CHAPTER FIVE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

This chapter includes the details of the sampling plan and the measurement scales that are used in the present study for data collection. This chapter also provides information about the analytical tools that are used for data analysis to understand results of the study.

5.1 Research Design
The research design for the present study consists of three parts which helped to test the proposed hypotheses mentioned in Chapter four empirically. The first step involves the search for appropriate instruments to measure the constructs mentioned in the conceptual model. The second step includes the sampling process in which the criteria for selection of sample was defined and a survey was conducted to collect relevant responses. The third step was to decide an appropriate statistical tool for empirical analysis of collected data. The data was collected using online survey method from November 2016 to January 2017.

5.2 Measurement of variables
The present study consists of eight constructs namely supervisor support behavior, psychological empowerment, feedback seeking behavior, organizational socialization tactics, new recruit’s adjustment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to quit. The number of items in the scales are the number of questions provided to the respondent in the survey. All the data was collected from the new recruits working in Indian IT industry. This study defines new recruits as newly joined employees in the organization who have completed three to twelve months in the organization, who do not have any previous work experience and are undergoing a transition from education institute to the corporate world.
5.2.1 Supervisor support behavior

Supervisor support behavior is measured using a four-item scale developed by Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli, 2001. The scale was tested for the acceptable reliability and validity for the measurement of the construct (Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001). Some past studies have also used this scale to measure supervisor support behavior and confirmed its reliability (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2010). The four-item scale consists of one reversed coded item. All items in the scale were measured using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The support behavior of the supervisor is measured from the new recruit’s perspective. The sample item from the scale is “My supervisor cares about my opinions”. The reversed coded item in the scale is “My supervisor shows very little concern for me”.

5.2.2 Psychological empowerment

The nine-item scale designed by Menon, 2001, is used to measure psychological empowerment of the new recruits. The scale consists of three constructs with three-items each, namely perceived control, perceived competence and goal internalization. The study of Menon, 2001, has reported acceptable alpha reliability coefficients for perceived control, perceived competence and goal internalization as 0.83, 0.80 and 0.88 respectively. In the area of employee empowerment Menon, 2001 approach is widely used to conceptualize the psychological empowerment (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). All items in the scale were measured using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The sample item used to measure perceived control is “I have the authority to make decisions at work”. The sample item used to measure perceived competence is “I have the competence to work
effectively”. The sample item used to measure goal internalization is “I am inspired by the goals of the organization”.

### 5.2.3 Feedback seeking behavior

Ashford and Black, 1996, four-item scale is used to measure feedback seeking behavior of the new recruit in the organization. The scale has shown acceptable Cronbach α value of 0.87 and high construct validity (Ashford & Black, 1996). The study of Dahling, Chau and O’Malley, 2012, has also used this scale to measure the feedback seeking behavior of employees. All items in the scale were measured using seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “to no extent”, to seven, “to a great extent”. The sample item used to measure new recruit’s feedback seeking behavior is “To what extent have you sought feedback on your performance after assignments?”

### 5.2.4 Organizational socialization tactics

A twelve-item scale extracted by Cable and Parsons, 2001, from original Jones, 1986, thirty items scale is used to measure organizational socialization tactics. In the past studies, the thirty items scale given by Jones, 1986, was frequently used to measure organizational socialization tactics. However, Cable and Parsons, 2001, argued that the thirty items scale makes the survey extensively long and decreases the involvement of the participants in the survey. The twelve item scale developed by Cable and Parsons, 2001, is highly recommended as it considers only highest-loading items from the original thirty item scale of Jones, 1986 (Perrot Bauer & Roussel, 2012). The twelve item scale measures three aspects namely context, content, and social aspect of organizational socialization tactics using four items for each aspect. The scale has shown acceptable constructs validity and reliability with Cronbach α value of 0.81 (Cable & Parsons, 2001). All items in the scale are measured using seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The sample item used to measure context aspects
of organization socialization tactics is “This organization puts all newcomers through the same set of learning experiences”. The sample item used to measure content aspects of organization socialization tactics is “The steps in the career ladder are clearly specified in this organization”. The sample item used to measure social aspects of organization socialization tactics is “My colleagues have gone out of their way to help me adjust to this organization”.

5.2.5 New recruit adjustment

The new recruit adjustment is the level of adjustment the new recruit has achieved in the organization. Bauer et al., 2007, have defined three components of new recruit adjustment: role clarity, task mastery and social adjustment. For measurement of role clarity, a six-item scale developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman, 1970, is used. The scale has shown acceptable constructs validity and reliability with Cronbach α value of 0.94 (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). Task mastery is measured using five-item scale developed by Chao, O’Leary-Kelly, Wolf, Klein and Gardner, 1994, which consist of two reversed coded items. The scale has shown high construct validity and reliability with coefficient alpha as 0.93. For social adjustment, a scale consisting of six-items developed by Chao et al., 1994 is used which has shown the acceptable reliability with Cronbach α value of 0.85. The scale of social adjustment consists of two reversed coded items. These scales are separately used to measure role clarity, task mastery and social adjustment of newly hired employees in various studies in the past (Klein & Weaver, 2000; Morrison, 2002; Mukherjee & Malhotra, 2006). The study of Nifadkar et al., 2012, used combination of these three scales to measures the new recruit’s adjustment in the organization. The items in all three scales are measured using seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The sample item used to measure role clarity of newly hired employees is “I know what my responsibilities are”. For task mastery of newly hired
employees the sample item is “I have mastered the required tasks of my job”. The sample item used to measure social adjustment of newly hired employees is “Within my workgroup, I would easily be identified as one of the gang”.

5.2.6 New recruit outcomes

The new recruit outcomes were measured using three important variables, namely job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention to quit.

5.2.6.1 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is measured by the scale consisting of three items given by Cammann et al., 1983 which has shown the reliability with Cronbach α value of 0.77. Some of the studies in the past have used this scale to measure job satisfaction and confirmed its reliability (Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002; Anseel & Lievens, 2007). The items are measured using seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The sample item used to measure job satisfaction from the scale is “I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for a job well done”.

5.2.6.2 Affective commitment

In terms of organizational commitment, the focus of the study is to measure the affective commitment of the new recruits. In the context of organizational socialization and new recruits adjustment in the organization, affective dimension appears to be the most relevant as it is linked with uncertainty reduction theory (Simosi, 2010). Affective commitment is measured by Allen and Meyer’s 1990, eight-item scale. In the socialization literature the Allen and Meyer, 1990, scale is frequently used to measure the affective commitment of the employees (Fong & Snape, 2015). The studies like Albrecht and Andreetta, 2011, have also used this scale to measure the affective commitment. The scale has shown the acceptable reliability with alpha reliability coefficient of 0.87 (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The scale consists of four reversed coded
items. The items are measured using seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The sample item used to measure organizational commitment from the scale is “I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it”. The sample reverse coded item from the scale is “I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization”.

5.2.6.3 Intention to quit

The three-item scale of Michaels and Spector, 1982, is used to measure intention to quit among new recruit. The measurement of intention to quit using Michaels and Spector, 1982, scale is simple as the items are to the point and captures the desire of employees to quit the job (Larkin, 2015). The study of Ghosh and Gurunathan, 2014, has used this scale to measure the intention to quit of employees and confirmed its reliability. The scale has shown the acceptable reliability with alpha reliability coefficient of 0.81 (Michaels & Spector, 1982). The items are measured using seven-point Likert scale ranging from one, “strongly disagree”, to seven, “strongly agree”. The sample item used to measure intention to quit from the scale is “I often seriously consider leaving my current job”.

5.2.7 Demographic information of participants

The questions related to the demographic information of respondent were also requested in the survey. The information about participant’s, age, gender, education, marital status, tenure in the organization, total work experience, previous work experience, annual gross salary, the name of present organization, designation, current location and the native place was gathered using relevant questions in the survey. Also, the participants were requested to mention their contact details which were used further for the authentication of the responses. The demographic
information of the participants was collected to get better understanding of the profile of the participants and to verify that respondent are fit in the criteria of the study.

5.3. Sampling

The target population for the present study are new recruits working at entry level (junior management level/technical professional) in IT companies in India who completed three months to twelve months tenure in present company and one who do not have any previous work experience. Hyderabad is considered 2nd largest IT hub in India and close to 3000 companies operate from this destination (Telangana Government Annual Report, 2015). Major IT companies like TCS, Wipro, Infosys, Accenture and many others have branches in Hyderabad, whereas 223 companies are registered in Hyderabad under NASSCOM member directory. Thus, due to presence of a large number of eligible participants, Hyderabad was chosen as the destination for data collection. The NASSCOM membership directory provides the most comprehensive information about software companies operating in India thus in the present study, the companies listed in NASSCOM were considered for data collection.

A list of companies was prepared that are registered in Hyderabad and dealing in software industry using NASSCOM member directory which was accessed on 10th November 2016 and has 223 companies listed under city Hyderabad. The companies with the business focus of Education & Training, Staffing services & solution, Internet & eCommerce, Animation & Gaming, Insurance and financial institution were removed from the list. The companies with

\[\text{NASSCOM Foundation is a non-profit organization which provides platform for Indian IT companies for trade and growth. Its contribution to the growth of Indian IT industry is recognized by IBEF.}\]

\[\text{The list of companies at Hyderabad location is available at NASSCOM’s official website http://memberdirectory.nasscom.in/mms_company_free_search/city/Hyderabad}\]
business focus of IT services, BPM, Product, and Engineering/Embedded/R&D were considered as companies to be approached for data collection. After removing 24 companies with irrelevant business focus from original list of 223 companies with core IT business focus, 199 companies were considered for data collection. Further, we divided these companies based on the number of employees in three categories small, medium and large companies. The companies with employee strength 51-200 were labeled as small companies. The companies which had employees from the range of 201-5000 were associated with the category of medium companies whereas, the one’s with employees from 5001 to 10,000+ employees were considered as large companies. Among the list of 199 selected companies, 99 were small companies, 72 medium companies and 28 large companies. The categorical information about the companies listed in NASSCOM in Hyderabad location is given in Table 5.1

Table 5.1: Categories of Companies listed in NASSCOM Hyderabad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Companies</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>No. of Listed companies in Hyderabad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>51-200 Employees</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>201-500, 501-1000 &amp; 1001-5000 Employees</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5001-10,000 &amp; 10,000+ Employees</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information regarding how many employees are working at entry level (which are fit in our criteria) in different IT companies registered in NASSCOM at Hyderabad location was collected from various sources like annual reports of companies, NASSCOM survey reports,

---

3 The information regarding the total number of employees working in the listed companies and employees who are working at entry level is gathered and compiled by the author. The sources such as company website, company annual report, company official LinkedIn page and direct interaction with the HR professionals working for the organization.
company websites and directly speaking with HR professionals as well as technical professionals working in respective companies. Based on the gathered information approximately 5000 participants were identified who are eligible to take the survey and were working in small companies, approximately 30,000 were working in medium companies whereas approximately three to four lakhs eligible participants are working in large companies. The details of employees working in the companies listed in NASSCOM under location Hyderabad is presented in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Details of Employees working in Companies listed in NASSCOM Hyderabad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Companies</th>
<th>No. of Listed companies in Hyderabad</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>No. of Eligible employees (Approximately)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51-200 Employees</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>201-500, 501-1000 &amp; 1001-5000 Employees</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5001-10,000 &amp; 10,000+ Employees</td>
<td>3-4 lakhs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Estimate of Sample Size

As per Hinkin, 2005, the sample size should be decided based on the ratio of number of items in the questionnaire to total responses. The suggested range of ratio is 1:4 to 1:10 (Hinkin, 2005). Thus, for this study the number of items in the questionnaire is 60 which lead to the sample size of 240 to 600 responses. However, the statistical tool used for analysis of data is Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and Hair et al., 2006, suggested that for SEM model where the number of latent variables is more than six, the sample size should be maintained as more than 500. Thus, for this study the sample size was estimated as 600 which is ten times the number of items in the questionnaire and more than 500.
5.5. Data Collection process

The data was collected from November 2016 to January 2017 in different phases. The data was collected through personal efforts of researcher and with the help of survey research agency. The HR professionals\(^4\) and technical professionals\(^5\) working in the listed companies were approached to seek help for data collection. The platforms such as LinkedIn, ReferHire community, CiteHR.com, IBS Alumni page (ibsindia.almaconnect.com), Whatsapp Groups, Personal and Professional e-mail ids, Phone calls, conference calls, Skype calls, Facebook Groups\(^6\), LinkedIn Groups\(^7\) were used to approach the HR professionals and technical professional for data collection.

The HR professionals and technical professionals of 199 companies were approached among which 39 companies did not responded, 34 companies were not ready to share information due to company norms, 12 companies informed that the training process of new recruits was still going on and thus they are not part of active work process yet. Further, the recruitment process at the entry level was going on for 13 companies and hence, they were unable to help us in the data collection process, another 22 companies initially responded well...

\(^4\) HR professionals with the designations such as HR Executive, HR Manager, HR Head, Senior HR Manager, Business HR, Corporate HR, Senior Talent Acquisition Manger, HR Director, Assistant Manager - Talent Acquisition, T & D Incharge, Assistant manager- L&D, Induction Manager, Training Manager, Senior Manager- Induction and Senior Manager- L&D were contacted to seek help for data collection.

\(^5\) Technical professionals with the designation such as Team Leader, Assistant Manager- Testing, Senior Software developer, Lead Engineer, Project Manager, Business Operation Head, System Administrator, Senior Functional Consultant, Senior Programming Analyst, Software Designer, Senior Android Developer, and Software Engineer- L4 were contacted to seek help for data collection.

\(^6\) The information about the survey and eligible candidate was posted online in the Facebook groups such as Jobs @ Telangana, Hyderabad Freshers Jobs Walkins, Spread the Word Hyderabad. The members of these groups were requested to provide references of the candidates who were eligible to take the survey.

\(^7\) The information about the survey and eligible candidate was posted online in the LinkedIn groups such as Java Developers, LinkedIn :HR (#1 Human Resources Group), Compensation & Benefits Forum, Senior HR Professionals: Job Search Work Group – GTA, Career Strategies, Tips, Discussions and Support. The members of these groups were requested to provide references of the candidates who were eligible to take the survey.
but they did not respond in the later part of data collection. The HR professional and technical professionals of 47 companies among 199 listed companies provided positive response and were ready to co-operate for the data collection process resulting in response rate of 24%. These 47 companies consist of 14 small companies, 17 medium companies and 16 large companies based on the number of employees working in the respective companies. The details of the eligible employees working in selected companies who can take the survey is presented in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: Employee Details of Selected Companies for Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Companies</th>
<th>No. of Listed companies in Hyderabad</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
<th>No. of Eligible employees (Approximately)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51-200 Employees</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>201-500, 501-1000 &amp; 1001-5000 Employees</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5001-10,000 &amp; 10,000+ Employees</td>
<td>2 lakhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An online survey was created in Google document with a cover letter to provide a brief introduction about the purpose of the survey to the participant and to request them for participation (refer annexure 2). Also, it was mentioned in the cover letter that the survey was conducted only for the academic purpose and the information shared by the participant will remain confidential. The survey consists of two parts - the first part included 60 questions related to the constructs under study while the second part of the survey consists of questions related to demographic details of the participants. The online link to the survey was sent on the personal or professional e-mail ids of new recruits with the help of HR professionals and technical professional working in 47 companies which are listed under city ‘Hyderabad’ in NASSCOM.
member directory. The participants were requested to share the link of forms with their co-workers, friends, relatives, family members who are relevant to the study in order to reach the maximum amount of participants.

In the initial stage, responses were gathered at the rate of 16 percent as very small number of participants working in medium and small companies were fit in the criteria. The eligible participants in large companies were more in number and were responding very well, thus in order to gather response from more participants the list of companies was expanded. The companies which are listed in NASSCOM and have branches in Hyderabad were searched by visiting the company websites of leading IT companies in India. In order to target a larger pool of participants, only ‘large’ companies were considered during the expansion of the list of companies to be approached for data collection. After confirmation about branches in Hyderabad, HR professionals and technical professionals of 15 additional companies were approached to seek help for data collection among which 11 companies responded positively and showed interest to run the survey in their organization. These companies have branches in Hyderabad with business focus on IT services, BPM, Product and Engineering/Embedded/R&D but they are registered in NASSCOM member directory under city Bengaluru, Mumbai, Chennai, Noida, Gurgaon and Pune.

Finally, the data was collected from 58 companies among which 14 were small companies, 17 were medium companies and 27 (16 from companies which are registered in Hyderabad plus 11 companies which have branches in Hyderabad) were large companies (refer annexure 1 for list of companies).
After collecting data through personal efforts, a research agency was selected and approached to collect remaining data points. Three companies which were into market research were approached among which one agency was selected based on the quality assurance and minimum time required for data collection. The objective of the study, sampling design and list of companies to be approached and criteria of sample were shared with the data collection team.

The data collection agency approached the employees who met the criteria and used the same online link to distribute the survey form among them. The researcher was in touch with the data collection team throughout the process and helped them to collect data which is relevant to the study. Researcher has created a proper pitching script which was useful for the data collection team to approach the candidates and encourage them to participate in the survey. The agency has provided the contact details of the respondent who participated in the online survey. The data collection agency mentioned that they got responses from the participants at the response rate of 21 percent.

At the end of the data collection, 25 respondents were selected from the response sheet using RAND() function and called them on the given contact numbers to verify whether they have recently participated in the survey on the topic of organizational behavior. All 25 respondents confirmed that they participated in the survey and the information they have provided in the survey was authentic.

5.6. Discarded Responses
It is important to consider the responses which are fit in criteria for the further analysis. At the end of data collection total 771 responses were reported among which 347 responses were gathered through researcher’s personal efforts and 424 responses were received through data
collection agency. The collected responses were then checked for all the conditions mentioned in the sample criteria. It was found that 164 responses did not fit in the sample criteria and thus were discarded.

The responses were majorly discarded due to reasons such as:

a) The respondents were not working in NASSCOM listed companies.
b) Respondents were undergraduate or had no technical education (MBA, B.Pharmacy, M.Pharmacy).
c) Respondents had previous work experience (less than one year, one year to three years, more than three years).
d) Tenure of respondents in the current company was more or less than three months to one year (less than three months, one year to three years, more than three years).
e) Respondents were not located in Hyderabad and respondents were not technical professional (working as HR manager, help desk, management trainee, customer support executive).
f) Respondents mentioned in the form that they are not new recruits in the organization and still have taken the survey. Respondents were fresher or not currently working.
g) Respondents have not provided complete information asked in the survey (contact details, company details were not disclosed).

After discarding the unfit responses, the researcher considered 607 responses for further analysis.

Table 5.4: Details of sample collected based on type of companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Companies</th>
<th>No. of Companies</th>
<th>No. of Eligible employees</th>
<th>No. of Sample Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Approximately 700</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Approximately 8000</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Approximately 3,00,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We collected samples from 14 small companies in which approximately 700 employees were working at entry level among which 103 individuals completed the survey correctly. In the case of medium and large IT companies, around 8000 and 3,00,000 employees were fit in our criteria among which 104 and 400 employees completed the survey properly.

5.7 Statistical Tools

The common method variance was examined before testing the hypotheses. The internal consistency of the measurement scales was verified using Cronbach’s alpha. The present study used model fit indices to verify the goodness of fit of the measurement model. Lastly, structural equation modeling (SEM) is used to test the hypotheses.

*Common Method Variance:* The common method bias is considered as an issue which creates ‘noise’ in the collected data. The prime source of this variance is sociability of the participants, under which the participants desire to present themselves as positive and pleasing, and thus they respond to the survey questions in a positive manner (Chang, Van Witteloostuijin & Eden, 2010). Also, the variance in the data can be due to capturing both dependent and independent variable at the same time frame (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). Harman’s one factor test and common latent factor method are used to verify the common method variance (Podsakoff, et al., 2003). As per Harman’s one-factor test, all the items of all variables in the model were allowed to load as one factor during factor analysis. If the result has shown that the variance explained by the one factor is more than 50 percent, then it confirms the presence of variance in the data (Podsakoff, et al., 2003). The result of Harman’s one-factor test is mentioned in next chapter.
Cronbach’s alpha: The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of the instrument represents the internal consistency which is the reliability of the items used in the scale to measure the particular construct. As per Nunnally, 1978, suggestion the score of Cronbach’s alpha should be more than 0.7. Statistical Procedure for Social Science (SPSS) software version 21 was used to calculate the Cronbach’s alpha and CITC values for the scales and items in the instrument.

Model Fit Indices: The Chi-square test is the basic test which decides the good fit of the model in CFA; however, Hair et al., 2006, suggested that for studies with large sample size it is not right to rely on the chi-square test and some other indicators of goodness of fit should be calculated. Based on the suggestions of experts in the past (Barrett, 2006; Schermelleh et al., 2003) the present study has used optimum indicators to verify the goodness of fit and as per the suggestion of Hair et al., 2006, the cut-off scores of these indicators were decided. AMOS 20.0 software was used to estimate the model fit indices. For the present study, we selected indexes such as Root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), Goodness of fit index (GFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), Adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI), Comparative fit index (CFI) and Relative Chi-square Index (i.e. CMIN/DF). The summary of the required threshold scores of these indicators is presented in Table 5.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Threshold scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;0.05 is considered as good; &lt;0.08 is acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.95 is considered as superior; 0.9 is a good score; 0.8 is acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.95 is considered as superior; 0.9 is a good score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.95 is considered as superior; 0.9 is a good score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>0.8 is considered as good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt; 3 is considered good; &lt; 5 is acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Structural equation modeling (SEM):** The gathered data was analyzed to test the proposed structural model using structural equation modeling (SEM). It is a multivariate statistical technique used in order to confirm the significant relationships between latent variables. The SEM technique was relevant to the present study as it has a capability to test all hypothesized relationships simultaneously (Ding & Lin, 2006) including the effect of mediating variables. As stated by Hair et al., 2006, SEM is relevant when you want to estimate multiple interrelated relationships. Also, this method defines the structural model which explains all sets of relationships among the construct. Hair et al., 2006, highlighted that SEM is useful for testing the hypotheses in the empirical study as it represents the unobserved correction and concepts of measurement errors. Thus, SEM was found to be appropriate in the context of the present study for testing the proposed hypotheses, AMOS 20.0 software was used for SEM analysis.

To sum up, this chapter provides details of the sample design, scales used to measure the constructs, the sampling process and data collection process, also the statistical tools used in the study. The data analysis and results are presented in the next chapter.