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ABSTRACT

The current study examines the mediating role of General Organizational Means-efficacy (GOME) in the relationships between organizational context and employee attitudes. The organizational context consists of leadership support, centralization, and emphasis on training and development; and employee attitudes consist of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career outcomes. The purpose of this study is to reveal what contextual factors in an organization may affect employees’ perceptions of resources available and in turn affects employee attitudes. Structural equation modeling was used to analyze these relationships, and it was found that leadership support and an emphasis on training and development were positively related to GOME, and centralization was negatively related to GOME. It was also found that GOME was positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and career outcomes. Additionally, GOME was found to be a partial mediator of the relationships between organizational context and employee attitudes. These findings add to the limited research on GOME and provide organizations a better understanding of what may influence perceptions of resources within an organization along with how those perceptions may be affecting employee attitudes.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Means-efficacy is a relatively new topic in the motivation literature, which stems from the research done on the concept of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a person’s belief in whether or not he or she has the ability to do something (Bandura, 1977). The concept of self-efficacy (internal efficacy) only considers if an individual believes that he or she has the capability to perform a task and focuses very little on the external factors (external efficacy) that may also play a role in shaping a person’s motivation (Eden, 2001; Eden, Ganzach, Flumin-Granat, & Zigman, 2010). External efficacy, also known as means-efficacy, is the other half of a person’s overall efficacy beliefs, which considers the context and how it may affect a person’s motivation to perform. Means-efficacy is defined as “the individual’s belief in the utility of the means available to him or her for performing the job” (Eden, 2001, p. 74). The perception a person has of the means/resources available, differs from a person’s perception of whether or not he or she has the ability to complete the task. The studies conducted by
Eden reflect that means-efficacy is related to self-efficacy, but also has an independent effect on performance (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010). These results are an indicator that self-efficacy is only part of a person’s overall efficacy beliefs, and that means-efficacy is another factor that contributes to those efficacy beliefs.

As previously mentioned, the means-efficacy construct came from the recognition that self-efficacy did not take into account the context and how it may affect an individual’s motivation (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010). Bandura (1991) argues that the theory of self-regulation affects how self-efficacy relates to a person’s motivation. According to the theory of self-regulation, there are three sub-functions that take place that contribute to a person’s motivation. Self-regulation occurs through self-monitoring of behavior, forming judgments of those behaviors, and affective self-reaction (Bandura, 1991). Within the second sub-function of forming judgments, Bandura (1991) discusses that these judgments are based on personal standards and environmental circumstances. As Eden argued, the concept of self-efficacy largely focuses on,
and measures, the internal factors (personal standards) that create our efficacy perceptions, but the external factors (environmental circumstances) are not often considered (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010). Bandura’s (1991) theory of self-regulation is thought to affect how means-efficacy, like self-efficacy, relates to employees’ motivation in the workplace (Agars & Kottke, 2010). The main difference is that means-efficacy takes into consideration the environmental circumstances, or context, that employees work within.

Throughout employees’ lives they are likely to work in a wide range of organizations that all provide a unique context for them to work within. It is important to study the context of an organization because it has been shown to be an important factor when studying organizational behavior (Johns, 2006). Johns (2006) discusses how there are many ways in which context can enhance or constrain effects and relationships between variables. There are studies that have demonstrated unexpected relationships, such as when previously known and well-studied positive relationships are shown to be negatively related (Johns, 2006; Rousseau, & Fried, 2001). Some of these changes in the level and direction
of relationships, when studying organizational behavior, have been related to the context of the situation (Johns, 2006; Rousseau, & Fried, 2001). This effect that the context can have on the relationship between variables expresses that when trying to understand constructs related to organizational behavior, that it is important to consider the context of the organization. One of the issues with context though, is that the influence context has on a situation is often unrecognized or underappreciated within the literature (Johns, 2006). This can be seen in regards to efficacy beliefs, because it is pointed out that much of the literature focuses on the internal beliefs (self-efficacy) and lacks a consideration of external resources (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010). Means-efficacy was developed in order to consider the context in regards to a person’s formation of efficacy beliefs and motivation. Three elements that are considered as part of the organizational context are the leadership support, centralization, and emphasis on training and development within an organization.
Centralization

Many studies have shown that the structure of an organization can have a significant impact on employees’ attitudes toward an organization (Agars, 2010; Benson, 2006; Bulut & Culha, 2010; Katsikea, Theodosiou, Perdikis, & Kehagias, 2011; Kottke & Agars, 2005; Lee & Bruvold, 2003; Newman, Thanacoody & Hui, 2011; Owens, 2006; Porter & Lawler, 1965). Organizational structure is the formal and informal way in which organizational resources are configured and coordinated within an organization (Kottke & Agars, 2006). One of the more studied topics regarding organizational structure is centralization. Centralization describes the concentration of decision-making power within an organization. Centralized organizations have the decision-making power limited to very few people, which are typically in top management. It has been pointed out that centralization has had some contradicting results in regards to its effect on job satisfaction and performance over the years (Porter & Lawler, 1965). Some studies have shown that decentralized organizations have higher satisfaction and performance than those that are more centralized, and other studies have shown that there is
no difference between centralized and decentralized organizations in relation to satisfaction and performance (Porter & Lawler, 1965). Porter and Lawler (1965) also noted that these differences seemed to depend on the size of the organization. Decentralization had positive outcomes when the organization had less than 5,000 employees, whereas centralization level did not make much of a difference when an organization was over 5,000 employees.

Cummings and Berger (1976) later reviewed the additional studies on the effects of centralization on job attitudes and found that research was more often demonstrating a positive relationship between decentralization and job satisfaction. Decentralization is thought to be positively related to job satisfaction because it allows employees to participate more in the decision-making process or at least have more say in the decision-making process (Porter & Lawler, 1965). More recent research has shown that sales employees feel like they have higher autonomy and job variety in organizations that are more decentralized, which also contributed to higher job satisfaction (Katsikea et al., 2011). This demonstrates that if the employees feel that
they have some decision-making power, then they are likely to be more satisfied within an organization. Being more involved in the decision-making processes of an organization also is related to employees being more committed to their organization (Morris & Steers, 1980). Morris and Steers (1980) believe that this demonstrates that employees who work for organizations with a greater dispersion of the decision-making power feel more involved in decision-making processes and feel that they are a part of the organization. It has also been shown that organizations with higher levels of centralization are associated with lower perceptions of advancement (Agars, 2010; Kottke & Agars, 2005) and increased turnover intentions (Agars, 2010). Means-efficacy was shown to mediate these relationships between the organizational structure variables of centralization and innovation with the career outcomes of turnover intentions and advancement perceptions (Agars, 2010). This mediation effect demonstrates that the level of centralization in an organization relates to employees’ perceptions on the availability of resources (Agars, 2010). Overall, the studies on the effects of centralization on employee attitudes generally agree that
higher levels of centralization are related to employees having more negative attitudes toward the organization.

Training and Development

The amount of emphasis an organization has on training and development is another factor that makes up the context of an organization. This refers to all aspects of an organization that provide opportunities for employees to better themselves. These opportunities can range from a chance to train in a task that expands their responsibilities in the organization or programs such as tuition reimbursement. Training and development programs in an organization have been shown to relate to many positive outcomes, such as increased job satisfaction (Lee & Bruvold, 2003; Owens, 2006) and organizational commitment (Benson, 2006; Bulut & Culha, 2010; Newman et al., 2011; Owens, 2006), as well as decreased turnover intentions (Benson, 2006; Kuvaas, & Dysvik, 2010; Owens, 2006). People who perceive the organization as investing in them are likely to be more satisfied with their job, more affectively committed, and less likely to consider turnover (Lee & Bruvold, 2003). It is suggested that these relationships occur as part of an exchange
relationship (Lee & Bruvold, 2003). Since the organization is investing and being committed to the employees, then the employees reciprocate by also being more committed to the organization. Additionally, when employees are more motivated to participate in training, have access to training, believe they will benefit from training, and the organization supports the training, then they are likely to be more committed to the organization (Bulut & Culha, 2010).

Training and development has also been shown to keep employees committed to an organization and less likely to turnover even when job security was low (Benson, 2006). When an organization cannot guarantee job security to its employees, the availability of training and development programs help with the employability of its employees (Benson, 2006). Employees now have additional knowledge and skills that makes them more competitive should they need to search for another job. The only exception to this finding was that employees who received a degree through tuition reimbursement, which had increased turnover rates unless the organization offered a promotion (Benson, 2006). Overall, the research seems to agree that the more training and development an
organization offers, the more positive employees’ attitudes are about working in the organization. Previous research has also shown that perceived access to training and the organization’s support for training increases commitment to the organization (Bulut & Culha, 2010; Newman et al., 2011). These results may indicate that means-efficacy may play a role in these relationships since the perceptions of the availability of training development, which is a resource, had an effect on organizational commitment.

Leadership Support

Another one of the contextual factors that has an impact on employees is leadership support perceptions. Many studies have shown that employees’ perceptions of leadership in an organization can have an effect on their performance and attitudes toward the organization (Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne, 2006; DeConinck, 2011; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Han & Jekel, 2011; Lapierre & Hackett, 2007; Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang, & Shore, 2012). One of the highly studied topics in leadership is leader-member exchange theory (LMX), which is defined as “...the quality of the
relationship that develops between a leader and a follower...” and these relationships are “…predictive of outcomes at the individual, group, and organizational levels of analysis” (Gerstner & Day, 1997, p. 827). One of the main aspects of LMX theory is that employee attitudes and behaviors are a function of how leaders treat them, whether positively or negatively (Rockstuhl et al., 2012). Many studies in the LMX literature support this by demonstrating that employees who have a higher quality LMX relationships with their supervisor are more likely to be satisfied (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Han & Jekel, 2011; Lapierre & Hackett, 2007; Rockstuhl et al., 2012), committed (DeConinck, 2011; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Rockstuhl et al., 2012), perform better (Bauer et al., 2006; DeConinck, 2011; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Rockstuhl et al., 2012), display more organizational citizenship behavior (Rockstuhl et al., 2012), and are less likely to consider turnover (Bauer et al., 2006; DeConinck, 2011; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Han & Jekel, 2011; Rockstuhl et al., 2012). Another factor that affects employee attitudes toward the organization is the amount of trust they have in their leaders. There are many
different definitions of trust depending on the field of study, but for psychology, “trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998, p. 395). In the leadership literature, employees’ trust in their leaders is a reflection of whether or not they perceive their leaders to be fair and ethical (Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2006). Employees are already somewhat vulnerable to their leaders because of the position they hold, but trust is meant to reflect whether or not employees have a positive perspective of their leader’s behaviors and intentions. Research has demonstrated that when employees feel they can trust in their leaders that they are more satisfied (Chan, Huang, & Ng, 2008; Mulki et al., 2006; Yang & Mossholder, 2010) and committed (Tremblay, 2010; Yang & Mossholder, 2010), and have fewer turnover intentions (Chan et al., 2008; Mulki et al., 2006; Tremblay, 2010).

Perceptions of leadership are not just formed at an individual relationship level with a leader, but are also experienced at group level (Gavin & Hofmann, 2002). The group can vary from a specific department under one
supervisor or as the whole organization of employees under the top management. The decisions and actions made by leaders can have far reaching effects on the organization. The employees’ have a common leadership experience, whether positive or negative, which in turn creates the leadership climate that the employees perceive and react to within the organization (Gavin & Hofmann, 2002). Employees’ perceptions of this leadership climate in organizations have been shown to have an effect on employee attitudes toward the organization (Schyns & Van Veldhoven, 2010; Schyns, Van Veldhoven, & Wood, 2009). Overall, the literature demonstrates that leaders can have a profound impact on the behaviors and attitudes of the employees in an organization, either through individual or group interactions. What is not known is the mechanism(s) through which leadership support affects these behaviors and attitudes. Previous research has shown that a possible mechanism that may explain this relationship is means-efficacy (Walumbwa, Avolio, & Zhu, 2008; Walumbwa, Cropanzano, & Goldman, 2011). Walumba, Cropanzano, and Goldman (2011) demonstrated that means-efficacy was positively related to LMX and that means-efficacy mediated the relationship
between LMX and performance. Walumbwa, Avolio, and Zhu (2008) demonstrated that the relationship between transformational leadership and performance was mediated by self-efficacy and work unit identification. The relationships that self-efficacy and work unit identification had with performance were then moderated by high levels of means-efficacy. These studies demonstrate the type of leadership, and other factors related to leadership in an organization, can have effects on the means-efficacy perceptions of employees.

Employee Attitudes

Many organizations strive to promote and create a positive atmosphere within the workplace so employees will want to be there and continue to work there. Creating a work environment that increases employees’ attitudes toward an organization has many benefits for the organization and its employees, such as organizational citizenship behaviors and well-being. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are behaviors that go beyond the basic requirements of the job and are beneficial to the organization. These behaviors have been shown to be a reflection of the attitudes people have
toward the organization, such as commitment and job satisfaction (Gurbuz, 2009; Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007). Positive attitudes also contribute to improving employees’ general well-being, both within the organization and at home. The literature has demonstrated that employees who are more satisfied at work (Bowling, Eschleman, & Wang, 2010) and more committed (Kanste, 2011) to their organization, have an increased sense of well-being. Well-being can include many things, such as life satisfaction, happiness, positive affect, and absence of negative affect, which are all positive outcomes for employees to experience (Bowling et al., 2010). Factors such as well-being and OCB are positive for organizations, which is why many organizations are now starting to pay more attention to employee attitudes.

There are many employee attitudes that have been studied in the literature, but two of the most often researched attitudes are job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006). Job satisfaction has been defined as how someone feels about his or her job and aspects of the job (Spector, 1997). How satisfied a person is on the job is determined by both the intrinsic and extrinsic
satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction is related to factors such as responsibility and skill development (Decker, Harris-Kojetin, & Bercovitz, 2009). Extrinsic satisfaction is related to factors such as salary and organizational policies (Decker et al., 2009). The balance of these intrinsic and extrinsic factors that employees experience are what create a person’s level of satisfaction with the job. Organizational commitment is an indicator of an employee’s feelings and beliefs regarding his or her relationship with the organization, and what makes him or her stay (Meyer, & Allen, 1991). Organizational commitment has been shown to have three sub dimensions: affective, continuance, and normative (Meyer, & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment refers to employees staying because of how emotionally attached a person is and how much they identify with the organization. Continuance commitment refers to employees staying because of the potential losses they may experience if they leave. Lastly, normative commitment refers to employees staying because they feel as if they are expected and ought to stay with that organization. The level of commitment employees have toward the
organization is determined through the combination of these three sub dimensions.

Another factor that is expected to be related to employees’ attitudes toward the organization is career outcome perceptions. An employee’s career outcome perception is an indicator of whether the employee feels that he or she has a future at the organization. Career outcome perceptions consist of advancement perceptions and turnover intentions. Advancement perceptions refer to an employee’s expectations regarding advancement and promotion within the organization (Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992). Turnover intentions refer to how often an employee considers leaving the organization (Nadler, Jenkins, Cammann, & Lawler, 1975). These two factors combined together form an employee’s overall perceptions of career outcomes. The three job attitudes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceptions of career outcomes should provide a high-quality understanding of employees’ general attitudes toward the organization in which they are presently employed.
General Organizational Means-Efficacy

Most of the means-efficacy literature has been focused on a person’s perceptions of the tools available (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010) and how means-efficacy is related to performance (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Walumbwa et al., 2011). Recently, means-efficacy has been expanded to include more organizational resources besides the tools available to perform the job, which has been labeled general organizational means-efficacy. The General organization means-efficacy (GOME) scale has been created to measure an individual’s overall perceptions of resources available to him or her within an organization (Agars & Kottke, 2010). The organizational resources included in the concept of GOME include tools, time, information, performance feedback, training, team relations, and supervisory support (Agars & Kottke, 2010). Each of these dimensions are organizational resources that will vary in their availability depending on the organization. Since means-efficacy perceptions are based on the observations an employee makes of the organizational context, it is then important to discover what organizational factors lead to the formation of GOME perceptions.
The structure of an organization is a potential factor that may affect the perceptions employees have of the resources available to them. Specifically, the level of centralization in an organization is a potential factor that could affect employees’ GOME perceptions. Higher levels of centralization in an organization seem to generally have a negative effect on the employees’ attitudes in the organization (Cummings & Berger, 1976; Porter & Lawler, 1965), but we do not know what all contributes to these negative effects. Agars (2010) demonstrated that the contextual factor of centralization affects the perceptions employees have of resources available to them, which influences their GOME perceptions. Centralized organizations have the decision-making power concentrated at the top levels of the organization, which may make it difficult for employees to obtain or express a need for resources. If the employees feel that they cannot obtain or communicate their need for resources necessary to perform well on the job, then they are likely to have more negative attitudes about working at the organization. Research has shown that GOME partially mediates the relationship between centralization and the career outcomes of turnover.
intentions and advancement perceptions (Agars, 2010). Centralization has also been shown to be related to commitment (Morris & Steers, 1980) and job satisfaction (Katsikea et al., 2011), but no study has yet tested if GOME mediates these relationships.

An organization's emphasis on training and development is another factor that may influence employees' perceptions of resources. Within the sub-dimensions of GOME, information and training are very relevant to training and development. Training and development programs provide opportunities for employees to learn more information that may help them with their current job and may even help them with new assignments in the future. It is important that employees receive the proper training because then they will know how to correctly perform their job, which leads to increased performance (Van Iddekinge, Ferris, Perrewé, Perryman, Blass, & Heetderks, 2009). If employees do not feel that they have received or have access to the resources (training) necessary to perform their job, then they may not be motivated to perform. Through various training and development programs employees will gain more skills and
have more resources to draw upon in order to do their job and any future tasks they may take on.

Additionally, when employees are given opportunities to take part in training and development programs that are not directly related to their job, such as tuition reimbursement or leadership training, they may feel that they have access to those resources if they are ever needed. Within the means-efficacy literature it has been shown that use of a resource was not a predictor of performance, but being trained about the resource and having access to the resource were predictors of performance (Eden et al., 2010). So in an organizational setting this could translate to increasing means-efficacy by offering training program and informing employees about them, even if employees decide not to participate in the program.

Leaders also play a role in how employees view their access to resources. Leaders provide the feedback and job information that employees need in order to perform their job well. Those who have higher quality LMX relationships with their leaders tend to have higher performance and a greater sense of well-being (Bauer et al., 2006; DeConinck, 2011; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005). This
exchange relationship employees have with leaders can help them gain access to resources that may not have been previously available, if it is a high quality LMX relationship, which would then lead to greater means-efficacy. Leaders also provide opportunities to work on new projects and participate in organizational programs, such as the training and development opportunities that were previously mentioned. Additionally, other leadership factors may play a role, such as trust in leadership. Trust in leadership, when high, has been shown to lead to positive attitudes about the organization (Chan et al., 2008; Mulki et al., 2006; Tremblay, 2010; Yang & Mossholder, 2010). These positive attitudes could be a function of employees trusting that their leader will provide them with the resources necessary to perform their job. If someone did not trust their leader to provide them with the feedback, information, and the time they need to perform their job, then that could be stressful and lead to negative attitudes. Overall, leaders can play a big role in an employee’s ability to access and obtain organizational resources. This is why the relationship between perceived
leadership support and employee attitudes is expected to be mediated by means-efficacy perceptions.

Present Study

The present study seeks to examine the mediating role of General Organizational Means-efficacy in the relationships between organizational context and individual employee attitudes. The organizational context is separated out into leadership support, centralization, and emphasis on training and development. Leadership support consists of leader-member relationship quality, trust in leadership, and leadership climate. These constructs make up the organizational context that is expected to be related to employee attitudes. Employee attitudes consist of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career outcomes. Job satisfaction consists of both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction; organizational commitment consists of affective, normative, continuance commitment; and career outcome consists of turnover intentions and advancement perceptions. The relationships between the organizational context and employee attitudes are expected to be
mediated by general-organizational means-efficacy. The expected relationships are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. This Figure Portrays the Proposed Structural Equation Modeling Model
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Sample

The present study used archival data which were collected as part of a comprehensive organizational culture assessment for a mid-sized city government in Tennessee, and were made available by Agars Consulting. This sample included 1,252 participants which was predominately male (75%) and had an average age of 41.67 years. The ethnicity of this sample is 80% white, 12% African American, and no other ethnicity represents more than 2%. There were no incentives given to employees who filled out the survey provided to them.

Procedure

Data were collected as part of an organizational cultural assessment being conducted approximately six-months after the initiation of a city-wide diversity management effort. All employees were invited to participate and provided an electronic link to the survey which included all study scales as well as several other scales assessing traditional organizational perceptions and attitudes. For a small number of participants who did
not have computer access, hard copies of the survey were provided. Participants were given a two-week window to respond, and completion of the survey took approximately 15 minutes. The response rate for the survey was 91%.

Measures

General Organizational Means-Efficacy

General Organization Means-efficacy was measured using the scale developed by Agars and Kottke (2010), which measures employees’ general perceptions of resources available to them in the organization. A short version of this scale was used and consists of seven items and is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree. The scale consists of statements regarding the availability of resources such as, “work is often given to me with unreasonably quick deadlines.” The reliability of this measure is .74. The full scale can be found in Appendix A.

Centralization

Centralization was measured with the scale developed by Hage and Aiken (1967), which measures the level of authority and decision-making that occurs at the top
levels of an organization. This scale consists of the two sub dimensions: authority hierarchy and participation in decision-making. This scale consists of five items and is measured on a 5-point Likert scale, which ranges from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “employees are encouraged to participate in important decisions.” The reliability of this scale was shown to be .68. The full scale can be found in Appendix B.

**Training and Development**

The scale measuring an organizations emphasis on training and development was developed by Blum, Fields, and Goodman (1994). This scale measures the amount of emphasis an organization has on providing opportunities for training, development, and promotions within the organization. This scale consists of six items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “there is considerable investment to train and develop employees.” The reliability of this scale was shown to be .72. The full scale can be found in Appendix C.
Leader-Member Relationship Quality

Leader-member relationship quality was measured using an adaption of the scale developed by Liden and Maslyn (1998). This scale measures the level of the leader-member-exchange (LMX) relationship between employees and their leaders. It consists of four items with one representing each of the four dimensions of the scale. The four dimensions are broken down into affect, loyalty, contribution, and professional respect. These items are measured with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.” The reliability of this measure was shown to be .92. The full scale can be found in Appendix D.

Trust in Leadership

Trust in leadership was measured with a scale developed by Gabarro and Athos (1976). This scale measures the level of trust an employee has with their leadership within a business environment. These items are measured with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “I believe my employer has
high integrity.” The reliability of this measure was shown to be .94 (Saunders, Skinner, Dietz, Gillespie, & Lewicki, 2010). The full scale can be found in Appendix E.

Leadership Climate

Leadership climate was measured using a scale developed by Schyns and Van Veldhoven (2010). This scale measures how much support employees feel they receive from leaders, as well as the way in which leaders make decisions. It consists of nine items that consist of the two sub dimensions of atmosphere and support. These items are measured with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- never to 5- always. The scale consists of items such as, “can you count on your boss when you come across difficulties in your work?” The reliability of this measure was shown to be .88. The full scale can be found in Appendix F.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using a scale developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967). This scale measures how someone feels about their job and aspects of their job (Spector, 1997). It consists of 10 items that consist of the two sub dimensions of intrinsic
and extrinsic satisfaction. These items are measured with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- very dissatisfied to 5- very satisfied. The scale consists of items such as, “the amount of challenge you have in your job and the relationship you have with your co-workers.” The reliability of this measure was shown to be .89. The full scale can be found in Appendix G.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured using an adaption of the scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). This scale measures employees’ feelings and beliefs regarding their relationship with the organization, and what makes them stay (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The measure consists of 15 items with three sub dimensions (affective, normative, and continuance commitment). These items are measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” and, “I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.” The measures for the sub dimensions of affective (α = .89), continuance (α = .84), and normative (α = .79)
have all been shown to be reliable. The full scale can be found in Appendix H.

**Turnover Intentions**

Turnover intention is measured using a scale based on the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Nadler et al., 1975). This scale measures how often an employee considers leaving the organization. The scale consists of two items and uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “I often think about quitting this job and working for another company.” The reliability of this scale was shown to be .92. The full scale can be found in Appendix I.

**Advancement Perceptions**

Advancement perceptions were measured using a scale developed by Heilman, Block, and Lucas (1992). This scale measures individuals’ expectations regarding advancement and promotion within the organization. This scale consists of three items that are measured by a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. The scale consists of items such as, “If you work hard and do well, there are opportunities to advance in this organization.” The reliability of this
measure was shown to be .76. The full scale can be found in Appendix J.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

The Hypothesized Model

The hypothesized model was tested with structural equation modeling (SEM) using EQS software. The full hypothesized model is represented in Figure 1. Circles represent latent variables and rectangles represent measured variables. Solid lines indicate the predicted direct effects between variables and constructs, and dotted lines represent predicted indirect effects between variables and constructs. The hypothesized model examines the effect of organizational context on employee attitudes and if general organizational means-efficacy (GOME) mediates those relationships. Organizational context is represented by the construct of leadership support and the measured variables of centralization and training and development. The construct of leadership support has three indicators: trust in leadership, leadership climate and leader-member-exchange relationship quality. The measured variables of centralization and training and development were covaried. Employee attitudes are represented by the
constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and career outcomes. The construct of job satisfaction has two indicators: intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction. The construct of organizational commitment has three indicators: affective, continuance and normative commitment. The construct of career outcomes has two indicators: turnover intentions and advancement perceptions. The mediator is the construct of GOME, which has seven indicators: tools, time, information, feedback, training, team relations and supervisory support. It was hypothesized that leadership support and emphasis on training and development would be positively related to GOME and centralization would be negatively related to GOME. It was also hypothesized that GOME would be positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment and career outcomes, and that GOME would mediate the relationships between organizational context and employee attitudes.

Data Screening

The data set contains responses from 1,252 participants with 1,098 participants who completed at least part of the survey. Missing values analysis was
conducted and no variables were missing more than 5% of responses. A listwise deletion of missing data was conducted with surveys that did not complete all items or had values that were not possible. There were complete data for 1,008 participants on the 28 variables of interest. Each scale used had reverse coded items that were then recoded within the data. The measured variables of turnover intentions and advancement perceptions were coded such that a high score reflected less thoughts of turnover and positive thoughts about advancement within the organization. Composite scores were calculated for the items representing centralization and training and development.

There were a total of 16 univariate outliers among the following variables that were all on the low end of the scales (Z < -3.3): leadership climate (6), leader-member relationship quality (1), intrinsic satisfaction (5), continuance commitment (3) and normative commitment (1). All univariate outliers were deleted listwise (N = 992). There were a total of three multivariate outliers that were deleted listwise because they were discontinuous from the distribution of scores (N = 989). Seven of the measured items (gome4, gome5,
gome6, gome7, leadership climate, intrinsic satisfaction, and turnover intentions) were skewed in a negative direction and three (gome1, gome2, gome3) was skewed in a positive direction. None of the variables were transformed since the consequences of making the transformations were not worth correcting these modest violations of normality. There were no violations of homoscedasticity or multicollinearity within the data. The bivariate correlations between measured variables can be found in Table 1 and Table 2. A measurement model was conducted in EQS, which confirmed that all measured variables loaded onto their hypothesized latent constructs, see Figure 2.
Model Estimation

Mardia’s normalized coefficient = 38.09, p < .05, indicated a violation of multivariate normality; therefore the model was estimated with maximum likelihood estimation and tested with the Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-squared. Only moderate support was found of the hypothesized model [Satorra-Bentler \( \chi^2 \ (147, \ N = 989) = 1886.86, \) Robust CFI = .75, Robust RMSEA = .11], and the results of the individual relationships can be found in Figure 3. The chi-squared
to degrees of freedom ration is greater than 2:1, but with such a large sample it is not unexpected. The first post-hoc modification made after evaluating the Lagrange Multiplier test was to have the latent construct of organizational commitment predict career outcomes. After running the new model, a second modification was made based on the evaluation of the Lagrange Multiplier test. The model was changed to reflect the measured variable of trust in leadership predict GOME. The final model was run and moderate support was found [Satorra-Bentler \( \chi^2 (146, N = 989) = 1394.52, \) Robust CFI = .82, Robust RMSEA = .09]. The results of the individual relationships can be found in Figure 4. As with the initial results, the chi-squared to degrees of freedom ratio is greater than 2:1. The Lagrange Multiplier test and the Wald test were again reviewed, but none of the suggested changes that were consistent with the theory of the model or strong enough to make a significant improvement upon the model.
Figure 3. This Figure Portrays the Results of the Proposed Structural Equation Modeling Model
Direct Effects

GOME was positively predicted by perceived leadership support (standardized coefficient = .55, p < .05) and emphasis on training and development (standardized coefficient = .49, p < .05). Both of these relationships had a large effect size. GOME was negatively predicted by greater perceived centralization (standardized coefficient = -.13, p < .05), but has a small effect size. GOME positively predicted job satisfaction (standardized coefficient = .87, p < .05),
organizational commitment (standardized coefficient = .58, p < .05) and career outcomes (standardized coefficient = .56, p < .05). All three of these relationships had a large effect size. Additionally, organizational commitment positively predicted career outcomes (standardized coefficient = .57, p < .05) and trust in leadership positively predicted GOME (standardized coefficient = .26, p < .05). GOME was shown to explain 75.7% of the variance in job satisfaction, 33.6% of the variance in organizational commitment, and 31.4% of the variance in career outcomes.

Mediation

GOME was shown to mediate the relationships between leadership support and job satisfaction (indirect standardized coefficient = .63, p < .05) organizational commitment (indirect standardized coefficient = .42, p < .05), and career outcomes (indirect standardized coefficient = .64, p < .05). GOME was shown to mediate the relationships between centralization and job satisfaction (indirect standardized coefficient = -.16, p < .05) organizational commitment (indirect standardized coefficient = .42, p < .05), and career outcomes (indirect standardized coefficient = .64, p < .05).
coefficient = -.08, p < .05), and career outcomes (indirect standardized coefficient = -.12, p < .05). GOME was shown to mediate the relationships between emphasis on training and development and job satisfaction (indirect standardized coefficient = .42, p < .05) organizational commitment (indirect standardized coefficient = .28, p < .05), and career outcomes (indirect standardized coefficient = .43, p < .05).
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of GOME in explaining the relationships between organizational context and employee attitudes. GOME is thought to affect employee motivation and attitudes within the workplace based on self-regulation theory. Self-regulation theory is argued to occur through self-monitoring of behavior, forming judgments of those behaviors, and affective self-reaction (Bandura, 1991). Self-efficacy has been shown to play an important role in affecting motivation within the second sub-function of forming judgments (Bandura, 1991), but very little research has been done to discover what role means-efficacy plays within the same sub-function of self-regulation theory. Self-efficacy beliefs are formed based on a person’s observation of their own behavior (self-monitoring), whereas means-efficacy beliefs are formed based on a person’s observation of the context that he/she are asked to perform within (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010). The present study sought to demonstrate that the context that employees work within plays an
important role in what perceptions employees form about the availability of resources within an organization, and that the perceptions of resources will have an impact on employee attitudes toward the organization. The results of this study provide moderate support for the proposed model of GOME partially mediating the relationships between organizational context and employee outcomes. GOME was shown to be a partial mediator between the organizational context of leadership support, emphasis on training and development, and centralization; and the employee attitudes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and career outcomes.

The results indicate that leadership support (Walumbwa et al., 2008) and emphasis on training and development had a strong positive effect on employees’ perceptions of the availability of resources within an organization as predicted and demonstrated in previous research. The results also demonstrated that centralization had a weak negative effect on perceptions of resources as predicted and seen in previous research (Agars, 2010). GOME was shown to have a strong positive associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and career outcome perceptions as predicted.
and demonstrated in previous research (Agars, 2010; Kottke & Agars, 2005).

These results help to further the research on means-efficacy because many of the previous studies were focused only on a specific aspect or outcome of means-efficacy. Much of the initial research on means-efficacy was focused on the tools that were available to employees (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010) or how means-efficacy affected employee performance within an organization (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Walumbwa et al., 2011). However, this study provides a better understanding of means-efficacy by studying GOME as opposed to one specific aspect of means-efficacy that contributes to means-efficacy perceptions. GOME takes into consideration multiple factors that may influence a person’s perceptions of resources, such as tools, training and supervisory support, which provides us a more comprehensive understanding of means-efficacy. As mentioned previously, most of the research has studied how means-efficacy impacts employee performance, but this study reveals that means-efficacy can also have an impact on the attitudes of the employees within an organization. This important
because it provides a more comprehensive understanding of the impact GOME has within an organization and the consequences that may be associated with attempting to change GOME within an organization.

One of the changes made from the initial hypothesized model to the final model was indicating that organization commitment is a predictor of career outcomes. This change is consistent with previous research documenting the strong relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions, which is one of the measured variables within the construct of career outcomes (DeConinck, 2011). Another change that was made from the hypothesized model was to have the measured variable of leadership trust directly predicting GOME. This suggested change was made since previous research has shown that leadership trust can have a significant impact on how employees view the organization (Chan et al., 2008; Mulki et al., 2006; Tremblay, 2010). This suggested change may be a reflection that leadership factors, especially trust in leadership, may play a large role in how employees perceive the availability of resources within an organization.
The strong relationships between the leadership variables, such as leadership trust, and GOME may be an indicator that leadership support is the primary source behind the perceptions employees have regarding availability of resources within an organization. Within the work environment the leaders are one of the stronger factors that contribute to employee satisfaction (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Schyns & Van Veldhoven, 2010), commitment (DeConinck, 2011; Tremblay, 2010), and turnover intentions (Bauer et al., 2006; Mulki et al., 2006). Also, leaders are the authority through which all employees must go through in order to obtain most the resources that they require to perform their job. Therefore, the relationships that employees form with their leaders would be an important contextual factor that informs employees’ perceptions on the availability resources are within the organization. These perceptions that are formed will then impact the attitudes that employees form toward the organization. Compared to the contextual factors of emphasis on training and development and centralization, leadership support was the strongest predictor of GOME, which may indicate that leadership plays a very important role in the formation
of employees’ perceptions regarding the availability of resources within the organization.

The results of this study can help organizations understand the aspects of an organization that are influencing employees’ perceptions of resources and may help to explain why some employees have negative attitudes toward the organization. For example, if an organization has a high level of emphasis on training and development, the present study would suggest that employees would perceive resources as being more available. This happens because when an organization emphasizes the training opportunities and development opportunities within the organization and encourages employees to take part, the employees see these opportunities and potential resources that they have access to and can participate in. With these higher perceptions of training and development resources available, employees would then feel more satisfied, more committed and more likely to advance within the organization. As this study demonstrates, the organization’s emphasis on training and development opportunities is positively impacting the perceptions of resources within the organization and in turn is
positively affecting employee attitudes toward the organization.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is the strong relationship between GOME and job satisfaction (standardized coefficient = .87). This high relationship seems to indicate that participants may not have distinguished the difference between the questions they answered regarding GOME and satisfaction. There are some similarities between these two measures, such as the items asking about the participants’ perception of their supervisor, perception of their team members and the amount of performance feedback they receive. Having multiple questions that overlap between these two measures may have led to the participants answering the questions similarly since they may not have distinguished the difference between these two questionnaires. Within this study the short version of the GOME questionnaire was used, so it is possible that if the full GOME measure was used that there would be less overlap between these two measures and more clear results would be provided. Overall, having this very strong relationship between job
satisfaction and GOME is partially contributing to the lack of fit within the model and limits the amount of information that can be obtained from the results.

Another limitation of this study is that all of the data were from a single organization. Even though it was a large city government organization with employees working in a wide variety of occupations, the data are still from a single organization. This makes the results less likely to generalize to other organizations without further research and additional studies. Additionally, the data were collected from a single government organization, so it is not known if the same relationships would exist within a private organization. It may be that employees in private organizations assign different weight to which contextual factors affect their perceptions of resource availability. Overall, the results of this study are limited to being reflection of the relationships that exist within a large government organization and cannot be generalized across many organizations until further research is conducted.

Another limitation of this study is that it is not a longitudinal study so strong predictive inferences cannot be made based on the results that were found. The results
of this study show the strength of relationships between variables within this organization at one point in time and it is not known how these relationships change over time. By conducting a longitudinal study, the results would be able to reveal if there were any changes in the organizational context and the impact those changes might have had on perceptions of resources within the organization. Additionally, the longitudinal results would be able to reveal if any changes occurred in the perception of resources available and the impact those changes may have had on employee attitudes toward the organization. This would provide further evidence toward determining the strength of the relationships between GOME, the organizational context, and employee attitudes and if any casual inferences can be made.

Future Research

General Organization Means–Efficacy is still a new topic within the motivation literature and there are many other predictors and outcomes to be tested with GOME. The predictors tested in this study were regarding the overall context of an organization as a whole, but there are many other contextual factors that can be tested,
such as a department setting or even an individual team environment within an organization. As discussed previously regarding leadership climate, employees have a shared experience with leaders from many different levels of an organization (Gavin & Hofmann, 2002). This study mainly focused on the leadership perceptions of the organization as a whole, but employees also form leadership impressions based on the top leaders of the organization, the head of their department or their immediate supervisor. It is not yet known how the perceptions of these leaders at different levels within the organization affect GOME, but it could be expected that there would be a strong association with the lower level leaders since the employees would have more interactions and experiences with their immediate supervisors. This information would also be able to provide evidence toward the previously mentioned postulation of supervisory support being the primary force behind GOME perceptions, especially since the leaders that employees most often interact with are likely the ones who have the power to grant resources to the employees in most situations. Previous research has demonstrated that the immediate supervisors can have an
effect on means-efficacy, specifically through the leader-member-exchange relationship and level of transformational leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Walumbwa et al., 2011), but it is not yet known to what degree the immediate supervisors or leaders at other levels of the organization can influence the employees overall perceptions of resources available (GOME) within an organization.

Future research should also test if the relationships in this model differ depending on the profession of the employees within the organization. Would testing these relationships with employees who rely more on tools to perform their job reveal that GOME has a greater impact on employee attitudes than it does with employees who rely less on organizational resources? These relationships can be tested across many different types of workers, which all rely on different types of resources within their field of work. For instance, the perceptions of resources from police officers may have a stronger impact on those employees since police officers can be in life-threatening situations and may need to rely on the resources provided to them in order to protect themselves. This knowledge would create a better
understanding on the type of professions that are influenced the most by GOME, which would enable organizations prioritize where the changes in the organization may be needed most.

Future research could also test if GOME has any impact on other employee outcomes such as well-being, overall stress and organizational citizenship behaviors. Bandura (1991) discusses the potential negative impact that the dysfunctions of self-regulation can have on individuals. Within the theory of self-regulation it is held that employees receive positive feedback when they accomplish the job they are asked to perform (Bandura, 1991). On the negative side though, if expectations are set too high to the point where an individual does not believe they can reasonably accomplish the task, then there can be negative consequences such as self-devaluation and lower satisfaction (Bandura, 1991). Within the construct of means-efficacy, this would be a situation where an organization is asking employees to perform a job by a specific date without consulting if this is even a possibility with the employees. If the employees did not perceive the resource of time to complete the project as something that can be negotiated
or changed, then they may feel that the goal is unobtainable. This could then lead to increased stress, depression and self-devaluation. There also could be other reactions to this situation as well since many people handle stress in different ways. This situation could lead to the employees taking short-cuts to complete the project on time or employees may take actions against the organization, such as theft, if they feel the organization has wronged them with these unobtainable expectations. As this previous research has shown, the perception of resource availability within an organization can have an impact on employee performance and attitudes toward the organization (Eden, 2001; Eden et al., 2010; Agars, 2010). However, what has not yet been explored is how the perceived lack of resources available can affect employees’ well-being, stress levels, and behaviors within the organization.

Future research could also test if there is a plateau to the positive effects of GOME or if there are situations where increased GOME may be negative for the employees. Previous studies have shown that autonomy within the workplace generally increases the innovation within the organization, but when the organization is too
decentralized and there is too much autonomy, innovation begins to decline (Gebert, Boerner, & Lanwehr, 2003).
Similar to autonomy and decentralization, which in general provides greater decision-making power to the employees, increased GOME provides more choices and more options of resources available to employees to use when performing their job. If employees have many resources to choose from and use to perform their job, then it potentially could lead to some negative outcomes within the organization. A previously mentioned study demonstrated that a training and development program of tuition reimbursement actually increased turnover intentions if the employees received a degree (Benson, 2006). This is just an example of increased GOME having a negative impact on an organization, and future studies can seek to reveal other potential negative outcomes that high GOME may be associated with. With GOME being a construct that organizations can influence, it would be beneficial to understand all the potential outcomes, both positive and negative, that increasing employees' perceptions of resources can have on the organization as a whole and the employees who work there.
Implications

The results of this study reveal that the context of an organization has an impact on the perceptions employees have of the resources available within the organization, which in turn has an impact on employees’ job satisfaction, commitment and perceptions of career outcomes. One of the main points that organizations can take away from this study is that there are contextual aspects of the organization, such as organizational structure, that can impact the way employees perceive resources within the organization. It is important to realize what aspects of the organization are affecting the perceptions employees have regarding the availability of resources because it provides guidance for organizations so that they know where to make the changes to improve their organization. This study shows that by taking an action to change the organizational context, such as offering some training and development programs, can positively impact on employees’ perceptions of resources, which in turn can lead to more satisfied and committed employees. Organizations do not only have to try and create more satisfied and committed employees by only changing the organizational context, but can also
have the same if not stronger effect by directly making changes to the perceptions of resources available within the organization. This can be potentially be accomplished by starting an initiative within the organization to train leaders on how to be more supportive to their employees or make announcements of resources that are available that employees may not have been aware of in the past. Advertising what resources are available in the organization allows employees to be aware of what resources are out there and therefore can have an impact on their perception of resources available. Overall, this study has demonstrated that organizational context and GOME are important factors to consider within the motivation literature and in explaining the attitudes employees hold toward their organizations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it has been shown that organizational context does impact employee attitudes within an organization and this impact is partially mediated by employees’ perceptions of the availability of resources within the organization. High leadership support, low centralization and high emphasis on training and
development are factors that increase employees’ perceptions of available resources, which in turn appear to increase job satisfaction, organization commitment, and employees’ perceptions of career outcomes. Knowing that means-efficacy perceptions can have an impact on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career outcome perceptions enables organizations to make specific changes within their organization, such as training leaders to be more supportive of their employees, in order to have a positive impact on employee attitudes. Future research should seek to discover what other organizational factors affect GOME, the potential positive and negative consequences of high and low amounts of GOME, and what types of jobs are impacted the most be the employees’ perceptions of resources. This will allow organizations to have a greater understanding and impact on the employees within their organization.
APPENDIX A

GENERAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEANS-EFFICACY SCALE
General Organizational Means-Efficacy Scale

1. The tools, equipment, technology in this organization are top-of-the-line.

2. Work is often given to me with unreasonably quick deadlines.

3. I frequently find myself without the proper instructions or necessary direction I need to do my job.

4. This organization has many training opportunities for its employees.

5. I can count on my team members to pull their weight whenever we are working on a team project.

6. If employees need to report a problem, management is there to listen.

7. I regularly receive information about how well (or poorly) I am performing my job.

APPENDIX B

CENTRALIZATION SCALE
Centralization Scale

1. Employees and managers work together to solve problems regarding the way work gets done.

2. Employees are encouraged to participate in important decisions.

3. Employees are free to determine how their job should be done.

4. Employees are not involved in decisions that affect their job.

5. Only managers and supervisors are involved with decisions about policies and procedures.

APPENDIX C

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT SCALE
Training and Development Scale

1. Employees who obtain additional training (formal or informal) are rewarded.

2. There are clear career paths.

3. There are very few opportunities for non-management personnel to move into managerial positions.

4. There is considerable investment to train and develop employees.

5. There is an emphasis on hiring people with potential and developing their skills.

6. There is an emphasis on promotion from within.

APPENDIX D

LEADER–MEMBER RELATIONSHIP QUALITY SCALE
Leader-Member Relationship Quality Scale

1. I like my supervisor very much as a person.

2. My supervisor would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake.

3. I do work for my supervisor that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.

4. I am impressed with my supervisor's knowledge of his/her job.

APPENDIX E

LEADERSHIP TRUST SCALE
Leadership Trust Scale

1. My employer is open and upfront with me.
2. I am not sure I fully trust my employer.
3. I believe my employer has high integrity.
4. In general, I believe my employer’s motives and intentions are good.
5. My employer is not always honest and truthful.
6. I can expect my employer to treat me in a consistent and predictable fashion.

APPENDIX F

LEADERSHIP CLIMATE SCALE
Leadership Climate Scale

1. Can you count on your boss when you come across difficulties in your work?
2. If necessary, can you ask your boss for help?
3. Do you get along well with your boss?
4. Do you have conflicts with your boss?
5. In your work, do you feel appreciated by your boss?
6. Do you experience any aggressiveness from your boss?
7. Is your boss friendly toward you?
8. Is there a good atmosphere between you and your boss?
9. Have there been any unpleasant occurrences between you and your boss?

APPENDIX G

JOB SATISFACTION SCALE
Job Satisfaction Scale

1. The amount of job security you have.
2. The relationship you have with your co-workers.
3. The amount of independent thought you have.
4. The amount of challenge you have in your job.
5. The relationship you have with your supervisor.
6. The work environment.
7. The recognition you get for good work.
8. Your chances for promotion.
9. The amount of variety in your job.
10. Your job, overall.

APPENDIX H

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT SCALE
Organizational Commitment Scale

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization
2. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one
3. I feel like 'part of the family' at my organization
4. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization
5. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up
6. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to
7. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now
8. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire
9. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives
10. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
11. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization
12. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization
13. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization
14. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers
15. I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore

APPENDIX I

TURNOVER INTENTIONS SCALE
Turnover Intentions Scale

1. I often think about quitting this job and working for another company.

2. Within the next year, it is likely I will leave to work for a different organization.

APPENDIX J

ADVANCEMENT PERCEPTIONS SCALE
Advancement Perceptions Scale

1. Leaders in this organization provide opportunities for workers to develop and grow.

2. If you work hard and do well, there are opportunities to advance in this organization.

3. Many employees in this organization are stuck in positions with little opportunity to advance.

APPENDIX K
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