CHAPTER SIX
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In the first section of this chapter the results of data analysis have been elaborately discussed. The second section of the chapter includes the details of hypotheses testing and the results of SEM are presented.

6.1 Preliminary Analysis

The preliminary analysis of the data was conducted to check the case of missing value, outliers and to verify the assumptions of multivariate data analysis (MVA).

**Missing values:** In online designed survey for the study all the questions were marked as mandatory (*required) thus, there was no case of missing values in the data. Also, the responses where the participant had not provided the asked information such as name of the company or designation were discarded and not considered for further analysis.

**Outliers:** Johnson, 1992, defined an outlier as a response recorded in the data which is inconsistent as compared to the remaining responses in the dataset. It is important to detect and eliminate outliers as multivariate statistical techniques are sensitive to outliers (Stevens, 1984). We used Mahalanobis distance (MD) method to identify the outliers in the data, under which MD’s $p$-value should be less than 0.05 to indicate no presence of outliers (Hadi, 1992). In the current study, upon analysis we found four such cases of outliers, which were removed before further analysis.

**Assumptions of multivariate data analysis (MVA):** Hair et al., 2006, has claimed that deviation in the assumptions of multivariate data analysis can lead to incorrect results. Thus, it is essential to check the linearity, multi-collinearity and normality which are some of the
assumptions of multivariate data analysis (MVA). Linearity indicates the linear relationship among independent and dependent variables. The F-statistic is used to test the linearity for all possible relationship among independent and dependent constructs. The results were found significant such as relationship between supervisor support behavior to feedback seeking behavior (F [16, 589] = 2.752, p < .01), and psychological empowerment (F [16, 589] = 7.333, p < .01). In the case of relationship between feedback seeking behavior and new recruit’s outcomes the F-statistic were found as-for job satisfaction (F[17, 588] = 0.562, p = 0.920), affective commitment (F[17, 588] = 2.716, p < .01) and intention to quit (F[17, 588] = 19.732, p < .01). For relationship between new recruits adjustment and new recruit’s outcomes the F-statistic were found as-for job satisfaction (F[48, 557] = 1.275, p = 0.108), affective commitment (F[48, 557] = 1.964, p < .01) and intention to quit (F[48, 557] = 3.644, p < .01). Thus, the assumption of linearity was found to be significant for the study.

The normality of the data was confirmed using the kurtosis and skewness values of each construct present in the conceptual model. As per suggestion of Avey, 2007, the kurtosis value between +/-7 is acceptable while Gravetter and Wallnau, 2014, suggested that the skewness value between +/-2 is considered as acceptable. The kurtosis and skewness values of each construct in the study are presented Table 6.1 which indicates that all the values are within the suggested cut-off ranges.
Multicollinearity is considered as an issue which arises when two predicting variables are highly correlated which provides biased results of the model (Gujarati & Madsen, 1998). The variance inflation factor (VIF) was calculated to estimate the issue of multicollinearity. Pan and Jackson, 2008, have recommended the range of VIF values between 4 to 10 which indicates the presence of multicollinearity. The VIF values of predictors’ feedback seeking behavior and new recruit’s adjustment on the criterion value of job satisfaction ranges between 1.24 to 1.30, which are within the recommended range. The VIF values of predictors’ feedback seeking behavior and new recruit’s adjustment on the criterion value of affective commitment ranges between 1.20 to 1.30, which are within the recommended range. The VIF values of predictors’ feedback seeking behavior and new recruit’s adjustment on the criterion value of intention to quit ranges between 1.17 to 1.20, which are also within the recommended range. Thus, the VIF verification confirms there are no multicollinearity issues in the collected data. The results of VIF test are presented in Table 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4.

Table 6.1: Kurtosis and Skeweness Values for Normality Check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support behavior</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>-1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>5.203</td>
<td>-1.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback seeking behavior</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>-.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational socialization tactics</td>
<td>3.705</td>
<td>-1.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New recruit’s adjustment</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>-1.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.320</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>-1.048</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2: VIF Test Results for Multicollinearity Check (Job Satisfaction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Feedback seeking behavior</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New recruits adjustment</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction*

Table 6.3: VIF Test Results for Multicollinearity Check (Affective Commitment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Feedback seeking behavior</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New recruits adjustment</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment*

Table 6.4: VIF Test Results for Multicollinearity Check (Intention to Quit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Feedback seeking behavior</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New recruits adjustment</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Intention to quit*

6.2 Descriptive Statistic

The demographic information about sample includes the age, gender, education, marital status, annual gross salary and native place of the respondent. As per the criteria of the study the responses of participant who have completed three months to twelve months tenure in the present organization (IT company), who had no previous work experiences were only considered as valid sample under study. Other responses were declared as not relevant to the study and were discarded.
In the sample of 607 participants, most number of individuals are of age group 20-25 years which is 92.8 percent of the entire sample. The participants with age group of 26-30 years were 6 percent of the total sample while 0.7 percent participants were age group of 31-35 years. There were no participants with age of 36 years or more. The participants include more number of males, which is 67.4 percent of the entire sample. The female participants were 32.6 percent of the total sample. The ratio of male and female participants matches as per the prediction of Deloitte, 2016, report on women in IT jobs.

The participants include 81.2 percent of graduate. The participants who had completed post graduation were 18 percent of the total sample while 0.6 percent participants had other qualifications. The responses from under graduate participants were removed from the data as they were not fit in the sample criteria. The participants have mostly singles which is 96.9 percent, while 3.1 percent of the participants were married. As the study is based on newly hired employees who did a transition from education institute to corporate world most of the participants are unmarried as they have recently completed their education and looking for stability in life.

The participants include 6.3 percent individuals with annual gross salary less than one lakh per annum. Most number of participants had annual gross salary between one lakh to three lakhs which is 59.3 percent of the entire sample. The participants with annual gross salary between three lakhs to five lakhs are 26.2 percent of the total sample. The participants also include 8.2 percent of individuals with annual gross salary more than five lakhs per annum. As the survey was conducted in Hyderabad, 47.6 percent had Telangana as their native place while 24.2 percent participant belonged to Andhra Pradesh. The respondents also included 12.7 percent of people from North India, 6.6 percent of participants with native place in East India, 5.68
percent people who belonged to West India, while 3.1 percent from other parts of South India.

Table 6.5 entails all details regarding demographic information of the participants.

Table 6.5: *Demographic Details of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gross Salary</td>
<td>Less than 1 Lakh</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Lakh to 3 Lakh</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Lakh to 5 Lakh</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 Lakh</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Place (Region-wise)</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>24.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telangana</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>47.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South India</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West India</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East India</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics of the constructs such as means and standard deviation along with the minimum and maximum value estimated based on the responses collected from the participant is presented in Table 6.6. These values provide the information regarding disperse and spread of the responses (refer annexure 3 for item-wise descriptive statistics).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support behavior</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback seeking behavior</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational socialization tactics</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New recruit’s adjustment</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Common Method Variance

In order to verify the presence of common method bias, the common method variance (CMV) is calculated in the present study. Harman’s one factor test is used to verify the common method variance (Podsakoff, et al., 2003). The results of Harman’s one factor test, the one factor has explained only 32.51 percent which verified that common method variance issues do not exist (Podsakoff, et al., 2003).

### 6.4 Purification of the Scale

This section provides the analysis and results of validation of instruments used for eight constructs namely supervisor support behavior, psychological empowerment, feedback seeking behavior, organizational socialization tactics, new recruits’ adjustment, job satisfaction, affective commitment and intention to quit in the present study. As stated by Churchill, 1979, it is important to verify the reliability and validity of the constructs used in the study before we proceed for hypotheses testing process. Straub, Boudreau, and Gefen, 2004, stated that confirmation of the validity of constructs is a process to verify that instrument question or items in the scale represent the respective construct. Churchill, 1979, has clearly stated that it is
important to get rid of “garbage items” from the scale of the construct which is required before we proceed for factor analysis. Thus, examination of corrected-item total correlation (CITC) score of every item (all 60 items) with respect to the construct was conducted. Cronbach, 1951, provided that the CITC score of the item captures the degree to which the item is contributing to the internal consistency of the variable under study. The items with CITC scores above 0.6 are items which are significantly contributing in the measurement of the construct while items with CITC score less than 0.2 should be eliminated due to poor contribution. Some of the items with CITC less than 0.6 but more than 0.2 can also be removed if their removal can improve the overall reliability of the instrument.

Among the four items of supervisor support behavior (SSB), one item (SSB4) had a CITC score of 0.171. The contribution of this item to the internal consistency of the scale was not significant. The item has CITC score less than 0.2 and it was reverse coded – “My supervisor shows very little concern for me”. Thus, the item was dropped from the scale.

In case of new recruit’s adjustment (NRA), the variable is defined by Bauer et al., 2007, using three components: role clarity, task mastery and social adjustment. Three different scales were used to measure these components for role clarity, a 6-item scale developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman, 1970, while task mastery was measured using 5-items scale developed by Chao et.al, 1994, and for social adjustment, Chao et.al, 1994 6-items scale was used. Thus, the CITC score was estimated for role clarity (RC), task mastery (TM) and social adjustment (SA) separately. All the items of role clarity (RC) had CITC score more than 0.2, thus, all the items were retained. Among the five items of task mastery (TM), the two items (TM1 and TM4) had a CITC score of 0.2 and 0.328 respectively. The contribution of these two items to the internal consistency of the scale was relatively less and both the items were reversed coded. Hence, the
item TM1 was dropped due to low CITC score while TM4 was removed to improve the reliability of the instruments. The results of Cronbach’s alpha are mentioned in the next section. The items “I have not yet learned "the ropes" of my job” and “I have not fully developed the appropriate skills and abilities to successfully perform my job” were removed from the task mastery scale. Among the six items of social adjustment (SA), the three items (SA3, SA5, SA6) had a CITC score of 0.069, 0.106 and 0.2 respectively. The contribution of these three items to the internal consistency of the scale was relatively less. Among these three items, the CITC score of two items is lower than 0.2 while the third one has CITC score close to 0.2. Thus, the items "Within my work group, I would easily be identified as one of the gang," "I am pretty popular in the organization" and "I believe most of my co-workers like me" were dropped from the scale.

In the case of psychological empowerment (PE) and feedback seeking behavior (FSB), job satisfaction (JS), affective commitment (AC) and intention to quit (IQ) all the items had CITC score more than 0.2, thus, all the items were retained. The summary of the items dropped from the measurement scales of all the construct are given in Table 6.7.
Table 6.7: Results of Scales Purification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Original item in the scale</th>
<th>No. of items dropped</th>
<th>CITC of dropped items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSB4- 0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Seeking Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization Tactics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Recruits Adjustment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TM1- 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TM4- 0.328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task mastery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SA3- 0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social adjustment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SA5- 0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA6- 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TM3 was removed from the task mastery scale to improve the reliability of instrument.

6.5 Principle Component Analysis (PCA)

Once the purification of scale using CITC analysis was done, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted through Principle Component Analysis (PCA) with VARIMAX rotation method for items in each scale to assess initial validity of measurement. The item with higher loadings on the factor is considered as items with good measuring properties and indicates the proper measurement of constructs has been done. Thus, Segars and Grover, 1993, claimed that EFA is the indicator of the initial validity of measurement of items in the scale. In order to maintain a high excellence of measuring instrument, in the present study, the cut-off of factor loading score less than 0.5 is used to remove the items. The sample adequacy was verified using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value for all the variables and factor analyses at the dimension level. Generally, 0.9 KMO score is considered as outstanding, a very good score is of 0.8, an
average score is 0.7 while 0.6 is a tolerable score. The KMO score at 0.5 is considered as miserable while anything below 0.5 is unacceptable (Cerny & Kaiser, 1977). 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 more than 0.7 is acceptable. Statistical Procedure for Social Science (SPSS) software version 21 was used to calculate the Cronbach’s alpha and exploratory factor analysis of the instruments.

Among the nine items of psychological empowerment (PE), one item (PE6) had factor loading score of 0.336 which was less than the cut-off value of 0.5. Thus, the item “I have the authority to make decisions at work” was removed which significantly improved the Cronbach’s alpha of the scale. Among the four items of feedback seeking behavior (FSB), one item (FSB3) had factor loading score of 0.120 which was less than the cut-off value of 0.5. Thus, the item “To what extent have you solicited critiques from your boss” was removed from the scale.

Among the twelve items of organizational socialization tactics (OST), the three items (OST1, OST4 and OST10) had factor loading score of 0.322, 0.278 and 0.374 respectively. Factor loading score of these items were less than the cut-off value of 0.5. The items dropped from the scale of organizational socialization tactics were “I have been extensively involved with other new recruits in common, job related training activities”, “I did not perform any of my normal job responsibilities until I was thoroughly familiar with departmental procedures and work methods” and “My colleagues have gone out of their way to help me adjust to this organization”. Among the six items of role clarity (RC), the three items (RC4, RC5 and RC6) had factor loading score of 0.460, 0.472 and 0.434 respectively. These three items from the scale of role clarity had factor loading less than 0.5 and were cross loading into the construct of task
mastery. Thus, the items “I know exactly what is expected of me”, “I feel certain about how much authority I have been given to do my job” and “Explanations is clear of what has to be done” were dropped from the role clarity scale. Among the eight items of affective commitment (AC), three items (AC1, AC2 and AC4) had factor loading score of 0.266, 0.240 and 0.091 respectively. Thus, due to low factor loading the items “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization”, and reverse coded item “I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one” and “I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it” were removed from affective commitment scale.

The factor loading of all the items in the scale of supervisor’s support behavior, job satisfaction and intention quit were more than 0.5 and thus, all the items present in the scale after CITC score analysis were retained for further analysis. After dropping the items for all the variables which had lower factor loading, the Cronbach’s alpha for all the scales were calculated separately. It was found that Cronbach’s alpha all the scales were more than 0.7, thus the scales were considered as reliable and acceptable (Nunnally, 1978). The results of Cronbach’s alpha of all the scale is mentioned in Table 6.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item in the scale after CITC analysis</th>
<th>No. of items dropped after PCA</th>
<th>Factor loading of dropped items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PE6-0.336</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Seeking Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FSB3-0.120</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization Tactics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OST1-0.322</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OST4-0.278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OST10-0.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Recruits Adjustment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RC4-0.460</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RC5-0.472</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task mastery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>RC6-0.434</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AC1-0.266</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AC2-0.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AC4-0.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample adequacy for construct supervisor support behavior was verified using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value; all the scales had shown the KMO value in the range of average score and thus confirmed the sample adequacy. A significant (0.000) result was reported of Bartlett’s test for Sphericity for all the constructs used in the study. The result of principle component analysis is presented in Table 6.9.
Table 6.9: Results of Principle Component Analysis (PCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>KMO</th>
<th>Bartlett’s Test</th>
<th>Range of Communalties</th>
<th>Range of Factor Loading</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Support Behavior</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>946.286</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.771-.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>3992.313</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.446-.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Seeking Behavior</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>769.911</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.604-.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Socialization Tactics</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>2430.874</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.403-.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Recruits Adjustment</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>3580.559</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.506-.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>815.865</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.751-.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>811.989</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.456-.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>1903.776</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.899-.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 Correlation Analysis

The Pearson correlation method was used to check the statistical validity of the proposed hypotheses. The result of correlation analysis is present in Table 6.10 which provides initial support to the proposed relationship between the constructs. Specifically, supervisor support behavior (SSB) is significantly correlated to psychological empowerment (PE), feedback seeking behavior (FSB), organizational socialization tactics (OST), new recruits’ adjustment (NRA), job satisfaction (JS), affective commitment (AC) and intention to quit (IQ). Similarly, feedback
seeking behavior (FBS) and new recruit’s adjustment (NRA) had significant correlation with new recruit’s outcomes such as affective commitment (AC) and intention to quit (IQ). The values of correlations indicated that most of the hypothesized relationships are existing among the constructs.

Table 6.10: Correlation Analysis of all the Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisory Support Behavior</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>.379**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback Seeking Behavior</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Recruits Adjustment</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Socialization Tactics</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intention to Quit</td>
<td>-.110**</td>
<td>-.01*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

6.7 Analysis of Demographic Variables

The analysis of demographic variable was conducted to verify their effect on the constructs present in the structural model. ANOVA was conducted to test the impact of age, gender, marital status and annual gross salary of participants on the constructs in the structural model. The correlation among the demographic variables and constructed present in the model was verified using ANOVA. The Summary of ANOVA results is shown in Table 6.11. There is no significant effect of age, gender, marital status and annual gross salary on any of the constructs in the structural model.
Table 6.11: Summary of Correlation between the Demographic Variables and Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSB</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>FSB</th>
<th>OST</th>
<th>NRA</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>IQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gross Salary</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: there was no significant correlation among demographic variables and constructs

6.8 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Once the convergent validity of the construct was established using EFA the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to access the discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2006). In order to improve the model fit, the coefficients and modification indices were observed and iterative modifications were made for sub-constructs present in the model (Sethi & King, 1994). As per the recommendation of Joreskog and Sorbom, 1989, only one item in the construct was altered at a time to avoid the over modification. Until the key fit indices met the acceptable criteria the iterative modification was continuously carried out. The results of CFA is presented in Table 6.12, the score of GFI, AGFI, NFI, CFI and TLI for all the variables are greater than 0.9. Also, the RMSEA scores are less than 0.08 and the chi square/df values are less than 3 for organizational socialization tactics and organizational commitment which is a good fit and in the case of psychological empowerment and new recruit’s adjustment it is less than 5 which is acceptable. Thus, all the values indicate excellent model fit.
### Table 6.12: Model Fit Indices for the Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>X^2/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational socialization tactics</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New recruit’s adjustment</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.9 Convergent Validity

The convergent validity of a construct can be established by verifying that factor loading of each item in the variable to their respective construct is high and closer to 0.50 (Hair et al., 2006). The convergent validity of a construct can also be verified using composite reliability (CR) and average variance explained (AVE) of the construct. The recommended value to confirm the convergent validity of a construct is CR value should be more than the respective AVE value of the construct (Byrne, 2016). The results of test conducted to verify the convergent validity indicates that all the items of each constructs are having factor loading more than 0.50. Also, the CR and AVE value are at the acceptable level. Thus, the convergent validity of all the construct in the study is confirmed. The results of the test are presented in Table 6.13 and Table 6.14.
Table 6.13: Factor Loadings for First Order Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First order Construct</th>
<th>Measurement Items</th>
<th>Standardized Estimates</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support behavior</td>
<td>SSB1</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSB2</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSB3</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE5</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE7</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE8</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE9</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback seeking behavior</td>
<td>FSB1</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSB2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSB4</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational socialization tactics</td>
<td>OST2</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST3</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST5</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST6</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST7</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST8</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST9</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST11</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC2</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC3</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Mastery</td>
<td>TM2</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TM3</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TM5</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>SA1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA2</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA4</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First order Construct</td>
<td>Measurement Items</td>
<td>Standardized Estimates</td>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>OC3</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC5</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC6</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC7</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC8</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>IQ1</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQ2</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IQ3</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.14: Factor Loadings for Second Order Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First order Construct</th>
<th>Measurement Items</th>
<th>Standardized Estimates</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New recruit’s adjustment</td>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Mastery</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social adjustment</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.10 Discriminant Validity

As per Awang, 2012, the discriminant validity of the constructs is confirmed in a CFA model, when the square root of AVE is less than the inter-construct correlations. In Table 6.15 the results of inter-construct correlation is presented and the square root of the diagonal elements is less than the inter-construct correlation. Using this method the discriminant validity among the construct was verified.
### Table 6.15: Results of Inter-construct Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Affective commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor Support Behavior</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback Seeking behavior</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intention to quit</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New recruit Adjustment</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.11 The Structural Model

The structural model comprises with eight constructs, supervisor support behavior (SSB), psychological empowerment (PE), feedback seeking behavior (FSB), organizational socialization tactics (OST), new recruit’s adjustment (NRA), job satisfaction (JS), affective commitment (AC) and intention to quit (IQ). All the relationships among the constructs are evaluated simultaneously using SEM. The fit indices such as Chi-square, AGFI, GFI, TLI CFI, and RMSEA were utilized to assess fit of the model. The recommended cut-off values of these fit indices as presented in Table 5.6 were used to confirm the goodness of fit of hypothesized model. The conceptual model is given in Figure 6.1.
Figure 6.1: Proposed Conceptual Model

The model consists of eleven hypotheses which have proposed the direct relationship among the construct while four hypotheses which proposed the mediating relationship. Psychological empowerment and new recruit’s adjustment are the two proposed mediators in the model.
6.12 Structural Equation Modeling Results

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was conducted with the help of statistical software AMOS (version 21) to test the proposed hypotheses and research model as shown in Figure 6.1. The parameters which indicate model fit as given by AMOS output have been presented in Table 6.16. The results showed an acceptable goodness fit of the proposed structural model with CMIN/df = 2.232, RMSEA = 0.045, CFI = 0.923, TLI = 0.917, AGFI= 0.864, GFI= 0.880.

Table 6.16: Model Fit Indices for Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi square (df)</th>
<th>Chi square/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1858.869 (833)</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of path analysis of SEM provide clear evidence that supervisor’s support behavior has significant impact on the intention to quit of the new recruits in the organization. Further, the results also confirm that supervisors support behavior (SSB) has positive impact on psychological empowerment (PE) (β= 0.520, p < .001) and new recruit’s feedback seeking behavior (FSB) (β= 0.543, p < .001). Thus, the results supported hypotheses H1a and H1c. The results demonstrated that organizational socialization tactics (OST) has positive influence on new recruit’s adjustment (NRA) (β= 0.749, p < .001). Also, feedback seeking behavior (FSB) has positive impact on new recruit’s adjustment (NRA) (β= 0.186, p < .001). Thus, the results supported hypotheses H2 and H3.

The results have confirmed the positive influence of feedback seeking behavior (FSB) on affective commitment (AC) of the newly hired employee (β= 0.671, p < .001). Also, the results indicate that feedback seeking behavior (FSB) negatively affects the intention to quit (IQ) of newly hired employees (β= -0.244, p < .05). Thus, result supported hypotheses H5b and H6b.
The results demonstrated that new recruits adjustment (NRA) has positive influences on affective commitment (AC) of newly hired employees ($\beta = 0.217, p < 0.001$). However, the new recruit’s adjustment (NRA) in the organization negatively influence their intention to quit (IQ) ($\beta = -0.314, p < 0.05$). Thus, result supported hypotheses H5a and H6a. The results of structural model test are presented in Table 6.17.

Table 6.17: Structural Model Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>SSB $\rightarrow$ PE</td>
<td>0.520 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>PE $\rightarrow$ FSB</td>
<td>0.042 0.411</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>SSB $\rightarrow$ FSB</td>
<td>0.543 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>OST $\rightarrow$ NRA</td>
<td>0.749 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>FSB $\rightarrow$ NRA</td>
<td>0.186 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>NRA $\rightarrow$ JS</td>
<td>-0.006 0.914</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>FSB $\rightarrow$ JS</td>
<td>0.014 0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>NRA $\rightarrow$ AC</td>
<td>0.217 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b</td>
<td>FSB $\rightarrow$ AC</td>
<td>0.671 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>NRA $\rightarrow$ IQ</td>
<td>-0.314 0.001***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>FSB $\rightarrow$ IQ</td>
<td>-0.244 0.005**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** indicates significant at $p < 0.001$, ** indicates significant at $p < 0.05$

6.13 Testing the Mediating Relationship

The structural model consists of two mediators, psychological empowerment and new recruit’s adjustment. To assess the mediation effect of psychological empowerment (PE) and new recruit’s adjustment (NRA) we followed a procedure as per the suggestion of Baron and Kenny (1986).
6.13.1 Mediating effect of Psychological Empowerment

Baron and Kenny (1986) suggested there are three conditions which should be fulfilled for mediation relationship (i) there should be a significant relationship between independent variable and presumed mediator (ii) there should be significant relationship between presumed mediator and dependent variable (iii) the previously significant relationship among independent variable and dependent variable should not remain significant when the paths of relationship (i) and (ii) are controlled. In the case of psychological empowerment as a mediator, the relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and psychological empowerment (PE) is significant; however the relationship between psychological empowerment (PE) and feedback seeking behavior (FSB) is not significant. As the condition stated by Baron and Kenny (1986) is not fulfilled it is clear that psychological empowerment does not mediate the relationship between supervisors support behavior and new recruits feedback seeking behavior.

6.13.2 Mediating effect of New Recruit’s Adjustment

In the structural model, the new recruit’s adjustment is hypothesized to be mediating the relationship between new recruits feedback seeking behavior and their job satisfaction, affective commitment and intention to quit.

For job satisfaction, there is no significant relationship between mediator new recruits adjustment (NRA) and dependent variable job satisfaction (JS). More over there is no direct relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and job satisfaction (JS) of the newly hired employees. As the condition stated by Baron and Kenny (1986) is not fulfilled it is clear that new recruit’s adjustment does not mediate the relationship between feedback seeking behavior and job satisfaction of newly hired employees.
For affective commitment, first the direct relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and affective commitment (AC) was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.18.

Table 6.18: *Structural Model Results- Direct Effect of FSB on AC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSB → AC</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001*

Later, the mediator new recruits adjustment (NRA) was added and then the relationship between FSB-NRA, NRA-AC and FSB-AC was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.19. The relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and affective commitment (AC) was significant when direct impact was estimated. However, after introduction of mediator the relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and affective commitment (AC) became insignificant. Thus, new recruits adjustment (NRA) partially mediates the relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and affective commitment (AC) (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Table 6.19: *Structural Model Results- Mediating Effect of NA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSB → NRA</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA → AC</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSB → AC</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001*

For intention to quit (IQ) firstly the direct relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and intention to quit (IQ) was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.20.
Table 6.20: Structural Model Results- Direct Effect of FSB on IQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSB → IQ</td>
<td>-0.407</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001

Later, the mediator new recruits adjustment (NRA) was added and then the relationship between FSB-NRA, NRA-IQ and FSB-IQ was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.21. The relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and intention to quit (IQ) was significant when direct impact was estimated, however after introduction of mediator the relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and intention to quit (IQ) was again found significant with weaker estimates. Thus, new recruits adjustment (NRA) partially mediates the relationship between feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and intention to quit (IQ) (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Table 6.21: Structural Model Results- Mediating Effect of NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSB → NRA</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA → IQ</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSB → IQ</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>.010**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001, ** indicates significant at p<0.05
6.14 Post Hoc Analysis

Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and New recruit’s Outcomes

In the proposed structural model, the psychological empowerment did not lead to the feedback seeking behavior of the newly hired employees. Thus, the impact of psychological empowerment on the new recruit's outcomes remains unexplored. In post-hoc analysis we decided to verify the effect of psychological empowerment on the outcomes of newly hired employees in terms of affective commitment and intention to quit.

As discussed earlier, supervisor can create empowering working conditions in the organization through consistent managerial efforts (Laschinger et al., 2001). The supportive behavior of supervisor towards the team member promotes psychological empowerment of employees (Hancer & George, 2003). Some of the research evidence suggests that the high supervisor support behavior is directly linked with greater empowerment of the employees (Spreitzer, 1996). Thus, we hypothesized that:

**Hp1** Supervisor’s support will have a positive effect on psychological empowerment.

The study by Fong and Snape, 2015, has shown that the empowered employees are likely to be committed to the organization. The study indicated that when supervisors empower their team members, these members get involved in the work process more keenly and get identified with the organization. Thus, we hypothesized that:

**Hp2** Psychological empowerment will mediate the relationship between supervisor’s support and affective commitment.

**Hp2a**: Psychological empowerment will have a positive effect on affective commitment.

**Hp2b**: Supervisor’s support will have a positive effect on affective commitment.
The study of Klerk and Stander, 2014, suggested that when supervisor psychologically empowered the employees, their empowerment influences the turnover decision. The empowered employees feel competent to perform the job and also their contributions were valued and had an impact on business strategy. Further, it leads to increase in engagement, attachment and willing to stay in the organization. The study also suggested that psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between leaders (managers) supportive behavior and outcomes of their followers. Thus, we hypothesized that:

**Hp3**: Psychological empowerment will mediate the relationship between supervisor’s support and intention to quit.

**Hp3a**: Psychological empowerment will have a negative effect on intention to quit.

**Hp3b**: Supervisor’s support will have a negative effect on intention to quit.

So, under post hoc analysis we tested the direct impact of psychological empowerment on affective commitment and intent to quit of newly hired employees. Further, the mediating effect of psychological empowerment on the relationship between supervisor support behavior and new recruits outcomes (affective commitment and intention to quit) was also tested. The conceptual model for post hoc analysis is given in Figure 6.2.
Figure 6.2: Proposed Conceptual Model for Post Hoc Analysis

The fit indices of this model shown an adequate fit with the data of present study (CMIN/df = 2.390, RMSEA = 0.048, CFI = 0.937, TLI = 0.924, AGFI= 0.921, GFI= 0.941). The results are presented in Table 6.22.

Table 6.22: Results - Impact of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSB → PE</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE → AC</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB → AC</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE → IQ</td>
<td>-0.524</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB → IQ</td>
<td>-0.387</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001, ** indicates significant at p<0.05
**Mediating effect of Psychological Empowerment**

For affective commitment, first the direct relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and affective commitment (AC) was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.23.

Table 6.23: Results- Direct Effect of FSB on AC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSB → AC</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001*

Later, the mediator psychological empowerment (PE) was added and then the relationship between SSB-PE, PE-AC and SSB-AC was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.24. The relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and affective commitment (AC) was significant when direct impact was estimated. However, after introduction of mediator a weaker but significant relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and affective commitment (AC) was estimated. Thus, psychological empowerment (PE) partially mediates the relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and affective commitment (AC) (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Table 6.24: Results- Mediating Effect of PE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSB → PE</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE → AC</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB → AC</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001*
For intention to quit (IQ) firstly the direct relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and intention to quit (IQ) was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.25.

Table 6.25: Results - Direct Effect of SSB on IQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSB → IQ</td>
<td>-0.648</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001

Later, the mediator psychological empowerment (PE) was added and then the relationship between SSB-PE, PE-IQ and SSB-IQ was estimated and the results are presented in Table 6.26. The relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and intention to quit (IQ) was significant when direct impact was estimated, however after introduction of mediator the relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and intention to quit (IQ) was again found significant with weaker estimates. Thus, psychological empowerment (PE) partially mediates the relationship between supervisor support behavior (SSB) and intention to quit (IQ) (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Table 6.26: Results - Mediating Effect of PE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Coefficient (β)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSB → PE</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE → IQ</td>
<td>-0.492</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB → IQ</td>
<td>-0.414</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *** indicates significant at p<0.001
Direct Impact of Organizational Socialization Tactics on New recruit’s Outcomes

The organizational socialization tactics are important part of socialization of newly hired employees. In the present study the results of structural model testing have shown that organizational socialization tactics promotes the adjustment of newly hired employees in the organization. The study of Saks and Ashforth, 1997, has suggested that organizational socialization tactics has positive impact on organizational commitment of the employees. A meta-analysis conducted by Saks, Uggerslev and Fassina, 2007, suggested that organizational socialization tactics can be used as a tool to reduce employee turnover. Thus, based on the past studies, under post hoc analysis we tested the direct impact of organizational socialization tactics on affective commitment and intent to quit of newly hired employees. As expected the results suggested that organizational socialization tactics has positive impact on new recruit’s affective commitment ($\beta = 0.560, p < .001$). Further, the results provide support to the argument that organizational socialization tactics have negative effect on new recruit’s intention to quit ($\beta = -0.452, p < .001$). These findings provide a positive message to the corporate world to encourage the implementation of organizational socialization tactics to make newly hired employees committed and reduce the turnover at entry level.

6.15 Summary of Results of Hypotheses Testing

The results of hypotheses testing are summarized and presented in Table 6.27. The results provide clear evidence that supervisor’s support behavior has significant impact on the intention to quit of the new recruits in the organization. Further, the results also confirm that supervisors support behavior has positive impact on psychological empowerment and new recruit’s feedback seeking behavior. However, the psychological empowerment had no influence on new recruit’s feedback seeking behavior. The results show that new recruit’s adjustment and new recruit’s
feedback seeking behavior has significant impact on affective commitment and intention to quit, however it did not have any influence on job satisfaction. The results also confirmed the positive effect of organizational socialization tactics on new recruit’s adjustment in the organization. The direct relationship between feedback seeking behavior and new recruits adjustment in the organization is also confirmed as per the results of the present study. The study has not supported the mediating role of psychological empowerment among the relationship between supervisor support behavior and new recruits feedback seeking behavior. However, the mediating role of new recruit’s adjustment among the relationship between new recruit’s feedback seeking behavior and new recruits outcomes (affective commitment and intention to quit) is partially supported. The justification and clarification regarding the results of this study are provided in the next chapter.

Table 6.27: Summary of Hypotheses Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Psychological empowerment will mediate the relationship between</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s support and new recruit’s feedback-seeking behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Supervisor’s support will have a positive effect on psychological</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Psychological empowerment will have a positive effect on new recruit’s</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback-seeking behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: Supervisor’s support will have a positive effect new recruit’s</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback-seeking behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Organizational socialization tactics will have a positive effect on new</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruit’s adjustment in the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: New recruit’s feedback seeking behavior will have a positive effect on</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new recruit’s adjustment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: New recruit’s adjustment will mediate the relationship between new</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruit’s feedback seeking behavior and job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: New recruit’s adjustment will have a positive effect on job</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: New recruit’s feedback seeking behavior will have a positive effect</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: New recruit’s adjustment will mediate the relationship between new</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruit’s feedback seeking behavior and affective commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a: New recruit’s adjustment will have a positive effect on their affective</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5b: New recruit’s feedback seeking behavior will have a positive effect</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on their affective commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6:</strong> New recruit’s adjustment will mediate the relationship between new recruit’s feedback seeking behavior and intention to quit.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6 a:</strong> New recruit’s adjustment will have a positive effect on their intention to quit.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6 b:</strong> New recruit’s feedback seeking behavior will have a positive effect on their intention to quit.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, this chapter covered the data analysis which includes preliminary data analysis and reliability estimates of variables used in the study. It also provides information about the descriptive statistics of sample. The chapter also includes hypotheses testing and results of SEM. The next chapter consists of discussion on the results and findings of the study.