

## **Impact of Job Satisfaction and Mutual Trust on Employee Loyalty in Saudi Hospitality Industry: A Mediating Analysis of Leader Support**

\*Malik Farrukh , Ramanthan Kalimuthu\* and Sarwat Farrukh\*\*

\**Post Graduate Centre, Limkokwing University of creative Technology, Cyberjaya, Malaysia*

\*\**Jeddah international college, Saudi Arabia*

*Corresponding author Email: farrukhgull786@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

In any industry, employee loyalty is regarded among prime factors for growth and sustainability of business, therefore, investigating the factors that might affect employee loyalty has become one of the tinted areas of research, and thus the purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of satisfaction trust and leadership support on employee loyalty in the hotel industry of Saudi Arabia. Data were collected with the help of structure questionnaire. PLS SEM has been used to test the hypothesis The findings of the data analysis showed the entire hypothesis was accepted except the mediation. There have been several research works conducted and reported, evaluating the relationship individually, however, we have not come across research work which has looked into the aggregate relationship of mutual trust, job satisfaction, and leader support and employee loyalty. This research indicates that employee loyalty is influenced by the elements of job satisfaction. Mutual trust, though, has little impact on employee loyalty. The second theoretical contribution is that leader support is significant to create employee loyalty. Employee loyalty is directly associated with these factors. This theoretical contribution is significant because a leader is an agent to the organization and plays a vital role in the progress of the company, it includes manpower movement. This theoretical contribution allows organizations, to find out the difference between the roles of the leaders and the roles of the employees for organizational sustainability.

**Keywords:** Job Satisfaction, Mutual Trust, Employee Loyalty, Leader Support.

---

Cite this paper as

Farrukh, M., Kalimuthuan, R., & Farrukh, S. (2019). Impact of Job Satisfaction and Mutual Trust on Employee Loyalty in Saudi Hospitality Industry: A Mediating Analysis of Leader Support. *International Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(2), 30–52.

## INTRODUCTION

Managing business is becoming more complex in today's business environment. Recruitment of right candidates for firms is turning into a big issue for organizational managers besides retaining them. This factor is affecting all industries in manufacturing as well as service sectors. In an industry, employee loyalty is regarded among prime factors for growth and sustainability of business. As per employee loyalty, employees dedicate themselves to the organization, work hard and show commitment with it. The loyal employees truly believe in the objectives of the company and work hard for the welfare of the company. Employee loyalty serve as a wonderful catalyst in an industrial system as enzymes multiply the speed of a bio-chemical reaction during metabolic activity in a living system.

Generally speaking, the concept of loyalty is to expect a high level of loyalty from its employees. In this regard a company is expected to show an optimum if not higher level of loyalty from its employees (Aityan and Gupta, 2012). In this scenario employees focus upon potential rewards and on the other hand employers find that their workforce is more 'loyal' so they, too, in return provide beneficial outputs to gain input from the employees. An important part of business is to manage people regarding recruiting and retaining. Employee loyalty carries great importance as the business of a company evolves and as a result employee structure starts changing as a result of relocation, restructuring and downsizing. (Larivière et al., 2016) viewed that long-term success of a company depends greatly upon the quality of its products as well as loyalty of its employees. Research has revealed that organizations with high employee loyalty generate more profits for shareholders (Foster, Whysall and Harris, 2008); (TaghiPourian and Bakhsh, 2015) Loyalty is regarded as a key factor to achieve long term business objectives (Antoncic and Antoncic, 2011)

As per the extraordinary importance of employee loyalty for a company, the present research looks at employee loyalty as well the factors affecting employee loyalty. An important determinant affecting employee loyalty is mutual trust amongst employees and also between supervisors/ managers and employees (Matzler et al., 2008); (Abubakar, Chauhan and Kura, 2014). It has been observed that mutual trust among employees and managers play a vital role, so as a consequence barrier between employees and employers are minimized. Better communication ensures better cooperation. Supervisors are supposed to be open to provide required support to employees seeing they observe that the employees are interactive with their supervisors. The said leader support could be seen as work-related support, for example facilitating or assisting in completing a variety of tasks of employees. It includes provision of work directions as well as assignments. The tasks are carried out by motivating and encouraging them which boosts employees to work hard and serve eagerly with dedication for the betterment of business. It leads employees to become more loyal to the organization.

The leader-support at part of supervisors has wide social dynamics. It includes to be more caring regarding their personal requirements e.g. family-related matters, residential/ domestic living environment related issues etc. that in turn, effects work potential of the employees. For this concern the management can facilitate them within realistic limits by encouraging them to share their family-related matters in the wider interest of the company, for example sharing their requirements regarding child care, family health, child education etc.

A prime factor which effects employee loyalty is job satisfaction (Chen et al., 2013); (Matzler et al., 2008). It has been observed that satisfied employees have fewer complaints and they pay more attention to their work activities. It has been noted that satisfied employees are more willing to extend cooperation with the supervisors and the company. The satisfied employees have

less probability to act in detrimental way to the directions of their company. It also entices the supervisors to provide them support as such support further accelerates the contribution of the employees to the organization. So, in business organizations job satisfaction and employee loyalty serve as drivers of productivity, efficiency and profit.

Therefore, the present research studies the relationship of leader support with, job satisfaction, mutual trust and employee loyalty. Studies have been conducted to observe the role of leader support in work situations and how leader support relates to proactive behavior in the workplace and how it enhances creativity followed by its relationship to workplace stresses (Byun et al., 2016); (Khalid et al., 2012); (Wu and Parker, 2017).

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Employee Loyalty**

Employee loyalty has been defined in several ways by the scholars. Some researchers have explained employee loyalty as a psychological state that elaborates the relationship between the employee and the organization which, in turn, influences the employee's decision to stay with the organization (Allen and Grisaffe, 2001).

Employee loyalty can also be seen as a strong feeling or passion of attachment to the organization as part of an emotional response, due to the desire of the members to be with an organization. The desire is driven by the strong beliefs in the organizational goals and values (Riketta, 2002); (Wu and Norman, 2006). Loyal members of an organization are willing to put a lot of effort in the betterment of the organization (Yao, Qiu and Wei, 2019). So, the major element of loyalty is the employees' belief in the values of the organization and hence, they have a strong desire to be with the organization. An employee who is loyal to the organization works harder at the workplace to achieve the goals that have been set by the organization. This is an important factor that retains the employee in the organization.

Employee loyalty could also be viewed in context of the equation regarding reciprocity between the employee and employer (Gupta and Mikkilineni, 2018). In this broader context, there is mutual acceptance between both employees and employers on the workings of the organization. It is seen that organizations expecting high levels of loyalty from its employees must equally reciprocate the loyalty exhibited by their employees.

Employee loyalty could also be seen by identification with and allegiance to organizational leaders and the organization as a whole, it includes working beyond due interests, readiness to stand up against criticism to the organization and sometimes working with others to serve for the betterment of the organization (Antoncic and Antoncic, 2011); (Chun, 2009); (Whiting, Podsakoff and Pierce, 2008). As per this definition, organizational requirements are preferred over personal requirements. In this case the employees will serve or try to serve the purpose of organization before serving their own needs.

### **Mutual Trust**

Scholars have defined mutual trust in a number of ways. (Huang and Wilkinson, 2013) defined mutual trust as the general expectation that the word of the mouth, promise, oral or written statement of some individual or a group could be relied upon.

Mutual trust could also be defined as the willingness of one party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party is based upon the expectations that the other will perform a certain action regarded important to the trustor, regardless of the capability to monitor or control that other party (Salamon

and Robinson, 2008). As per this definition, mutual trust refers to a specific target which is the 'other party'. There is also a probability that the second party is might react, while the trustor is willing to take risk but there is no guarantee of its reoccurring. (Vanneste, Puranam and Kretschmer, 2014) explains the phenomenon as that mutual trust is more or less, 'a psychological state consisting the intention to agree to take the vulnerability founded upon positive expectations of the intentions or the conduct of the other', resembles Mayer et al. (1995) who is of the view that, there is also risk in undertaking the expectations put forward by other party. Some other researchers have explained mutual trust as consisting two elements named as lateral trust, and vertical trust (Guinot, Chiva and Roca-Puig, 2014); (Wu et al., 2012). Lateral trust is said to be the trust relationship between employees and their co-workers. On the other hand, vertical trust is the trust relationship between employees and their direct supervisors. (Mooradian, Renzl and Matzler, 2006) also discussed that the trust between employees carries as much importance as of the trust between the employees and the employers. Same argument is raised by (Paliszkiwicz and Koohang, 2013) explaining that mutual trust exists at both levels i.e. between subordinates and supervisors; and among co-workers.

### **Job satisfaction**

There are several ways in which job satisfaction has been defined by scholars. (Table 2.4) To (Awad and Alhashemi, 2012), high level of job satisfaction may lead to positive results, especially, loyalty. On the other hand, low level of job satisfaction may lead to negative results. The negative ends include low work performance, disloyalty and intend to quit the organization.

A few researchers have defined job satisfaction in psychological terms, Locke sees it as either an emotional state (Abdullah et al., 2011). On the other hand, Spector view it as an attitude (Spector, 1997) (Wood et al., 2013) not only relates to the task (Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn, 1995); as well as to the job conditions that can create conducive and positive work acceptance. It includes explicit factors, like salary, followed by implicit factors as that of personal growth & development (Cumbey and Alexander, 1998). However, salary may not prove to be the only factor which is important but also the additional incentives/ facilities associated with the work package, for example medical, bonuses and rest of the monetary work incentives, which also create impact in job satisfaction. In this regard the nature of job and then the work environment also play their respective roles in job satisfaction.

The nature of job and the work environment that is acceptable to an individual may not be acceptable to others e.g. some person may like 'office environment', while another person may prefer 'hands-on' work environment. Generally, employees also want their growth with that of the organization as their long-term objective. They would like to going through the processes like trainings, job rotation, job enrichment etc. as part of their career development process.

### **Leader support**

In the related literature, it is seen that the term, 'leader support' is used interchangeably with supervisor support or superior support (Moneta et al., 2010); (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006); Ng & Sorensen, 2008). There are a number of studies regarding leader support from the viewpoint of leadership and LMX (Ahmed et al., 2013); (Dulebohn et al., 2012); (Uhl-Bien, 2011); (Landry and Vandenberghe, 2012); (Liden et al., 2006). These are plausible due to the fact that superiors or leaders are managers to the organization and are supposed to exhibit the elements of leadership. In addition, the organization hierarchy would establish leader- member relationship undertaking it as portion of the work process to run the company's business. So, there occurs LMX

between supervisors and employees. It is notable that in an organization, the supervisors are at the same time employees who are simultaneously reporting to a different set of leaders.

While conducting research on ‘support’, in the literature there has been a clear distinction between Organizational Support (OC) (Kurniawan and Hutami, 2015); (Boerner, Eisenbeiss and Griesser, 2007); (Stinglhamber, De Cremer and Mercken, 2006); (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006); (Henderson et al., 2008); and Leader Support (LS) (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006); (Stinglhamber, De Cremer and Mercken, 2006); (Liden et al., 2006); On the other hand a few researchers have discussed OS but with the LS embedded in the same sphere; (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006). On the other hand, the other researchers took OS and LS as perceived by employees as two distinct constructs, although interrelated.

Some scholars are of the view that OS also involve the factor of leaders in the organization, which, in fact, indicates the support, as a whole, by the organization. (Eder and Eisenberger, 2008); (Liden et al., 2006). They were of the view that OS contains continuous support and is provided throughout, for instance, the factor of promotions does involve not only the immediate supervisors but also all leaders at all levels in the organization. So, LS includes as a part of organizational support (Chen et al., 2009); (Shanock and Eisenberger, 2006). So, during literature review on LS, it is inevitable to taken into account the studies on OS, because both parts are interrelated, even both are perceived as different.

## **HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

### **Finding out the Relationship between Mutual Trust, Job satisfaction, and Leader Support**

(Mursaleen et al., 2015) conducted a research on the correlation between mutual trust, knowledge- sharing and leader support among some software projects teams working in Sri Lanka. He observed that team leader support enjoys great importance for employees to deliver a lessons learnt, and is followed by specialist knowledge support essential for the project. Willingness for knowledge- sharing is also found to be higher when the trust and the identity of the individuals identify with one another (Olaisen and Revang, 2017). Mutual trust is also identified as a prime ingredient in knowledge sharing (Balogun and Adetula, 2015) the primary part of leader support function in an organization is knowledge sharing. At part of leaders support in knowledge sharing could be provided in the form of work directions and then by mentoring the employees. The knowledge- sharing activity at part of leader needs confidence at some level to occur among the parties for the due information to be conveyed. So, it is anticipated that, the due support from the leader would be provided for the existing trust.

In addition, a recent analysis on employees serving in credit unions in USA indicated that trust- in-management has strong association with support and commitment. Though trust consequences in support provided by administration to workers, the support received from the administration, in turn, enhances mutual trust among the employees and their leaders. The strong impact also penetrates to their peers because this is taken by the employees as continuing confidence which the management has on its employees (Sousa-Lima, Michel and Caetano, 2013).

Research by (Settoon, Bennett and Liden, 1996)proposed that saw that organizational support will be considerably related to a range of employee behavior and attitudes, including trust (Eisenberger, Fasolo and Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Likewise, (Ponnu and Tennakoon, 2009) verified how leadership behavior has encouraging association with workers’ trust. The leaders

having ethical behavior are supposed to provide support to their employees not only due to their self-interest but primarily in the larger interest of the organization. The support provided by the leaders to the workers is established on moral behavior, allowing employees to have participation in the decision making process of the team (Ponnu and Tennakoon, 2009). It can only happen where there is some existing mutual trust among employees in order to pursue such type of moral support at part of the leaders.

A research conducted by Mayer et al. (1995) evaluates mutual trust establishing risk-taking behavior as well as enhancing level of expectations in relationship. The said expectations are at two levels: between the trustor and the trustee, and between the employee and the supervisor. Now, the level of trust which has been established will affect in the sense that how, and, to what extent the supervisor empowers the employee, and so, is serves as an indicator of the magnitude of leader support which the employee would be gaining. (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). On the other hand, a low level of inter-personal trust between the employee and the supervisor, for instance, will conclude to higher level of monitoring at part of the supervisor (Schoorman, Mayer and Davis, 2007) In this regard monitoring is also a kind of support to be provided by the leader. Based on the above mentioned discussion, we hypothesize that:

*H1: Mutual trust influences leader support*

Research conducted by (Tarigan and Ariani, 2015) in manufacturing sector in Indonesia revealed that LMX mediates between the relationship of job satisfaction and commitment. The study provided an evidence that job satisfaction has a great impact upon LMX (Tarigan and Ariani, 2015). The concept of LMX defines the relationship between the employee and the supervisor. Members portraying high degree of LMX character have high exchange quality relationships in form of loyalty, contributory behavior, professional respect, leader attention and support (Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997). Therefore, it is likely that job satisfaction would occur in support from the supervisors. The work was carried out by (Baytok, Kurt and Zorlu, 2014) in a Turkish Municipality on employee workplace studying deviance behavior, satisfaction and support. The study concludes that job satisfaction is associated with leader support and deviance behavior can be improved with the help of leader support (Zorlu and Bastemur, 2014).

Hence, based on these studies, the following hypothesis is developed:

*H2: Job satisfaction influences leader support*

### **The Relationship between Leader Support and Employee Loyalty**

Khuong and Tien, (2013) conducted out research on employee loyalty in banking sector, in particular, the impacts of satisfaction, supervisor support, teamwork, fringe benefits, work environment and training were investigated to evaluate their association with loyalty. It was discovered that higher level of supervisor support, teamwork, working environment, fringe benefits, training programs and job satisfaction lead to higher levels of employee loyalty and vice versa. (Michael et al., 2006) conducted research on the subject of the significance of supervisor being an influential communicator for providing relevant support to employees in an organization. This support leads to employee loyalty and employee loyalty is primarily important to the immediate supervisor rather than the organization itself (Michael et al., 2006). Supervisor is supposed to be an agent loyal to the organization (Settoon, Bennett and Liden, 1996). The current display of the supervisor should be free of the type of industry, whether service or manufacturing,

because of the fact that supervisors exist in both aspects as compulsory part of the organizational arrangement. So, the importance of supervisor support should be predominant as well similar to what is experimental in the banking industry. Such support then is assumed to influence loyalty.

From the above studies, the following hypothesis is developed:

*H3: There is a significant relationship between leader support and employee loyalty*

### **The Relationship between Mutual Trust, Job satisfaction, and Employee Loyalty**

Job satisfaction and commitment as part of an organization's determination to retain employees with high level of performance since information is important in order to remain competitive and to push the organization ahead (Matzler and Renzl, 2006). Research has shown that trust in management as well as peers effect job satisfaction, which simultaneously, effect employee loyalty, so, providing evidence on the strong link between employee trust, job satisfaction and employee loyalty (Matzler & Renzl, 2006). In this regard loyalty is the complement of trust. Consequently, when the trustor trusts the trustee, the trustee honors the trust because of his/her loyalty to the trustor. In the first instance, the trustor is keen to give the trust to the trustee since the trustor presumes the trustee to be loyal by keeping the trust. In the second instance, honoring the trust by the trustee creates loyalty, and henceforth the complementary behavior (Rosanas and Velilla, 2003).

A research was conducted on the interrelationship between job satisfaction and employee commitment with employee loyalty was observed in India among the employees in the computer software industry. The study examined the backgrounds and significances of employee loyalty. The research established that employee engagement, job satisfaction and employee commitment have certainly substantial effects on employee loyalty and are the vital factors for forecasting employee loyalty (Rosanas and Velilla, 2003)

Research work has shown that those employees who are committed to work lifelong in an organization, in turn, influence employers to be more loyal to their employees with strong sense of trust between these two factions (Kayeres Fatima and Abdur Razzaque, 2014). It is also expected that this phenomenon based upon the concept of reciprocity would bring forward such employees who are more loyal to their employers. A research revealed that job satisfaction is a solid cause of employee commitment and employee loyalty (Turkyilmaz et al., 2011); (Pei-Lee et al., 2017). Another study was conducted in the hospitality industry in Malaysia confirming employee loyalty as the key link to build a relationship between employ satisfactions and employee loyalty. (Abdullah et al., 2011). This work is also in line with the research carried out by (Turkyilmaz et al., 2011) who studied the phenomenon in Turkey. The research investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. It considered the two features of relationship with reference to a progressive and developing economy. The work reveals that there are strong evidences of definitely important relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty (Turkyilmaz et al., 2011). A study on offshore industrial firms was conducted by (Kang, Alejandro and Groza, 2015) based upon the factors which affect job satisfaction and employee loyalty. The research revealed that employee empowerment, teamwork and employee compensation has an important and positive impact upon job satisfaction (ZHANG and CHEN, 2006).

A research conducted on the subject in the hospitality sector in Malaysia has revealed that job satisfaction influences employee loyalty (Abdullah et al., 2011) It is probable that alike association can be observed for other industries. Similar observations have been reported regarding retail industry in Malaysia (Salleh, Nair and Harun, 2012). Since turnover purpose is influenced by employee loyalty, it is expected that commitment and support would then influence loyalty.

Consequently, the above mentioned discussion leads to the following hypothesis:

*H4: There is significant relationship between mutual trust and employee loyalty*

*H5: There is significant relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty*

### **The Mediating Effect of Leader Support on the Relationship between Mutual Trust, Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty**

In deciding on the mediator variable, first there must be a clear theoretical rationale for the hypothesis that the predictor is related to the dependent variable (Mallinckrodt et al., 2006); (Karazsia et al., 2013); (MacKinnon et al., 2007). (Goodman and Togna, 2014) studied the impact of effective communication and stated that through trust, the aspect of loyalty is established (Zeffane, Tipu and Ryan, 2011). Based upon a research done in the manufacturing industry in Australia, the trust atmosphere was established within the organizational community consisting employees and supervisors. Employee loyalty and mutual trust is an interactive phenomenon due to the fact that if mutual trust is established between the employee and the employer, is accompanied by employee loyalty to the organization (Zeffane, Tipu and Ryan, 2011). Trust has also been found to mediate the effect between psychological contract breach and loyalty (Tomprou and Hansen, 2018)

Both employee commitment and job satisfaction have sound impact upon employee loyalty as it was observed in a study in the software industry context and it was considered as among the primary causes for creating employee loyalty (Onsardi, Asmawi and Abdullah, 2017). (Mooradian, Renzl and Matzler, 2006) carried out a research on the association between mutual trust, employee loyalty and job satisfaction. Based upon the study, job satisfaction was found to be the main driver to achieve productivity, quality and customer satisfaction. The study explains the phenomenon that how mutual trust influence job satisfaction and job satisfaction, in turn, influences employee loyalty.

(Chenet, Dagger and O'Sullivan, 2010) study on academicians revealed that employee commitment is vital factor to achieve employee loyalty (Mehta et al., 2010). It has been observed that the workers more committed to their job, i.e. who have higher levels of employee loyalty are more likely to not to quit even a failing organization (Brown et al., 2011).

A comprehensive study on mutual trust has explained that mutual trust has been identified as an inevitable prerequisite for knowledge sharing (Pangil and Moi Chan, 2014) of which, knowledge sharing being necessary ingredient of the leader support function. So, the leader support in the process of knowledge sharing could be in the kind of work directions and employee mentoring.

A study has discovered that job satisfaction has profound impact upon LMX (Ariani, 2012). The perception of LMX explains the relationship between the employee and the supervisor. Persons with high LMX level have high exchange quality relationships, which includes leader support. (Dulebohn et al., 2012).

A research was done studying the role of HR practices in establishing employee commitment in hospitality industry. The design also included evaluating the relationship between employee commitment and leaders support. (Guchait, Cho and Meurs, 2015). The results of the research suggest that there is a well- established relationship between employee commitment and leader support which may affect the business target of the employees.

A research was conducted on employee loyalty in banking sector in Singapore, predominantly the relationship of employee loyalty with satisfaction, supervisor support, fringe benefits, teamwork, work environment and training. (Prabhakar, 2016). The research recommends that higher levels of supervisor support, teamwork, work environment, fringe benefits, training



programs and job satisfaction, results in higher level of employee loyalty. In addition, research on supervisor support in form of being an effective communicator, was also conducted. (Michael et al., 2006). The outcome of the research suggests that supervisor support leads to enhancement in employee loyalty.

Based upon (Zhao, Lynch Jr and Chen, 2010) procedure to discover adjudicated relationships, the above mentioned studies and research outcome provide evidence on the existence of direct relationships among the factors of mutual trust, job satisfaction and on employee loyalty. There are also sufficient evidences from the above mentioned discussion above on the direct impacts of mutual trust, job satisfaction and leader support. In addition, the outcome of the discussion also reveals that there is direct impact of leader support on employee loyalty.

These studies have led to the development of the following hypothesis:

*H6: Leader support mediates the relationship between mutual trust and employee loyalty*

*H7: Leader support mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty*

## **METHODOLOGY**

Data were collected from the employees of the hotel industry in Saudi Arabia from Jeddah Makkah, Medina, Riyadh and Abha. 700 questionnaires were sent to the hospitality industry employees and at the end of the data collection a total of 384 questionnaires were received back.

### **Measures of study**

*Employee Loyalty.* It consists of a parameter based upon five questions, by (Matzler and Renzl, 2006), using the five-point Likert scale from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. These questions are also adopted by Matzler & Renzl (2006) in their research work on employee loyalty. *Mutual Trust* comprising five questions adapted from Cook and Wall (1980); and (Matzler and Renzl, 2006).

*Job satisfaction,* It comprised six questions based on (Homburg and Stock, 2005); and adopted by (Matzler and Renzl, 2006) in their research work on job satisfaction. The scale was originally based on the valuable works by (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951) who extensively worked upon the scale development at the University of Minnesota, US. The foundation of this scale is that it uses an index to 'over- all' job satisfaction rather than to specific aspects of the job situation and is applicable to a wide variety of jobs.

*Leader Support* comprising four questions based on (Eisenberger et al., 1986); (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988); and (Stinglhamber, Cremer and Mercken, 2006); and adopted by (Paillé, 2013). The reliability of the construct is .88 (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988) and .90 (Paillé, Morin and Grima, 2011); (Stinglhamber, Cremer and Mercken, 2006)

## **ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

To test the study model, partial least square method is used, which is a second generation multivariate technique (Hair et al., 2014). This technique can simultaneously assess the measurement model and structural model by minimizing the error variance (Hair et al., 2014). SmartPLS version 3 was used to analyze the developed model. Bootstrapping function (5000 resample) was used to assess the significance level of path. The partial least squares technique is a powerful component-based method widely used in prior studies (Farrukh, Wei Ying and Abdallah Ahmed, 2016; Farrukh et al., 2017; Farrukh, Ying and Mansori, 2017; Kazumi and Kawai, 2017; Hussain and Endut, 2018).

### Evaluation of measurement Model

All the exogenous and endogenous variables were conceptualized a first order reflective construct. Essentially, an important aspect in PLS model evaluation is the presentation of measurement model results, which focuses on ascertaining of individual item reliability, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity and discriminant validity of the measures used to represent each construct (Hair Jr et al., 2016); (Nam, Ekinici and Whyatt, 2011); (Sarstedt, Henseler and Ringle, 2011). Table 2 shows the results of measurement model evaluation

**Table 2: Measurement Model Quality Criteria**

Latent variable	Factor Loading	Composite Reliability	AVE
Employee loyalty			
EL1	.751	.84	.62
EL2	.756		
EL3	.775		
EL4	.745		
EL5	.685		
Leader support			
LS1	.757	.82	.55
LS2	.638		
LS3	.854		
LS4	.897		
Job satisfaction			
JS1	.773	.88	.60
JS 2	.903		
JS 3	.774		
JS 4	.726		
JS 5	.697		
Mutual trust			
MT1	.758	.80	.65
MT 2	.882		
MT 3	.870		
MT 4	.873		

### Discriminant validity

To establish discriminant validity in this study, Fornell and (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) criterion was implemented by comparing the correlations among the latent constructs with square roots of average variance extracted as presented in Table-3. Furthermore, as a rule of thumb for establishing discriminant validity, Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggested that the square root of the AVE should exceed the correlations among latent constructs.

**Table 3: Discriminant Validity**

Variable	1	2	3	4
1-Employee Loyalty	<b>0.78</b>			
2- Job satisfaction	.43	<b>0.74</b>		
3- Mutual Trust	.62	.26	<b>0.77</b>	
4- Leader support	.34	.32	.36	<b>0.74</b>

**Hypothesis Testing:**

Analysis of study was done through measurement of two models. The initial model portrays direct relationship of four constructs of HPWPs (Independent Variable) on Environmental Social Responsibility of firm (Dependent Variable). Second model measures mediating role of Individually Perceived Stress (Mediator) on relationship of HPWPs and Environmental Social Responsibility of firm (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Results of hypothesis testing are based on finalized structured model. Results in table 4 and 5 shows that all hypothesis of research study is supported with a significance level less than 0.05.

**Assessment of Significance of the Structural Model**

After establishing the reliability and validity of the measurement model, the results of the structural model are then presented.

*R square:*

The first step in structural model evaluation is evaluating R square. R square is the percentage change in the endogenous variables caused by the exogenous variables. Following pictures shows that the R square value for Leader support is .734 which means 73.4% change in Leader support is being caused by job satisfaction and mutual trust, Similarly, R square value of employee loyalty is 0.745 which means 74.5% variance in employee loyalty is caused by job satisfaction, leader support and mutual trust.

*Bootstrap Resampling*

In the current study, a bootstrap resampling method has been applied based on 5000 replicates and 295 cases to assess significance of the path coefficients (Sarstedt et al., 2014) (Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2011) (Sarstedt et al., 2014) b; (Henseler, Ringle and Sinkovics, 2009); (Preacher and Hayes, 2008). R2 measures the predictive accuracy of the model (Ang, Ramayah and Amin, 2015) and represents the percentage of variance in the dependent variables as explained by the independent variables in the model (Hair et al., 2010). Whereas, path coefficients indicate the degree of change in the dependent variable occurred in accordance for each independent variable (Hair, Ringle and Sarstedt, 2011); (Hair et al., 2014); (Pallant and Manual, 2007).Table 4 shows the results of bootstrapping and decision taken for each hypothesis.

**Table 4: Results of Hypothesis Testing via bootstrapping**

Path	Path coefficient	SE	T Statistics	Decision
JS -> LS	0.283	0.1582	2.41	Supported
MT -> LS	0.640	0.1979	2.71	Supported
JS -> EL	0.3434	0.1609	4.51	Supported
MT -> EL	0.2091	0.275	2.36	Supported

LS -> EL	0.2589	0.2915	2.54	Supported
MT -> LS ->EL	0.114	0.110	1.56	Not Supported
JS -> LS ->EL	0.1242	.1420	1.60	Not Supported

Results of analysis in Table show that all hypotheses have been supported except relationship between risk taking and attitude towards entrepreneurship.

## DISCUSSION

### The Relationship between Mutual Trust and Leader Support

The first research question deals with the relationship between mutual trust and leader support. The research findings indicate that there is important relationship between inter-personal trust and leader- support while the relationship is positive. This is in line with the study carried out by (Amabile et al., 2004) on creativity which recognizes that leader support involves both task and relationship support whereas relationship support involves mutual relationship, such as trust. Also based on the Social Exchange approach, employee will trade under the norm of reciprocity on mutual trust, dedication and effort for physical and socio- emotional returns, such as respect, recognition, caring and support from the leaders which make up the organization based on the relationship exchange (Blau, 1964); (Eisenberger et al., 1986); (Eisenberger, Cotterell and Marvel, 1987). This is also in line with the study carried out by (Gentry and Shanock, 2008). Employees will also look at the organization as a living entity that can hire and fire as well as provide or not provide support. Leaders are agents of the organization with certain related authority (Levinson, 1965).

Having mutual trust then would mean some form of reciprocity from the leaders, such as support. (Stinglhamber, Cremer and Mercken, 2006) also reported positive relationship between mutual trust and leader support. (Whitener, 2001) who carried out research on the relationship between trust and leader support, discovered that the relationship between trust and supervisor is more important than trust towards the organization. It also predicts that based on the SET, mutual trust developed will in turn positively lead to reciprocity of leader support (Whitener, 2001).

### The Relationship between Job satisfaction and Leader Support

The second research question deals with the relationship between job satisfaction and leader support. The research findings indicate that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and leader support and the relationship is positive.

The probable explanation on this important relationship is that when employees are satisfied, they normally will exhibit positive behavioral traits, including positive work behavior. These include higher degree of motivation and their earg to carry out the work responsibility effectively (Cano and Castillo, 1999); (Madera et al., 2017); (Bushra, Ahmad and Naveed, 2011). As a result, superintendents as agents of the organization, will incline to provide support in to make certain that the employees could perform much effectively the work functions that have been ascribed to them. In addition, supervisors act as mediator to the organization; so, the supervisor has obligation to provide necessary backing to ensure that the objectives of the organization are achieved (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

The support could be in the as functional support, such as provision of a piece of advice, providing necessary directions as well as provision of socio-emotional support for example,

encouragement. It is also in line with the research done by (Tarigan and Ariani, 2015) who worked upon job satisfaction and leader support as per LMX concept. The study verifies that there is positive bondage between satisfaction and leader support. Some other elements which have been observed by some other researchers comprise the relationship between work tenure, job satisfaction, role of teamwork, supervisor support and employee loyalty (Abdullah, Musa, Zahari, Rahman, & Khalid, 2011). The study suggests that there is a certain correlation between teamwork, satisfaction, supervisor relationship and employee loyalty.

### **The Relationship between Leader Support and Employee Loyalty**

The fourth research question deals with the relationship between leader support and employee loyalty. The findings assure that there is substantial relationship between leader support and employee loyalty, and that the relationship is positive.

The possible elucidation for this is that actions directed at employees by the organization or the leaders as mediators of the organization, will lead to the sensitivity of obligations at part of the employee who will then respond positively through commitment or loyalty (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Hutchinson, 1997; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). This work is also in line with the research done by Bond et al. (1998) on the US labor force on the relationship between leader support and employee loyalty; they argued that leader support absolutely influences employee loyalty (Galinsky, Bond and Swanberg, 1998). A similar study was carried out by Ueda et al. (2012) in Japan, who came up with conclusion that whenever leader support is evident, it results in a exhibition of loyalty.

There are some other important research works conducted on the relationship between supervisor support and work-life support and its impact on employee loyalty. The results of the said research works indicate that higher levels of leader support would result in higher level of employee loyalty (Goldberg et al., 1989); (Grover and Crooker, 1995); (Roehling, Roehling and Moen, 2001). The study conducted by Roehling et al. (2001) focused on the relationship between the support granted by the supervisor on direct work tasks as well as non-task related support in the organization. Task related support comprises items related to the work and providing flexible working hours. Non-task work support comprises support on family matters, e.g. support for child care requirements and for work-family conflicts. It concludes that supervisor support has positive impact on employee loyalty; it highlights the significance of leader support, particularly on work-non-work life issues.

A similar research was carried out by Brashear (2006) on sales team, discovering that when leaders deliver support in terms of career development for the employees, increase in employee loyalty is evident (Roehling, Roehling and Moen, 2001)The significantly positive relationship between leader support and employee loyalty is also in line with the SET (Henderson et al., 2008)

### **The Mediating Effect of Leader Support on the Relationship between Mutual Trust, Job satisfaction and Employee Loyalty**

The next research question was whether leader support mediates the relationship between mutual trust, job satisfaction and employee loyalty? From the study, it was revealed that leader support does not mediate the relationship between mutual trust, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty. In further analyzing the study results during the tests for mediation, it indicates considerably positive relationships between mutual trust, job satisfaction, and leader support. However, the research shows that during the test for mediation, there was no significant relationship found between leader support and employee loyalty.

The possible causes for this factor are that mutual trust, job satisfaction are elements which are personal to the holder, in this case, the employee. Hence, the impacts to other elements, for example employee loyalty, which is also personal to the holder or employee is direct without any intermediary influence required. The employee will like to manifest his/her loyalty to the organization enthusiastically and straightforwardly without resistance from other elements, such as, from the leader.

The second probable cause is that the role of the leader when providing support to the employee does not seem to be significantly important. There is no doubt that leader support is needed and the leader do provide support but the perceived value of the support does not meet the expectations of the employee in context of increase or reduction in his/her loyalty to the organization. The third likely reason is that there is insufficient or unsuccessful communication between the employee and the leader. Due work processes occur in the organization but it happens as a result of work pressure: the need to meet deadlines and to gain good performance indicators, the employee's requirements and the response of leader in terms of support are not well communicated.

The fourth possible cause is that while dealing with attachment elements, for example, loyalty, leaders may have constraints on their limits of authority and about the procedures in place; so, support that could be provided is restricted or limited and workers are aware of these limitations of their supervisors. Hence, the role of supervisors is limited and on the other hand, the social exchange elements are also limited; therefore, ultimately there are limited consequences for the employees.

### **Theoretical Contributions**

This study is founded upon the supporting of SET. This theory is a vital tool to elaborate workplace or organizational behavior. In the Social Exchange perspective, people do not only uphold relationship for individual interest but for friendship and for the interest of the organization (Blau, 1964). The study was based on the Social Exchange approach where employees will trade under the norm of reciprocity with commitment and put effort for physical as well as socio-emotional returns based on the relationship exchange (Blau P. 1964; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; (Eisenberger, Cotterell and Marvel, 1987).

This study deals with the relationship of mutual trust, job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee loyalty. The component of leader support is included in the study to investigate whether it facilitates the relationship between the three independent variables with employee loyalty. The study results in several contributions in the theoretical field.

The first theoretical contribution was on the relationship of mutual trust, job satisfaction with employee loyalty. There have been several research works conducted and reported, evaluating the relationship individually, for instance between mutual trust and job satisfaction (Van de Ven et al., 2015); and mutual trust and loyalty (Ogunyemi, 2014) however, we have not come across research work which has looked into the aggregate relationship of mutual trust, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty. This research indicates that employee loyalty, is influenced by the elements of job satisfaction. Mutual trust, though, has little impact on employee loyalty. The second theoretical contribution is that leader support is not significant to create employee loyalty when employee has higher satisfaction level.

Employee loyalty is directly associated with these factors. This theoretical contribution is significant because a leader is an agent to the organization and plays a vital role in the progress of the company, it includes manpower movement. This theoretical contribution allows organizations, to find out the difference between the roles of the leaders and the roles of the employees for

organizational sustainability. Here it is also important to highlight that leaders in the organization are themselves employees with responsibilities to their own strata of leaders.

### **Managerial Implication**

The first administrative repercussion is for management to understand the factors that affect loyalty. Companies need loyalty from their employees to follow their vision, mission and objectives of the company. The factors effecting loyalty are satisfaction and commitment.

The second managerial implication relates to management requirements to provide working conditions that satisfy the employees. All these acts lead to loyal employees.

Companies need committed employees who 'work hard' and are enthusiastic about their job. The other side of the picture is that, employees do have their needs and they want to be satisfied. If an employee is not satisfied due to any reason, the work focus will be affected. In a company, a favorable work environment means of information sharing which allows for better communication; ensuring performance during working hours; minimum impact of 'red tape' i.e. bureaucratic hurdles; and a motivated work atmosphere due to better understanding between employers and the employees.

The third administrative implication is that management must develop a work feasible package, including optimum amount of salaries/ wages, in time payment of salaries/ wages, so that can enhance job satisfaction. On the other hand, the company would want to retain good employees as an asset to the organization. In order to retain good employees, suitable work packages are needed to be offered. As per the results of the present study, a management would be able to objectively understand the variables effecting employee loyalty. So the understanding of objectively the relationship of each of the variables carries prime importance.

The fourth managerial implication is that the company should have an effective feedback system for its employees. Having well developed as well as effective feedback system and responding as per feedback enhances trust level in the company. It is suggested to carry out periodical monitoring surveys, for instance Employee Employment Index (EEI) to evaluate the reception of the employee on the human resource practices in the company. Companies generally need feedback from its employees. On the other hand, receiving feedback is one aspect, but what is even more important is acting upon the feedback. Acting upon the feedback never means agreeing to what has been reported, as responding sagaciously to the employees is a key element in managing feedback. It could be done through town hall sessions, having one-to-one sessions, or through questionnaires.

Employees should contribute and function more effectively if the work environment is conducive for them. Better communication is expected between the two parties so that, for employees there should be less fear to give feedback of their own working rather than concentrating upon their performance. Such two-way communication or feedback is necessary to mitigate any issue which may arise before emergence of some kind of crisis in the organization. Such issues can have profound impact upon the performance of the employee and ultimately the working of the company.

The fifth managerial implication is that the company must clarify the role to be played by the leaders in order to develop loyalty amongst the employees. Supervisors may not vividly realize the factors that can affect the performance of the employees. Supervisor support should be looked at as a kind of long-term benefit to the company, and not as merely a short-term action to resolve problems faced by the employees or to mitigate job assignments ascribed to them. It is so because leader support does have positive impacts upon loyalty of the employees to the company and in reciprocity company wants loyalty from the employees to pursue the vision, mission and

objectives of the company.

The sixth managerial implication is for company to de-layer the organization to hasten and have effective communication and decision-making. Communication is an important aspect in business. It includes top-down communication between the supervisors and the employees as well as bottom-up communication between the employees and the supervisors. This flow of information normally happens to be and proves to be very effective when there is trust between the two parties. Communication will prove less effective if there are too many functional layers causing information to be filtered.

The eighth managerial implication is for the company to develop effective training programs around the variables that result in positive reinforcement to the employee. Training programs are necessary for a company to ensure that the employees have the necessary skill-sets. Based upon the results of the present study, the company can devise training programs around the key factors which have great impact on employee loyalty.

The ninth managerial implication is for the company to develop capacity building to reduce the attrition rate. Retaining good employees is inevitable for an organization. This can ensure work continuity, retaining knowledge within the company, use of good experience and cost saving from new staff intake programs. Cost factor would include hiring cost, retraining cost and loss of opportunity cost also because the new staff would require some time to be actively involved in his/her new role. Studies have pointed out that employees who are satisfied with their jobs are generally more loyal to their organizations (Mooradian, Renzl and Matzler, 2006). Passionate employees are always committed to their work..

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, R. et al. (2011) 'The study of employee satisfaction and its effects towards loyalty in hotel industry in Klang Valley, Malaysia', *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(3), pp. 147–155.
- Abubakar, R., Chauhan, A. and Kura, K. M. (2014) 'Relationship between perceived organizational politics, organizational trust, human resource management practices and turnover intention among Nigerian nurses', *Human Resource Management Practices and Turnover Intention Among Nigerian Nurses* (May 14, 2014).
- Ahmed, I. et al. (2013) 'Influence of relationship of POS, LMX and organizational commitment on turnover intentions', *Organization Development Journal*. International Society for Organization Development, Inc., 31(1), pp. 55–68.
- Aityan, S. K. and Gupta, T. K. P. (2012) 'Challenges of employee loyalty in corporate America', *Business and Economics Journal*. HATASO Enterprises, LLC.
- Allen, N. J. and Grisaffe, D. B. (2001) 'Employee commitment to the organization and customer reactions: Mapping the linkages', *Human Resource Management Review*. Elsevier, 11(3), pp. 209–236.
- Amabile, T. M. et al. (2004) 'Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support', *The Leadership Quarterly*. Elsevier, 15(1), pp. 5–32.
- Ang, M. C. H., Ramayah, T. and Amin, H. (2015) 'A theory of planned behavior perspective on hiring Malaysians with disabilities', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 34(3), pp. 186–200.
- Antoncic, J. A. and Antoncic, B. (2011) 'Employee loyalty and its impact on firm growth', *International Journal of Management and Information Systems*. The Clute Institute, 15(1), pp. 81–87.



- Ariani, D. W. (2012) 'Leader-member exchanges as a mediator of the effect of job satisfaction on affective organizational commitment: An empirical test', *International Journal of Management*. *International Journal of Management*, 29(1), p. 46.
- Awad, T. A. and Alhashemi, S. E. (2012) 'Assessing the effect of interpersonal communications on employees' commitment and satisfaction', *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 5(2), pp. 134–156.
- Balogun, A. G. and Adetula, G. A. (2015) 'Willingness to share and use tacit knowledge among employees in team-based organisations: are the dimensions of interpersonal trust facilitators', in *Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 100–107.
- Baytok, A., Kurt, M. and Zorlu, Ö. (2014) 'The role of transformational leader on knowledge sharing practices: a study about international hotel chains', *European Journal of Business and Management*. Citeseer, 6(7), pp. 46–61.
- Blau, P. (1964) 'Power and exchange in social life', NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S. A. and Griesser, D. (2007) 'Follower behavior and organizational performance: The impact of transformational leaders', *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 13(3), pp. 15–26.
- Brayfield, A. H. and Rothe, H. F. (1951) 'An index of job satisfaction.', *Journal of applied psychology*. American Psychological Association, 35(5), p. 307.
- Brown, S. et al. (2011) 'Workplace performance, worker commitment, and loyalty', *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*. Wiley Online Library, 20(3), pp. 925–955.
- Bushra, F., Ahmad, U. and Naveed, A. (2011) 'Effect of transformational leadership on employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in banking sector of Lahore (Pakistan)', *International journal of Business and Social science*. Centre for Promoting Ideas, USA, 2(18).
- Byun, G. et al. (2016) 'When does empowering leadership enhance employee creativity? A three-way interaction test', *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*. Scientific Journal Publishers, 44(9), pp. 1555–1564.
- Cano, J. and Castillo, J. X. (1999) 'A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF OHIO AGRICULTURE TEACHERS' LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION', *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 40(4).
- Chen, K.-Y. et al. (2013) 'Burnout, job satisfaction, and medical malpractice among physicians', *International journal of medical sciences*. Ivyspring International Publisher, 10(11), p. 1471.
- Chen, Z. et al. (2009) 'Perceived organizational support and extra-role performance: which leads to which?', *The Journal of social psychology*. Taylor & Francis, 149(1), pp. 119–124.
- Chenet, P., Dagger, T. S. and O'Sullivan, D. (2010) 'Service quality, trust, commitment and service differentiation in business relationships', *Journal of services Marketing*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 24(5), pp. 336–346.
- Chun, R. (2009) 'A corporate's responsibility to employees during a merger: organizational virtue and employee loyalty', *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 9(4), pp. 473–483.
- Cumbey, D. A. and Alexander, J. W. (1998) 'The relationship of job satisfaction with organizational variables in public health nursing', *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*. LWW, 28(5), pp. 39–46.
- Dulebohn, J. H. et al. (2012) 'A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future', *Journal of management*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 38(6), pp. 1715–1759.
- Eder, P. and Eisenberger, R. (2008) 'Perceived organizational support: Reducing the negative influence of coworker withdrawal behavior', *Journal of Management*. Sage Publications Sage

- CA: Los Angeles, CA, 34(1), pp. 55–68.
- Eisenberger, R. et al. (1986) 'Perceived organizational support.', *Journal of Applied psychology*. American Psychological Association, 71(3), p. 500.
- Eisenberger, R., Cotterell, N. and Marvel, J. (1987) 'Reciprocation ideology.', *Journal of personality and social psychology*. American Psychological Association, 53(4), p. 743.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. and Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990) 'Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation.', *Journal of applied psychology*. American Psychological Association, 75(1), p. 51.
- Farrukh, M. et al. (2017) 'Entrepreneurial intentions: the role of family factors, personality traits and self-efficacy', *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*. Emerald Publishing Limited, 13(4), pp. 303–317.
- Farrukh, M., Wei Ying, C. and Abdallah Ahmed, N. O. (2016) 'Organizational commitment: Does religiosity matter?', *Cogent Business & Management*. Cogent, 3(1), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1080/23311975.2016.1239300.
- Farrukh, M., Ying, C. W. and Mansori, S. (2017) 'Organizational commitment: an empirical analysis of personality traits', *Journal of Work-Applied Management*. Emerald Publishing Limited, 9(1), pp. 18–34.
- Fornell, C. and Larcker, D. F. (1981) 'Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics', *Journal of marketing research*. JSTOR, pp. 382–388.
- Foster, C., Whysall, P. and Harris, L. (2008) 'Employee loyalty: an exploration of staff commitment levels towards retailing, the retailer and the store', *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*. Taylor & Francis, 18(4), pp. 423–435.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T. and Swanberg, J. E. (1998) '1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce'. Families and Work Institute New York.
- Gentry, W. A. and Shanock, L. R. (2008) 'Views of managerial derailment from above and below: The importance of a good relationship with upper management and putting people at ease 1', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. Wiley Online Library, 38(10), pp. 2469–2494.
- Goldberg, W. A. et al. (1989) 'Attractiveness of child care and related employer-supported benefits and policies to married and single parents', *Child and Youth Care Quarterly*. Springer, 18(1), pp. 23–37.
- Goodman, M. and Togna, G. (2014) 'Does internal communication to generate trust always increase commitment?', *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Grover, S. L. and Crooker, K. J. (1995) 'Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents', *Personnel psychology*. Wiley Online Library, 48(2), pp. 271–288.
- Guchait, P., Cho, S. and Meurs, J. A. (2015) 'Psychological contracts, perceived organizational and supervisor support: Investigating the impact on intent to leave among hospitality employees in India', *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*. Taylor & Francis, 14(3), pp. 290–315.
- Guinot, J., Chiva, R. and Roca-Puig, V. (2014) 'Interpersonal trust, stress and satisfaction at work: an empirical study', *Personnel Review*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 43(1), pp. 96–115.
- Gupta, M. and Mikkilineni, S. (2018) 'Spirituality and Employee Engagement at Work', *The Palgrave Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Fulfillment*. Springer, pp. 1–15.
- Hair, J. et al. (2014) PARTIAL LEAST SQUARES STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING (

- PLS-SEM ).
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M. and Sarstedt, M. (2011) 'PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet', *Journal of Marketing theory and Practice*. Taylor & Francis, 19(2), pp. 139–152.
- Hair Jr, J. F. et al. (2016) *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage publications.
- Henderson, D. J. et al. (2008) 'Leader--member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: A multilevel examination.', *Journal of applied psychology*. American Psychological Association, 93(6), p. 1208.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M. and Sinkovics, R. R. (2009) 'The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing', in *New challenges to international marketing*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 277–319.
- Homburg, C. and Stock, R. M. (2005) 'Exploring the conditions under which salesperson work satisfaction can lead to customer satisfaction', *Psychology & Marketing*. Wiley Online Library, 22(5), pp. 393–420.
- Huang, Y. and Wilkinson, I. F. (2013) 'The dynamics and evolution of trust in business relationships', *Industrial Marketing Management*. Elsevier, 42(3), pp. 455–465.
- Hussain, A. H. M. B. and Endut, N. (2018) 'Do decent working conditions contribute to work–life balance', *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12(1), pp. 90–104. doi: 10.1108/APJIE-04-2018-045.
- Kang, J., Alejandro, T. B. and Groza, M. D. (2015) 'Customer–company identification and the effectiveness of loyalty programs', *Journal of Business Research*. Elsevier, 68(2), pp. 464–471.
- Karzsia, B. T. et al. (2013) 'Integrating mediation and moderation to advance theory development and testing', *Journal of pediatric psychology*. Oxford University Press, 39(2), pp. 163–173.
- Kayaser Fatima, J. and Abdur Razzaque, M. (2014) 'Roles of trust on rapport and satisfaction in services', *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 26(4), pp. 566–578.
- Kazumi, T. and Kawai, N. (2017) 'Institutional support and women's entrepreneurial self-efficacy', *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), pp. 345–365. doi: 10.1108/APJIE-12-2017-041.
- Khalid, A. et al. (2012) 'Role of supportive leadership as a moderator between job stress and job performance', *Information Management and Business Review*. International Foundation for Research and Development, 4(9), p. 487.
- Khuong, M. N. and Tien, B. D. (2013) 'Factors influencing employee loyalty directly and indirectly through job satisfaction—A study of banking sector in Ho Chi Minh City', *International Journal of current research and academic review*, 1(4), pp. 81–95.
- Kottke, J. L. and Sharafinski, C. E. (1988) 'Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support', *Educational and psychological Measurement*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, 48(4), pp. 1075–1079.
- Kurniawan, I. S. and Hutami, L. T. H. (no date) 'THE MEDIATION OF PERCEIVED SUPERVISOR SUPPORT TO LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE TOWARD JOB ENGAGEMENT'.
- Landry, G. and Vandenberghe, C. (2012) 'Relational commitments in employee–supervisor dyads and employee job performance', *The Leadership Quarterly*. Elsevier, 23(3), pp. 293–308.
- Larivière, B. et al. (2016) 'Modeling heterogeneity in the satisfaction, loyalty intention, and shareholder value linkage: a cross-industry analysis at the customer and firm levels', *Journal of Marketing Research*. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 53(1), pp. 91–109.

- Levinson, H. (1965) 'Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization', *Administrative science quarterly*. JSTOR, pp. 370–390.
- Liden, R. C. et al. (2006) 'Leader-member exchange, differentiation, and task interdependence: implications for individual and group performance', *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*. Wiley Online Library, 27(6), pp. 723–746.
- MacKinnon, D. P. et al. (2007) 'The intermediate endpoint effect in logistic and probit regression', *Clinical Trials*. Sage Publications Sage UK: London, England, 4(5), pp. 499–513.
- Madera, J. M. et al. (2017) 'Strategic human resources management research in hospitality and tourism: A review of current literature and suggestions for the future', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Emerald Publishing Limited, 29(1), pp. 48–67.
- Mallinckrodt, B. et al. (2006) 'Advances in testing the statistical significance of mediation effects.', *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. American Psychological Association, 53(3), p. 372.
- Matzler, K. et al. (2008) 'Personality traits and knowledge sharing', *Journal of economic psychology*. Elsevier, 29(3), pp. 301–313.
- Matzler, K. and Renzl, B. (2006) 'The relationship between interpersonal trust, employee satisfaction, and employee loyalty', *Total quality management and business excellence*. Taylor & Francis, 17(10), pp. 1261–1271.
- Mehta, S. et al. (2010) 'Employee loyalty towards organization—a study of academicians', *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research*, 1(1), pp. 98–108.
- Michael, J. H. et al. (2006) 'Production supervisor impacts on subordinates' safety outcomes: An investigation of leader-member exchange and safety communication', *Journal of safety Research*. Elsevier, 37(5), pp. 469–477.
- Moneta, G. B. et al. (2010) 'Multirater assessment of creative contributions to team projects in organizations', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. Taylor & Francis, 19(2), pp. 150–176.
- Mooradian, T., Renzl, B. and Matzler, K. (2006) 'Who trusts? Personality, trust and knowledge sharing', *Management learning*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, 37(4), pp. 523–540.
- Mursaleen, M. et al. (2015) 'Islamic work ethics as mediator between trust and knowledge sharing relationship', *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*. Lahore: Johar Education Society, Pakistan (JESPK), 9(2), pp. 614–640.
- Nam, J., Ekinci, Y. and Whyatt, G. (2011) 'Brand equity, brand loyalty and consumer satisfaction', *Annals of tourism Research*. Elsevier, 38(3), pp. 1009–1030.
- Ogunyemi, K. (2014) 'Employer Loyalty: The Need for Reciprocity', *Philosophy of Management*. Springer, 13(3), pp. 21–32.
- Olaisen, J. and Revang, O. (2017) 'The dynamics of intellectual property rights for trust, knowledge sharing and innovation in project teams', *International Journal of Information Management*. Elsevier, 37(6), pp. 583–589.
- Onsardi, A., Asmawi, M. and Abdullh, T. (2017) 'The effect of compensation, empowerment, and job satisfaction on employee loyalty', *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 5(12), pp. 7590–7599.
- Paillé, P. (2013) 'Organizational citizenship behaviour and employee retention: how important are turnover cognitions?', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Taylor & Francis, 24(4), pp. 768–790.
- Paillé, P., Morin, D. and Grima, F. (2011) 'Managing commitment to customer in the public

- sector: Highlight the role of the supervisor', *International Journal of Services Technology and Management*. Inderscience Publishers Ltd., PO Box 735 Olney Bucks MK 46 5 WB United Kingdom, 16(3–4), pp. 298–317.
- Paliszkievicz, J. and Koohang, A. (2013) 'Organizational trust as a foundation for knowledge sharing and its influence on organizational performance', *Online journal of applied knowledge management*, 1(2), pp. 116–127.
- Pallant, J. and Manual, S. S. (2007) 'A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows', in *SPSS Survival manual*. Open University Press.
- Pangil, F. and Moi Chan, J. (2014) 'The mediating effect of knowledge sharing on the relationship between trust and virtual team effectiveness', *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 18(1), pp. 92–106.
- Pei-Lee, T. et al. (2017) 'Do the Big Five Personality Factors affect knowledge sharing behaviour? A study of Malaysian universities', *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 16(1), pp. 47–62.
- Ponnu, C. H. and Tennakoon, G. (2009) 'The association between ethical leadership and employee outcomes-the Malaysian case', *EJBO-Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies*. Business and Organization Ethics Network (BON).
- Prabhakar, A. (2016) 'Analysis of high job satisfaction relationship with employee loyalty in context to workplace environment', *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2(4), pp. 640–643.
- Preacher, K. J. and Hayes, A. F. (2008) 'Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models', *Behavior research methods*. Springer, 40(3), pp. 879–891.
- Riketta, M. (2002) 'Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis', *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*. Wiley Online Library, 23(3), pp. 257–266.
- Roehling, P. V, Roehling, M. V and Moen, P. (2001) 'The relationship between work-life policies and practices and employee loyalty: A life course perspective', *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*. Springer, 22(2), pp. 141–170.
- Rosanas, J. M. and Velilla, M. (2003) 'Loyalty and trust as the ethical bases of organizations', *Journal of Business Ethics*. Springer, 44(1), pp. 49–59.
- Salamon, S. D. and Robinson, S. L. (2008) 'Trust that binds: The impact of collective felt trust on organizational performance.', *Journal of Applied Psychology*. American Psychological Association, 93(3), p. 593.
- Salleh, R., Nair, M. S. and Harun, H. (2012) 'Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: A case study on employees of a retail company in Malaysia', *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 72(12), pp. 316–323.
- Sarstedt, M. et al. (2014) 'On the emancipation of PLS-SEM: A commentary on Rigdon (2012)', *Long range planning*. Elsevier, 47(3), pp. 154–160.
- Sarstedt, M., Henseler, J. and Ringle, C. M. (2011) 'Multigroup analysis in partial least squares (PLS) path modeling: Alternative methods and empirical results', in *Measurement and research methods in international marketing*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 195–218.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G. and Osborn, R. N. (1995) *Basic organizational behavior*. J. Wiley Hoboken, NJ.
- Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C. and Davis, J. H. (2007) 'An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future'. *Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510*.

- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N. and Liden, R. C. (1996) 'Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity.', *Journal of applied psychology*. American Psychological Association, 81(3), p. 219.
- Shanock, L. R. and Eisenberger, R. (2006) 'When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance.', *Journal of Applied psychology*. American Psychological Association, 91(3), p. 689.
- Sousa-Lima, M., Michel, J. W. and Caetano, A. (2013) 'Clarifying the importance of trust in organizations as a component of effective work relationships', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. Wiley Online Library, 43(2), pp. 418–427.
- Spector, P. E. (1997) *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Sage publications.
- Stinglhamber, F., De Cremer, D. and Mercken, L. (2006) 'Group & Organization', *Group & Organization Management*, 31(4), pp. 442–468.
- Stinglhamber, F., Cremer, D. De and Mercken, L. (2006) 'Perceived support as a mediator of the relationship between justice and trust: A multiple foci approach', *Group & Organization Management*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, 31(4), pp. 442–468.
- TaghiPourian, M. J. and Bakhsh, M. M. (2015) 'Loyalty: From single-stage loyalty to four-stage loyalty', *International Journal of New Technology and Research*. Nextgen Research Publication, 1(6).
- Tarigan, V. and Ariani, D. W. (2015) 'Empirical study relations job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention', *Advances in Management and Applied Economics*. International Scientific Press, 5(2), p. 21.
- Tomprou, M. and Hansen, S. D. (2018) 'Organizational change', *Organizational Change: Psychological effects and strategies for coping*. Routledge.
- Turkyilmaz, A. et al. (2011) 'Empirical study of public sector employee loyalty and satisfaction', *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 111(5), pp. 675–696.
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2011) 'Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing', in *Leadership, gender, and organization*. Springer, pp. 75–108.
- Vanneste, B. S., Puranam, P. and Kretschmer, T. (2014) 'Trust over time in exchange relationships: Meta-analysis and theory', *Strategic Management Journal*. Wiley Online Library, 35(12), pp. 1891–1902.
- Van de Ven, A. H. et al. (2015) 'Welcome to the academy of management discoveries (AMD)'. Academy of Management.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. and Liden, R. C. (1997) 'Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective', *Academy of Management journal*. Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510, 40(1), pp. 82–111.
- Whitener, E. M. (2001) 'Do "high commitment" human resource practices affect employee commitment? A cross-level analysis using hierarchical linear modeling', *Journal of management*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA, 27(5), pp. 515–535.
- Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Pierce, J. R. (2008) 'Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings.', *Journal of Applied Psychology*. American Psychological Association, 93(1), p. 125.
- Wood, J. et al. (2013) *Organisational behaviour: Core concepts and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wu, C.-H. and Parker, S. K. (2017) 'The role of leader support in facilitating proactive work

- behavior: A perspective from attachment theory', *Journal of Management*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 43(4), pp. 1025–1049.
- Wu, L. and Norman, I. J. (2006) 'An investigation of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and role conflict and ambiguity in a sample of Chinese undergraduate nursing students', *Nurse education today*. Elsevier, 26(4), pp. 304–314.
- Wu, S.-Y. et al. (2012) 'The Influences of Social Self-Efficacy on Social Trust and Social Capital-A Case Study of Facebook.', *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*. ERIC, 11(2), pp. 246–254.
- Yao, T., Qiu, Q. and Wei, Y. (2019) 'Retaining hotel employees as internal customers: Effect of organizational commitment on attitudinal and behavioral loyalty of employees', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. Elsevier, 76, pp. 1–8.
- Zeffane, R., Tipu, S. A. and Ryan, J. C. (2011) 'Communication, commitment & trust: Exploring the triad', *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(6), pp. 77–87.
- ZHANG, G. and CHEN, C. (2006) 'Study on customer assets from a relationship perspective [J]', *China Industrial Economy*, 7, pp. 103–109.
- Zhao, X., Lynch Jr, J. G. and Chen, Q. (2010) 'Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis', *Journal of consumer research*. The University of Chicago Press, 37(2), pp. 197–206.
- Zorlu, K. and Bastemur, C. (2014) 'A Mediator Role of Perceived Organizational Support in Workplace Deviance Behaviors, Organizational Citizenship and Job Satisfaction Relations', *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 3(3), pp. 18–36.