8               |
| Sales manager                     | 5         | 4.2     | 4.2           | 35.0               |
| Senior Designer Eng.              | 10        | 8.3     | 8.3           | 43.3               |
| Project Eng.                      | 13        | 10.8    | 10.8          | 54.2               |
| MEP Eng.                          | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 57.5               |
| Senior Accountant                 | 8         | 6.7     | 6.7           | 64.2               |
| Estimation Eng.                   | 5         | 4.2     | 4.2           | 68.3               |
| Quantity Surveyor                 | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 71.7               |
| Procurement Eng./Mng              | 9         | 7.5     | 7.5           | 79.2               |
| Assessment Manager                | 5         | 4.2     | 4.2           | 83.3               |
| Secretary/Receptionist            | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 86.7               |
| Site Manager                      | 8         | 6.7     | 6.7           | 93.3               |
| Structural Manager                | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 96.7               |
| Associate Director                | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 100.0              |
| Total                             | 120       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

| Department                        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid                             |           |         |               |                    |
| Finance/Administration            | 16        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 13.3               |
| Project Management                | 17        | 14.2    | 14.2          | 27.5               |
| Engineering and Design            | 48        | 40.0    | 40.0          | 67.5               |
| 3                                 | 3         | 2.5     | 2.5           | 70.0               |
| Infrastructure Construction       | 12        | 10.0    | 10.0          | 80.0               |
| Building Construction             | 20        | 16.7    | 16.7          | 96.7               |
| Others                            | 4         | 3.3     | 3.3           | 100.0              |
| Total                             | 120       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| Size       | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 1-20 | 7         | 5.8     | 5.8           | 5.8                |
| 21-100     | 72        | 60.0    | 60.0          | 65.8               |
| 101-250    | 13        | 10.8    | 10.8          | 76.7               |
| Above 250  | 28        | 23.3    | 23.3          | 100.0              |
| Total      | 120       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
## Appendix D

### Mean and Standard Deviation of Variables

| Statistic               | N   | Mean     | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------------|-----|----------|----------------|
| IntentiontoLeave        | 120 | 2.6556   | .83564         |
| TopManagementSupport    | 120 | 3.0630   | .50349         |
| SatisfactionwithSupervisor | 120 | 3.1750   | .86760         |
| SatisfactionwithVariety | 120 | 3.1167   | .70333         |
| SatisfactionwithClosure | 120 | 3.1889   | .92958         |
| SatisfactionwithCompensation | 120 | 2.8067   | .66101         |
| SatisfactionwithCoworkers | 120 | 3.4750   | .68400         |
| SatisfactionwithHRPolicies | 120 | 3.1667   | .74848         |
| Valid N (listwise)      | 120 |          |                |
### Appendix E

#### Normality Test

|                      | N  | Skewness Statistic | Skewness Std. Error | Kurtosis Statistic | Kurtosis Std. Error |
|----------------------|----|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Intention to Leave   | 120| -0.027             | 0.221               | -0.560             | 0.438               |
| Top Management Support| 120| 0.058              | 0.221               | 0.190              | 0.438               |
| Satisfaction with Supervisor | 120| -0.636             | 0.221               | -0.450             | 0.438               |
| Satisfaction with Variety | 120| 0.229              | 0.221               | -0.685             | 0.438               |
| Satisfaction with Closure | 120| -0.346             | 0.221               | -0.179             | 0.438               |
| Satisfaction with Compensation | 120| -0.751             | 0.221               | 0.452              | 0.438               |
| Satisfaction with Coworkers | 120| -0.715             | 0.221               | -0.206             | 0.438               |
| Satisfaction with HR Policies | 120| -0.749             | 0.221               | 0.795              | 0.438               |
| Valid N (listwise)   | 120|                    |                     |                    |                     |
# Appendix F

## Multicollinearity Test

### Correlations

|                      | Satisfaction with Supervisor | Satisfaction with Variety | Satisfaction with Closure | Satisfaction with Compensation | Satisfaction with Coworkers | Satisfaction with HR Policies |
|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Satisfaction with Supervisor | 1                            | .280**                     | .480**                    | .259**                         | .050                        | .417**                      |
| **Sig. (1-tailed)**   |                              | .001                       | .000                      | .002                           | .294                        | .000                        |
| **N**                | 120                          | 120                        | 120                       | 120                            | 120                         | 120                         |
| Satisfaction with Variety | .280**                      | 1                          | .519**                    | .443**                         | .504**                      | .398**                      |
| **Sig. (1-tailed)**   |                              | .001                       | .000                      | .000                           | .000                        | .000                        |
| **N**                | 120                          | 120                        | 120                       | 120                            | 120                         | 120                         |
| Satisfaction with Closure | .480**                      | .519**                     | 1                         | .417**                         | .016                        | .655**                      |
| **Sig. (1-tailed)**   |                              | .000                       | .000                      | .000                           | .430                        | .000                        |
| **N**                | 120                          | 120                        | 120                       | 120                            | 120                         | 120                         |
| Satisfaction with Compensation | Pears | .259** | .443** | .417** | 1 | .231** | .755** |
| Argument: Correlation | | | | | | | |
| Correlation | Sig. (1-tailed) | .002 | .000 | .000 | .006 | .000 | |
| N | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |

| Satisfaction with Coworkers | Pears | .050 | .504** | .016 | .231** | 1 | -.021 |
| Argument: Correlation | | | | | | | |
| Correlation | Sig. (1-tailed) | .294 | .000 | .430 | .006 | .412 | |
| N | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |

| Satisfaction with HR Policies | Pears | .417** | .398** | .655** | .755** | -.021 | 1 |
| Argument: Correlation | | | | | | | |
| Correlation | Sig. (1-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .412 | |
| N | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
Appendix G
Reliability Analysis

Scale: Intention to Leave

| Reliability Statistics | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------|
|                         | .808            | 3          |

Scale: Top Management Support

| Reliability Statistics | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------|
|                         | .813            | 18         |

Scale: Satisfaction with Supervisors

| Reliability Statistics | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------|
|                         | .835            | 4          |
Scale: Satisfaction with Variety

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.659            | 4          |

Scale: Satisfaction with Closure

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.747            | 3          |

Scale: Satisfaction with Compensation

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.643            | 5          |
Scale: Satisfaction with Coworkers

| Reliability Statistics |
|------------------------|
| Cronbach’s Alpha       |
| N of Items             |
| .800                   |
| 4                      |

Scale: Satisfaction with HR Policies

| Reliability Statistics |
|------------------------|
| Cronbach’s Alpha       |
| N of Items             |
| .805                   |
| 4                      |
Appendix H

Factor Analysis

Intention to Leave

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .683 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 129.851 |
| Df | 3 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Component | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative |
| 1 | 2.190 | 73.001 | 73.001 | 2.190 | 73.001 | 73.001 |
| 2 | .520 | 17.338 | 90.340 |
| 3 | .290 | 9.660 | 100.000 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix*  

| Component | 1 |
|-----------|---|
| ITL1 | .896 |
| ITL2 | .867 |
| ITL3 | .798 |

Extraction Method:  
Principal Component Analysis.  
a. 1 components extracted.
## Top Management Support

### KMO and Bartlett’s Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .380 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 1682.731 |
| df | 153 |
| Sig. | .000 |

### Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|           | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 4.806 | 26.701 | 26.701 | 4.806 | 26.701 | 26.701 | 2.794 | 15.520 | 15.520 |
| 2         | 2.440 | 13.557 | 40.257 | 2.440 | 13.557 | 40.257 | 2.468 | 13.712 | 29.233 |
| 3         | 2.340 | 12.998 | 53.255 | 2.340 | 12.998 | 53.255 | 2.260 | 12.557 | 41.790 |
| 4         | 1.779 | 9.882 | 63.137 | 1.779 | 9.882 | 63.137 | 2.243 | 12.460 | 54.250 |
| 5         | 1.673 | 9.296 | 72.433 | 1.673 | 9.296 | 72.433 | 2.217 | 12.319 | 66.569 |
| 6         | 1.011 | 5.618 | 78.052 | 1.011 | 5.618 | 78.052 | 2.067 | 11.483 | 78.052 |
| 7         | .817  | 4.539 | 82.590 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 8         | .690  | 3.833 | 86.423 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 9         | .620  | 3.443 | 89.867 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 10        | .433  | 2.403 | 92.270 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 11        | .426  | 2.367 | 94.637 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 12        | .368  | 2.044 | 96.681 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 13        | .223  | 1.240 | 97.921 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 14        | .175  | .972  | 98.893 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 15        | .079  | .441  | 99.333 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 16        | .058  | .321  | 99.654 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 17        | .041  | .227  | 99.882 |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| 18        | .021  | .118  | 100.000 |            |            |            |            |            |            |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
### Component Matrix

| Component | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| TMS1      | .734  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS2      | .591  | .518  |       |       |       |       |
| TMS3      |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS4      | .784  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS5      | .587  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS6      |       |       | -.514 |       |       |       |
| TMS7      | .508  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS8      |       |       |       | .657  |       |       |
| TMS9      |       | -.597 |       |       |       |       |
| TMS10     | .624  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS11     | .728  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS12     |       |       | .505  |       |       |       |
| TMS13     |       |       | .589  |       |       |       |
| TMS14     |       |       |       | .608  |       |       |
| TMS15     | .582  |       |       |       |       |       |
| TMS16     |       |       | .519  |       |       |       |
| TMS17     |       | .541  | .518  |       |       |       |
| TMS18     |       |       |       |       | .563  |       |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 6 components extracted.
Satisfaction with Supervisors

| KMO and Bartlett’s Test |
|--------------------------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .715 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square 211.917 |
| df | 6 |
| Sig. | .000 |

| Total Variance Explained |
|---------------------------|
| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |
| Component | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 2.681 | 67.020 | 67.020 | 2.681 | 67.020 | 67.020 |
| 2 | .651 | 16.272 | 83.292 |
| 3 | .469 | 11.729 | 95.021 |
| 4 | .199 | 4.979 | 100.000 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

| Component Matrix* |
|-------------------|
| Component | |
| 1 | |
| SS1 | .868 |
| SS2 | .865 |
| SS3 | .775 |
| SS4 | .760 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.
Satisfaction with Variety

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .618 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 114.748 |
| df | 6 |
| Sig. | .000 |

**Total Variance Explained**

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|           | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.106 | 52.652 | 52.652 | 2.106 | 52.652 | 52.652 | 1.591 | 39.774 | 39.774 |
| 2         | 1.000 | 25.007 | 77.659 | 1.000 | 25.007 | 77.659 | 1.515 | 37.885 | 77.659 |
| 3         | .595  | 14.868 | 92.527 |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 4         | .299  | 7.473 | 100.000 |        |        |        |        |        |        |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Component Matrix**

| Component | 1     | 2     |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| SV1       | .546  | -.703 |
| SV2       | .840  |       |
| SV3       | .899  |       |
| SV4       | .543  | .711  |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 2 components extracted.
Satisfaction with Closure

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .617 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square |
| df | 3 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
|           | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.006 | 66.852      | 66.852      | 2.006 | 66.852      | 66.852      |
| 2         | .701  | 23.371      | 90.223      |       |              |             |
| 3         | .293  | 9.777       | 100.000     |       |              |             |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix*

| Component | 1 |
|-----------|---|
| SC1       | .681 |
| SC2       | .889 |
| SC3       | .867 |

Extraction Method:
Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.
Satisfaction with Compensation

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .472 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 149.880 |
| df | 10 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|           | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.171 | 43.422       | 43.422       | 2.171 | 43.422       | 43.422       | 1.984 | 39.687       | 39.687       |
| 2         | 1.226 | 24.519       | 67.940       | 1.226 | 24.519       | 67.940       | 1.413 | 28.253       | 67.940       |
| 3         | .900  | 18.003       | 85.943       |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 4         | .442  | 8.840        | 94.783       |       |              |              |       |              |              |
| 5         | .261  | 5.217        | 100.000      |       |              |              |       |              |              |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix

| Component | 1 | 2 |
|-----------|---|---|
| SCOMP1    | .769 | |
| SCOMP2    | .812 | |
| SCOMP3    | .722 | |
| SCOMP4    | .552 | |
| SCOMP5    | .815 | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 2 components extracted.
Satisfaction with Co-workers

**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

| Measure of Sampling Adequacy | Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin | Bartlett's Test of Sphericity |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
|                             | .736              | Approx. Chi-Square            |
|                             |                   | 215.411                       |
| df                          | 6                 |
| Sig.                        | .000              |

**Total Variance Explained**

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.652               | 66.289        | 66.289       | 2.652 | 66.289        | 66.289       |
| 2         | .797                | 19.928        | 86.217       |       |               |              |
| 3         | .309                | 7.733         | 93.950       |       |               |              |
| 4         | .242                | 6.050         | 100.000      |       |               |              |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Component Matrix**

| Component | 1 | SW1 | SW2 | SW3 | SW4 |
|-----------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|           | 1 | .877| .858| .896| .587|

Extraction Method:
Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.
Satisfaction with HR Policies

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .772 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 163.025 |
| df | 6 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
|           | Total    | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total    | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 2.529    | 63.226       | 63.226       | 2.529    | 63.226       | 63.226       |
| 2         | .743     | 18.565       | 81.791       |          |              |              |
| 3         | .391     | 9.772        | 91.563       |          |              |              |
| 4         | .337     | 8.437        | 100.000      |          |              |              |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix*

| Component | Component |
|-----------|-----------|
| 1         | SHRP1     |
|           | .834      |
|           | SHRP2     |
|           | .856      |
|           | SHRP3     |
|           | .849      |
|           | SHRP4     |
|           | .615      |

Extraction Method:
Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.
Appendix I

Assessment of Measurement Model
|                                    | Cronbach's Alpha | rho_A | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Intention to Leave                 | 0.814            | 0.872 | 0.888                  | 0.727                            |
| Satisfaction with Closure          | 0.746            | 0.750 | 0.853                  | 0.659                            |
| Satisfaction with Co-workers       | 0.822            | 0.848 | 0.884                  | 0.659                            |
| Satisfaction with Compensation     | 0.546            | 0.813 | 0.792                  | 0.663                            |
| Satisfaction with HR Policies      | 0.800            | 0.711 | 0.827                  | 0.550                            |
| Satisfaction with Supervisors      | 0.813            | 1.035 | 0.872                  | 0.697                            |
| Satisfaction with Variety          | 0.714            | 0.723 | 0.833                  | 0.624                            |
| Top Management Support             | 0.767            | 0.808 | 0.832                  | 0.504                            |

Fornell-Larcker Criterion

|                                    | Intention to Leave | Satisfaction with Closure | Satisfaction with Co-workers | Satisfaction with Compensation | Satisfaction with HR Policies | Satisfaction with Supervisors | Satisfaction with Variety | Top Management Support |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Intention to Leave                 | 0.853              |                           | 0.341                        | 0.812                          | 0.364                         | 0.037                      | 0.812                    | 0.767                 |
| Satisfaction with Closure          |                    |                           | 0.364                        | 0.037                          | 0.812                         |                            |                          | 0.546                 |
| Satisfaction with Co-workers       | 0.546              |                           | 0.485                        | 0.426                          | 0.394                         | 0.814                      |                          | 0.462                 |
| Satisfaction with Compensation     | 0.485              |                           | 0.610                        | 0.146                          | 0.650                         | 0.741                      |                          | 0.462                 |
| Satisfaction with HR Policies      | 0.351              |                           | 0.163                        | 0.536                          | 0.122                         | 0.491                      | 0.835                    | 0.462                 |
| Satisfaction with Supervisors      | 0.163              |                           | 0.474                        | 0.520                          | 0.469                         | 0.464                      | 0.342                    | 0.962                 |
| Satisfaction with Variety          | 0.474              |                           |                              | 0.597                          | 0.548                         | 0.394                      | 0.962                    | 0.710                 |
| Top Management Support             | 0.462              |                           |                              | 0.597                          | 0.548                         | 0.394                      | 0.962                    | 0.710                 |
## Cross Loadings

|      | Intent to Leave | Satisfaction with Closure | Satisfaction with Co-workers | Satisfaction with Compensation | Satisfaction with HR Policies | Satisfaction with Supervisors | Satisfaction with Variety | Top Management Support |
|------|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| IT L1 | 0.920           | -0.360                     | -0.348                        | -0.494                         | -0.302                        | -0.130                       | -0.432                   | -0.405                 |
| IT L2 | 0.872           | -0.166                     | -0.423                        | -0.443                         | -0.329                        | -0.117                       | -0.350                   | -0.337                 |
| IT L3 | 0.758           | -0.358                     | -0.109                        | -0.259                         | -0.272                        | -0.191                       | -0.451                   | -0.475                 |
| SC 1  | -0.318          | 0.777                      | 0.136                         | 0.352                          | 0.522                         | 0.244                        | 0.577                    | 0.770                  |
| SC 2  | -0.212          | 0.827                      | -0.112                        | 0.246                          | 0.393                         | 0.422                        | 0.304                    | 0.382                  |
| SC 3  | -0.276          | 0.829                      | 0.017                         | 0.411                          | 0.537                         | 0.660                        | 0.329                    | 0.395                  |
| SCOM P4 | -0.216         | 0.229                      | 0.139                         | 0.657                          | 0.392                         | 0.456                        | 0.318                    | 0.298                  |
| SCOM P5 | -0.502          | 0.425                      | 0.424                         | 0.946                          | 0.629                         | 0.289                        | 0.604                    | 0.605                  |
| SH RP 1 | -0.069          | 0.511                      | -0.175                        | 0.413                          | 0.649                         | 0.345                        | 0.313                    | 0.377                  |
| SH RP 2 | 0.025           | 0.601                      | -0.133                        | 0.296                          | 0.624                         | 0.311                        | 0.310                    | 0.396                  |
| SH RP 3 | -0.350          | 0.539                      | 0.162                         | 0.525                          | 0.903                         | 0.329                        | 0.451                    | 0.532                  |
| SH RP 4 | -0.238          | 0.470                      | 0.121                         | 0.573                          | 0.756                         | 0.534                        | 0.303                    | 0.360                  |
| SS 1   | -0.178          | 0.454                      | 0.063                         | 0.333                          | 0.403                         | 0.951                        | 0.285                    | 0.292                  |
| SS 2   | -0.007          | 0.307                      | -0.016                        | 0.091                          | 0.378                         | 0.778                        | 0.104                    | 0.121                  |
| SS 4   | -0.086          | 0.532                      | 0.213                         | 0.405                          | 0.506                         | 0.762                        | 0.356                    | 0.484                  |
| SV 2   | -0.365          | 0.261                      | 0.562                         | 0.657                          | 0.394                         | 0.290                        | 0.788                    | 0.726                  |
| SV 3   | -0.234          | 0.308                      | 0.352                         | 0.541                          | 0.381                         | 0.264                        | 0.796                    | 0.720                  |
| SV 4   | -0.453          | 0.583                      | 0.225                         | 0.296                          | 0.335                         | 0.256                        | 0.785                    | 0.805                  |
| SW 1   | -0.241          | -0.057                     | 0.852                         | 0.183                          | -0.074                        | -0.112                       | 0.403                    | 0.359                  |
|     | S W 2 | -0.373 | -0.085 | 0.864 | 0.405 | 0.117 | 0.081 | 0.390 | 0.311 |
|-----|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|     | S W 3 | -0.245 | 0.071  | 0.876 | 0.343 | 0.171 | 0.161 | 0.447 | 0.400 |
|     | S W 4 | -0.276 | 0.224  | 0.630 | 0.295 | 0.241 | 0.252 | 0.282 | 0.291 |
|     | T M 4 | -0.086 | 0.532  | 0.213 | 0.405 | 0.506 | 0.762 | 0.356 | 0.484 |
|     | T M 6 | -0.365 | 0.261  | 0.562 | 0.657 | 0.394 | 0.290 | 0.788 | 0.726 |
|     | T M 7 | -0.234 | 0.308  | 0.352 | 0.541 | 0.381 | 0.264 | 0.796 | 0.720 |
|     | T M 8 | -0.453 | 0.583  | 0.225 | 0.296 | 0.335 | 0.256 | 0.785 | 0.805 |
|     | T M 9 | -0.318 | 0.777  | 0.136 | 0.352 | 0.522 | 0.244 | 0.577 | 0.770 |
Appendix J

Assessment of Structural Model (Direct Effect)
Mean, STDEV, T-Values, P-Values

| Mean, STDEV, T-Values, P-Values |
|---------------------------------|
|                                |
|                                |
|                                |
|                  |                  |                  |                  |
| **Satisfaction with Closure -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| -0.319 | 0.188 | 1.694 | 0.045 |
| **Satisfaction with Co-workers -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| -0.203 | 0.100 | 2.032 | 0.021 |
| **Satisfaction with Compensation -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| -0.251 | 0.153 | 1.640 | 0.051 |
| **Satisfaction with HR Policies -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| -0.051 | 0.170 | 0.302 | 0.382 |
| **Satisfaction with Supervisors -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| 0.154 | 0.119 | 1.295 | 0.098 |
| **Satisfaction with Variety -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| -0.595 | 0.474 | 1.254 | 0.105 |
| **Top Management Support -> Intention to Leave** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| 0.525 | 0.557 | 0.943 | 0.173 |

Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected

| Confidence Intervals Bias Corrected |
|-------------------------------------|
|                                    |
|                                    |
|                                    |
| **Satisfaction with Closure -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| -0.319 | -0.252 | 0.067 | 0.529 | 0.031 |
| **Satisfaction with Co-workers -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| -0.203 | -0.194 | 0.009 | 0.365 | 0.050 |
| **Satisfaction with Compensation -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| -0.251 | -0.233 | 0.018 | 0.507 | 0.008 |
| **Satisfaction with HR Policies -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| -0.051 | -0.080 | 0.029 | 0.338 | 0.184 |
| **Satisfaction with Supervisors -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| 0.154 | 0.115 | 0.039 | 0.010 | 0.342 |
| **Satisfaction with Variety -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| -0.595 | -0.450 | 0.145 | 1.579 | 0.136 |
| **Top Management Support -> Intention to Leave** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Bias** | **95.0 %** | **90.0 %** |
| 0.525 | 0.335 | 0.189 | 0.034 | 1.554 |
### R Square

|                    | R Square | R Square Adjusted |
|--------------------|----------|------------------|
| Intention to Leave | 0.336    | 0.295            |

### f Square

|                        | Intention to Leave | Satisfaction with Closure | Satisfaction with Co-workers | Satisfaction with Compensation | Satisfaction with HR Policies | Satisfaction with Supervisors | Satisfaction with Variety | Top Management Support |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Intention to Leave     | 0.041              |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Satisfaction with Closure | 0.042          |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Satisfaction with Co-workers | 0.040         |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Satisfaction with Compensation | 0.002       |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Satisfaction with HR Policies | 0.023        |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Satisfaction with Supervisors | 0.023        |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Satisfaction with Variety | 0.023         |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
| Top Management Support | 0.014            |                           |                              |                               |                              |                              |                         |                        |
Appendix K

Assessment of Predictive Relevance

|                        | SSO | SSE   | Q² (1- SSE/SSO) |
|------------------------|-----|-------|-----------------|
| Intention to Leave     | 360 | 284.56| 0.210           |
| Satisfaction with Closure | 360 | 360   |                 |
| Satisfaction with Co-workers | 480 | 480   |                 |
| Satisfaction with Compensation | 240 | 240   |                 |
| Satisfaction with HR Policies | 480 | 480   |                 |
| Satisfaction with Supervisors | 360 | 360   |                 |
| Satisfaction with Variety | 360 | 360   |                 |
| Top Management Support | 600 | 600   |                 |
Appendix L

Assessment of Structural Model (Moderating Effect)
|                        | Original Sample (O) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| SC*TMS -> Intention to Leave | -0.146              | 0.167                      | 0.872                    | 0.192    |
| SCOMP*TMS -> Intention to Leave | 0.169              | 0.286                      | 0.591                    | 0.278    |
| SHRP*TMS -> Intention to Leave | 0.256              | 0.270                      | 0.947                    | 0.172    |
| SS*TMS -> Intention to Leave | 0.591              | 0.230                      | 2.566                    | 0.005    |
| SV*TMS -> Intention to Leave | -0.500             | 0.224                      | 2.227                    | 0.013    |
| SW*TMS -> Intention to Leave | 0.407              | 0.330                      | 1.233                    | 0.109    |
| Satisfaction with Closure -> Intention to Leave | -0.733             | 0.374                      | 1.959                    | 0.025    |
| Satisfaction with Co-workers -> Intention to Leave | -0.301             | 0.145                      | 2.083                    | 0.019    |
| Satisfaction with Compensation -> Intention to Leave | -0.134             | 0.215                      | 0.622                    | 0.267    |
| Satisfaction with HR Policies -> Intention to Leave | -0.032             | 0.192                      | 0.165                    | 0.434    |
| Satisfaction with Supervisors -> Intention to Leave | 0.162              | 0.208                      | 0.776                    | 0.219    |
| Satisfaction with Variety -> Intention to Leave | -0.662             | 1.036                      | 0.639                    | 0.261    |
| Top Management Support -> Intention to Leave | 1.087              | 1.227                      | 0.886                    | 0.188    |