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Abstract

The overall aim of this study is twofold; first to investigate the extent to which, in an Arab context, leadership and organisational career management practices predict individual career-related perceptions, attitudes and behaviours, and second to examine the extent to which the employees’ perceptions about organisational justice and politics mediate the relationship between the quality of the leader-member exchange (LMX) and work outcomes, and the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and work outcomes.

Drawing on several theoretical perspectives, such as the social exchange, organisational justice and organisational politics, this dissertation has developed an integrated perception-based approach to examine the possibility that employees' perceptions are associated with certain attitudes and behaviours. Within this framework, LMX and SPCD were treated as independent variables; they were assessed as predictors of employees’ perceptions about justice and politics, and work outcomes. LMX represents the organisational leadership model, and the corporate SPCD represents the organisational career management practices. The study also tested four work outcomes that included career success (CS), job satisfaction (JS), organisational commitment (OC) and turnover intentions (TOI), in addition to two variables related to the employees’ perceptions about organisational justice and organisational politics.
A prediction was made that in a relationship-oriented Arab society like Bahrain, the quality of the dyadic relationship between the leader and followers strongly impacts the employees’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviours. The results supported this prediction; both LMX and SPCD had positive correlations with OC, JS and CS, while they had negative relationships with TOI. Apart from that, both LMX and SPCD had positive relationships with organisational justice and negative relationships with organisational politics.

Another prediction was made regarding the mediation effects of organisational justice and politics on the relationship between LMX and SPCD, and work outcomes. The results revealed that both procedural justice (PJ) and distributive justice (DJ) had full mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and CS, and LMX and TOI. PJ had full mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and OC, and LMX and JS. DJ had partial mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and OC, and LMX and JS.

Furthermore, the results revealed that both forms of organisational politics i.e. general political behaviour (GPB) and get along to get ahead (GATGA) had full mediation effects on the relationship between LMX and TOI. GPB had no mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and OC, LMX and JS, and LMX and CS. However, it had partial mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and OC, and LMX and JS. GATGA had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS.
Regarding the mediation effects of organisational justice on the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes, the results revealed that both PJ and DJ had partial mediation effects on the relationships between SPCD and OC, SPCD and JS, and SPCD and CS. PJ had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI. However DJ had no mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI.

Another set of mediation tests was conducted to assess the effect of the two forms of organisational politics on the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes. GPB had no mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and the four work outcomes. GATGA had partial mediation effects on the relationships between SPCD and OC, SPCD and JS, and SPCD and CS. GATGA had a full mediation effect between SPCD and TOI.

A total number of three hundred and thirty three (333) complete questionnaires were received and analysed using SPSS v. 18 in order to assess the study’s hypothesised model. The results have been discussed with specific relevance to the Arab Middle Eastern context. The theoretical and managerial implications are suggested, alongside the directions for future research.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the background and problems addressed by the study. It starts with the research aim and objectives, followed by the problem statement and research questions. After that, it discusses the significance of the study followed by an overview of culture and concludes with the organisation of the study and chapter summary.

1.1. Research aim and objectives:

The overall aim of this study is twofold; first to investigate the extent to which, in an Arab context, leadership and organisational career management practices predict individual career-related perceptions, attitudes and behaviours, and second, to examine whether the perceptions of organisational justice and politics mediate the relationship between the quality of leader member exchange (LMX) and work outcomes, and the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes. To achieve that, the study will look into the employees' perceptions about the quality of their exchange relationship with their leaders/supervisors (LMX), and the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD) as possible predictors of employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics, organisational commitment, career success and turnover.
intentions. Based on that, the study attempts to address the following research objectives:

1: To explore the relationship between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX), the employees' perceptions about justice and politics, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment.

2: To explore the relationship between the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD), the employees' perceptions about justice and politics, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment.

3: To explore the mediation role of organisational justice and politics in the relationship between the quality of LMX and the employees’ work outcomes.

4: To explore the mediation role of organisational justice and politics in the relationship between the quality of LMX and the employees’ work outcomes.

1.2. The problem statement and research questions:

There is a long history and considerable body of literature devoted to the study of leadership and corporate career management processes and their impact on various organisational and individual variables. However, there are still very important gaps in the body of knowledge that are affecting our understanding of those concepts. For example, in relation to the present study, the idea that we are still away from understanding the phenomenon of succession planning is frequently stressed when this concept is reviewed (Dyck et al., 2002; Giambatista
et al., 2005; Kesner and Sebora, 1994). Apart from that, most of the available literature on leadership and organisational career management has taken place in Western countries which are culturally different from Arab countries. This created a gap in the knowledge related to the applicability of Western theories and empirical research results on the Arab context. Previous research (e.g. Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 1999) has identified several cultural differences between the Western and Arab countries that need to be considered in organisational research. This study contributes in filling those gaps through its attempt to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the relationships between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX), the employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

RQ2: What are the relationships between the corporate succession planning and career development, employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

RQ3: What is the mediation effect of perceptions of organisational justice and politics on the relationship between the quality of LMX, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

RQ4: What is the mediation effect of the perceptions of organisational justice and politics on the relationship between the corporate succession planning and
career development, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

1.3. The significance of the study:

Extensive theoretical and empirical research on human resources management has taken place at the international level during the past few decades. However compared to the other parts of the world, the Middle East has less available literature in this field than Western countries (Yahchouchi, 2009). In spite of the increasing globalization of business, there is still a need for more research to answer complex questions faced by organisations in an increasingly changing world (Kuchinke, 1999). Globalization has brought a lot of advantages to the modern organisations operating in the Arab world. Nevertheless, cultural sensitivity and diversity have become important issues that need to be addressed properly in order to avoid their undesirable consequences. Furthermore, the huge number of international organisations that are currently operating in the Arab countries has created a need for more research in the field of human resources management (Dirani, 2009) that could benefit both the local and international organisations. This study is significant in its contribution to the organisational research taking place in Arab countries.

Another significance of this study is related to the political perspective that it takes to the study of human resources management. It follows Ferris, Russ and Fandt (1989) model, which is considered as the first theoretical model of
antecedents and consequences of politics' perceptions. In support to this model, Gandz and Murray (1980) suggest that organisational politics should be considered as a subjective evaluation rather than an objective reality in organisations. This study extends the results of earlier research that considers the subjective implicit perceptions of organisational politics.

This study also looks at organisational justice as a second form of employees' perceptions that might be affected by the quality of the leader-member exchange (LMX) and the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD). Organisational justice has been established in previous research as a predictor of important work outcomes. It has received great attention from international researchers and scholars and has become a frequently researched topic in the field of industrial and organisational psychology, human resources management, and organisational behaviour (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997). However, very few studies have examined the mediating role of organisational justice in the relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes (Hassan and Chandaran, 2005). Based on that, recent research has called for further studies to determine if the leader's differential treatment affects perceptions of fairness and organisational outcomes (Cobb and Frey, 1991; Forret and Turban, 1994). This study responds to this call and looks into the direct impact of the quality of LMX on the employees’ perceptions about organisational justice, in addition to its role as a factor capable of playing a mediating role in the relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes.
The study is also significant in its contribution to the literature of organisational career. It looks at ‘career’ in two areas; as a predictor through the evaluation of the organisational career management practices, and as an outcome variable in the form of career success. The need for studying careers within the organisational context stems from the recent global changes that affected the concept of career. For example, long-term careers have started to disappear with the new global economy (Altman and Baruch, 2012) that is becoming increasingly turbulent. Consequently, lifelong commitment to one organisation started to decline with individuals becoming more interested in seeking better employment opportunities throughout their career life. Apart from that, job security diminished significantly with organisations trying to cut costs and reduce expenditure. This situation has negatively affected the psychological contract that directed the employees' perceptions regarding the reciprocal obligations between them and their employers (Sullivan, 1999; Baruch, 2004). As a result, the long-term contracts of loyalty to one organisation, life-time employment and mutual commitment have been replaced by short-term contracts and more flexible arrangements (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Sullivan, 1999; Sargent and Domberger, 2007) that appeared to be more convenient and less costly. Those changes affected the nature of career from being organisationally defined to the individually defined career (Baruch, 2004) that shifted the responsibility of career development from the organisation to the individual. Employees in many parts of the world started to make independent decisions about their own career moves
instead of relying on their employer organisations to make such decisions on their behalf (Altman and Baruch, 2012). This coincides with the development in management research that highlighted the importance of the individuals’ perceptions, interpretations and definitions of their own career situation. This is in contrast to the sole organisational needs that dominated career development research for various decades (Sullivan and Baruch, 2009). With the ongoing debate on whether the responsibility of the employees' career development should be taken by the organisation or the individuals, it becomes evident that succession planning is an important driver for organisations to develop their employees and prepare them to take important leadership and professional positions in the organisation while considering the individuals' career aspirations. Based on that, this study suggests an integrated approach to the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) that considers the individuals' career development needs, as well as the organisations' succession planning and skill requirements.

1.4. Overview of culture:

Several researchers have agreed on the difficulty of finding a single definition of culture as the concept is too deep to be categorized by tight definitions (Tayeb, 1994). For example, Ajiferuke and Boddewyn (1970) have stated that “culture is one of those items that defy a single all-purpose definition and there are almost as many meanings of cultures as people using the term” (Ajiferuke and Boddewyn,
Based on that, the definition of culture was tailored according to the purpose it was meant to serve. For example, Ting-Toomey (1999) describes it as a complex frame of reference that consists of patterns of traditions, beliefs, values, norms and meanings that are shared in varying degrees through the interaction among the members of a community. According to LeBaron (2003), culture comprises manners, principles, values and characters that a group generally accepts without thinking about them; they are passed along by communication and imitation from one generation to the next. However, some researchers argued that it is not necessary that every member shares all the cultural characteristics of the group they belong to (Hofstede, 1983; Martin, 2002; Schein, 2004).

A common categorization of culture among researchers is the allocation of culture within the country, nation and language boundaries labeled as national culture. According to Suliman (2013), the national culture has an overwhelming power to influence peoples’ behaviour both at the social and organisational levels. Therefore, the national culture dimensions may also exist at the individual level; people bring to their working day values, beliefs, expectations and attitudes that have been ingrained since childhood by their culture, society, community, family, friends and peers. Hence, it could be argued that in the organisational setting, a strong culture will outline the expected behaviours of the leaders and other members. This argument is supported by the study of Robertson, Al-Khatib and Al-Habib (2002), which revealed that the cultural value dimensions of
individualism and masculinity were also related to the individual's beliefs about organisational commitment.

1.4.1. Models of national culture:

Several models of national cultures were introduced by scholars in order to explore the effect of the different cultural dimensions on business, economics, employees and organisational behaviours. The main studies that were widely used by researchers include those of Hofstede (1980; 1991), House et al., (1999) and Hall (1959; 1976). The following section will provide a short review of each model.

a. Hofstede's (1980; 1991) cultural model:

Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions is the most frequently used for the effect of national cultures on management practices. It includes five dimensions:

(1) *Power distance* refers to the extent to which a society accepts the unequal distribution of power in institutions and organisations (Dorfman and Howell, 1988).

(2) *Individualism versus collectivism*: individualism characterizes societies in which people are connected through loose social networks, while collectivism characterizes societies in which members are held together with strong ties.
(3) *Masculinity versus femininity:* Masculinity characterizes societies that distinguish between the roles of their male and female members (Robertson, Al-Khatib and Al-Habib, 2002).

(4) *Uncertainty avoidance* refers to the degree to which people in a certain society feel threatened and uncomfortable by uncertain, ambiguous and unstructured situations, and try to avoid them.

(5) *Short versus long term orientation* focuses on the society's time horizon and whether it is attached to the future compared to the past and present.

b. **The Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness**

* (GLOBE) research project (House, 1999):

The Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) project is a long-term multi-method, multi-phase, cross-cultural research program that is concerned with the different effects of leadership, organisational practices and values (House et al., 1999). The GLOBE highlighted nine cultural dimensions:

1. Uncertainty Avoidance.

2. Power Distance.

3. Institutional collectivism.

4. In-group collectivism.

5. Gender Egalitarianism.

6. Assertiveness.
7. Future Orientation.

c. Hall’s cultural models:

Hall (1959; 1976) identified high-context and low-context cultures. In low context cultures, people seek information from research, placing more emphasis on the use of reports, databases and the internet (Morden, 1999). In contrast, people in high context cultures try to obtain information from personal networks. Hall (1976) explains that high-context cultures value collective needs and goals while low-context cultures value individual needs and goals and believe that every individual is unique.

Apart from that, Hall (1959; 1976) made another cultural distinction that is based on a culture’s attitude towards time (time orientation). In monochromic cultures, people prefer to do things in structured manners, they tend to be well organized and punctual, while polychronic cultures give high importance to interpersonal relations and tend to build lifetime relationships.

1.4.2. The Arab culture:

Since Bahrain is an Arab country, the cultural reference of this study will be the broader Arab culture that Bahrain belongs to. According to the Arab League website (2014), Arab countries include Algeria, Bahrain, Comoros, Djibouti,
Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Yemen. These countries share the same Arab identity including common history, language, cause, religion, values and beliefs, needs, interests and kinship (Barakat, 1993; De Vos, 1995). However it is impossible to make generalizations about all or most cultural values across all the Arab countries (Lamb, 1987; Nydell, 1987).

Hall (1984) classified the Arab societies as high-context; they are involved in close personal relationships and they have extensive information networks among the family, friends and colleagues (Muna and Khoury, 2012). He also described them as polychromic; characterised by the complex management of time where several tasks are managed simultaneously and where timing and diplomacy can override the need for urgency. Javidan et al., (2006) described Arab culture as distinct by its emphasis on in-group and institutional collectivism, power distance, humane orientation and male domination. An individual’s social identity is closely linked to his/her status in the network of kin relationships. Arabs also rate high in power distance and in uncertainty avoidance. They are also more concerned with maintaining their traditions, culture and religion. However, many traditional Arab values have been modified due to many reasons such as urbanization, Western influence, industrialization, oil related economic issues, political instability (Ali, 1990), and the international exposure of Arabs through their migration to
countries outside the Arab world, or their interactions with expatriates working and living in Arab countries.

In a relatively significant example, Sinha (1997) notes that Indian managers were described as high in power distance, collectivism, affective reciprocity and preference for personalized relationships. However, recent research has noted a change in the Indian work culture. For example, earlier studies have stated that Indians are high in uncertainty avoidance but in a more recent study Chhokar (2000) found that Indians are moderate on uncertainty avoidance. Also Sinha et al., (2004) stated that although Hofstede’s dimension of power distance emerged as a dominant theme, collectivism, masculinity and uncertainty avoidance did not appear at the top of the manager’s mind, while these were considered to be dominant parts of the Indian culture in an early study by Medonka and Kanungo (1996); people have expressed a preference towards a decrease in collectivism orientation. A similar cultural transformation was noted in the UAE by Whiteoak, Crawford and Mapstone (2006). They stated that due to the increased wealth and education, the younger generations of Emiratis are more individualistic than their parents and grandparents. Also Willemyns (2008) found that Emirati managers perceive that the workplace in the UAE culture is generally now less diffuse and more specific. The work and relationships do not mix as much as they did 25 years ago. It is also low in power distance and more competitive now than 25 years ago. Furthermore, relationships tend to be less important for success at work now than 25 years ago; success has become more achievement-based than
ascriptive-based. ‘Wasta’ is not as important in modern workplaces as it was in the past. However Emirati managers perceived that the UAE workplaces have not become more individualistic; they believe that they are still as collectivistic as they were 25 years ago.

1.5. The context of the study (The Kingdom of Bahrain):

The Kingdom of Bahrain is an archipelago consisting of 33 islands situated in the Arabian Gulf, to the east of Saudi Arabia. It is one of the six countries comprising the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), which are Bahrain, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Oman and Kuwait. The six countries encompass and display similar unique cultural characteristics (Schuster and Copeland, 1996; Kabaskal and Dastmalchian, 2001), which resulted from the geographic proximity, climate similarity, common linguistic roots, shared historical and ethnic backgrounds, and the common Islamic religion (Almaney, 1981; Ronen and Shenker, 1985).

The total area of Bahrain is around 707 square kilometers and the population is slightly over one million according to the 2010 census (CIO, 2010. p.4). Among those, 48.6% are Bahrainis and 51.4% are non-Bahrainis, most of whom are working in the country. The large expatriate workforce was created by the rapid economic growth that resulted in a labour shortage and skill gaps that needed to be filled from other countries such as India, Pakistan and Philippines.
The oil and gas industry has brought several development opportunities and solved many social and financial problems in Bahrain and other Arabian Gulf countries. However, it has contributed to the creation of new and often unexpected problems. One of the major problems that they had to face was the huge influx of expatriate workers and sudden international exposure (Abdalla and Al-Homoud, 2001). According to Singh, Jones and Hall (2012) within the Arabian Gulf region, expatriate workers currently hold an overwhelming majority of private sector jobs which raised new cultural and management issues that need to be addressed properly in order to reduce their reverse impact on the society.

Arabian Gulf countries endorse typical collective values and practices such as preference for personalized relationships, broad and profound influence of in-group on its members, and limited cooperation with other groups (Steers et al., 2010; Abdalla and Al Homoud, 2001). House et al., (1999) categorized the Arab culture as low in institutional collectivism and high in in-group collectivism. Barakat (1993) and Kabaskal and Bedur (2002) also argued that Arab culture promotes relation-oriented rather than task-oriented leadership styles. Similar to their Arab counterparts, Bahraini managers are driven by their belief that they have moral obligations to develop relationships in the workplace that lead to increased team and organisational solidarity (Bhuian, Al-Shammani and Jefri, 2001). Apart from that, Bahraini organisations are characterized by high power distance; managers in companies hold all the authorities and expect full compliance from their subordinates. In return, employees do not question or
challenge their managers and do not take initiative but rather wait for directions from them (Barakat 1993; Al-Faleh, 1987). This situation has many implications on the individuals' perceptions of their organisational career, career success and their proactive career behaviours.

1.6. Organisation of the study:

This dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter one provides an introduction to the study. Chapter two gives the theoretical background of the variables used in the study. Chapter three covers the literature review. Chapter four gives a description of the research design and methodology. Chapter five presents the data analysis and results. Finally, Chapter six presents the main findings, research contributions, managerial implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

1.7. Chapter summary:

This chapter introduced the study by describing the research aims and objectives, the problem statement, research questions and the significance of the study. This was followed by an overview of culture and the context of the study. The chapter concludes with the organisation of the study and chapter summary.
CHAPTER 2
THEORITICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Introduction:

This chapter provides a review for the theoretical and empirical literature related to the constructs of the study. The study takes a relational approach to the study of leadership within a political framework, assuming that the employees’ relationship with their supervisor/manager and the organisational career management practices play a significant role in forming their perceptions about organisational justice and politics, and work outcomes.

Eight constructs have been chosen to be examined in this study. They include four work outcomes, two predictors and two perceptions variables. The four attitudinal outcomes include organisational commitment, career success, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. The two predictors are the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD). The first, represents the leadership model within the organisation or the work unit that is expected to impact the employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics, and their work outcomes. The latter, represents the organisational corporate career management practices that might impact the employees' perceptions about justice and politics and their work outcomes. The two forms of employees’ perceptions include perceived
organisational justice and politics. Both were examined in previous empirical research and were found to have direct and mediating roles in the relationships between different organisational variables including the variables tested in this study.

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first reviews the literature related to the employees’ work outcomes, the second provides a discussion for the two predictors of employees' perceptions and work outcomes, and the third part explores the literature related to the mediators.

2.2. Employees’ work outcomes:

2.2.1. Attitudes in the workplace:

The term ‘attitude’ was used by social psychologists to refer to the individuals’ preference for or disinclination towards an idea, issue, item or object. It is described as a “disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects” (Sarnoff, 1960:261). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) proposed a model that explains the role of attitudes in human behaviour. It comprises three elements: (1) an individual’s positive or negative beliefs about a certain object form an attitude towards that object, (2) this attitude determines the individual's intention to behave in a certain way towards that object, and (3) the intention to behave is related to the actual behaviour acted. Hertzberg et al., (1959) described attitudes as the best way to understand the individuals' motivation to work. They further explained that attitudes are originated from a state of mind that when probed, it
reveals realistic information about the motivation of workers. They also came up with the factor-attitudes-effects (F-A-E) complex that focuses on the individuals (Tietjen and Myers, 1998) rather than the group. This is in contrast to the previous studies that looked at these aspects in a disconnected, fragmentary way that places more emphasis on the group's interaction with a particular variable. During their work experience, employees go through an evaluation process in which they build certain concepts that affect their attitudes and consequently behaviours towards their organisation or certain aspects of it (Rhein, 1958). Those who develop negative attitudes might eventually behave in ways that reflect that status such as quitting their jobs or behaving in certain ways that negatively affect the organisation or its interests. On the contrary, positive attitudes result in positive behaviours that benefit the individual and the organisation.

According to Chang (1999) attitudes are affected by two factors; the met expectations (Porter et al., 1974) and the psychological contract (Morrison and Robinson, 1997). The 'met expectations’ refer to the set of expectations that individuals bring with them to their work place. They compare the level of their expectations to their perceptions of the realities. The comparison process will result in certain attitudes and behaviours depending on the level of expectations met; the higher level will results in more positive attitudes and the opposite happens in the case of lower levels of met expectations. The second factor is the 'psychological contract' that connects the employees to their organisation. Within this contract the employees build beliefs about the reciprocal obligations between
them and the organisation (Hall and Moss, 1998; Robinson, 1996), and they evaluate whether the organisation has fulfilled its obligation in the contract. Their evaluation will be highly connected to their perceptions about what they are entitled to or should receive (Robinson, 1996). If they believe that the organisation has fulfilled its obligation towards them, they will adopt more positive attitudes and behaviours towards the organisation. However, if they feel that the organisation has not fulfilled its part of the contract, they will start to adopt negative attitudes and behaviours (Robinson et al., 1994).

The following sections will discuss the literature related to the four attitudinal outcomes of the organisational leadership and career management processes tested in this study starting with organisational commitment.

### 2.2.2. Organisational commitment:

Organisational commitment (OC) was defined in various ways (Mowday et al., 1982; Reichers, 1985; Samad, 2011; Dirani and Kuchinke, 2011). In its simplest form, OC refers to the psychological bond or linkage of the individual to the organisation as a whole (Martin and Roodt, 1999; Samad, 2011; Allen and Meyer, 1990; Nagar, 2012; Joo and Shim, 2010). It is the psychological link between the employee and his or her organisation that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organisation (Allen and Meyer's, 1996:252).

The definition of OC was refined and developed over the years depending on two factors: (1) variation in the research fields that looked into OC such as
sociology, social psychology and organisational behaviour (Akinbode and Fagbohungbe, 2012) which created disagreements among researchers about the definition that fits all disciplines, and (2) the different approaches followed by researchers for the study of OC. According to Suliman and Illes (2000), there are currently four main approaches for conceptualizing and exploring OC. These approaches are the attitudinal approach, the behavioral approach, the normative approach and the multidimensional approach. The attitudinal approach views OC as an employee’s attitude or set of behavioral intentions. The most widely accepted attitudinal conceptualization of OC is the one by Porter and his colleagues (1976). They define OC as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organisation (Mangaleswaran and Srinivasan, 2012). In this respect, commitment is viewed as an attitude that exists when the identity of the person is linked to the organisation (Sheldon, 1971), or when the goals of the organisation and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent (Hall et al., 1970). Mowday et al., (1979) mention three characteristics of attitudinal OC: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values, (2) a willingness to exert a considerable effort on behalf of the organisation and (3) a strong desire to remain with the organisation (Mowday et al., 1982). Mowday et al., (1979) suggest that the employees' commitment does not depend solely on perceptions and attitudes but it is also reflected in actions and translated into effective contribution to the organisation (Arkoubi et al., 2007). Such commitment often encompasses an
exchange relationship in which individuals attach themselves to the organisation in return for certain rewards or payments (March and Simon, 1958).

The second approach refers to OC as a behaviour (Suliman and Iles, 2000; Zangaro, 2001). Research that takes the behavioral approach focuses on the overt manifestations of commitment (Mowday et al., 1979). It emphasizes that an employee continues his/her employment with an organisation because of the investments he/she made such as time spent in the organisation, friendships formed within the organisation and the pension benefits. This approach is related to Becker’s (1960) ‘side bit’ theory which refers to the benefits that an employee considers as valuable, such as pensions, seniority, vacation, money and organisational relationships which are considered as rewards offered by the organisation. Becker (1960) describes OC as an employee’s continued association with a particular organisation that occurs because of his/her decision after evaluating the costs of leaving the organisation. In this respect, OC only happens once the employee has recognized the cost associated with leaving the organisation.

The third approach is the normative approach which argues that the congruency between the employee’s goals and values, and the organisation’s aims makes the employee feels obligated towards the organisation (Beker et al., 1995). Within this perspective, OC refers to the totality of internalized normative pressure to act in a way that meets the organisation’s goals and interests (Weiner, 1982).
The last approach is the multi-dimensional approach which assumes that OC is more complex than emotional attachments, perceived costs or moral obligations; OC develops as a result of the interaction between all the three components i.e. attitudinal, behavioural and normative. According to Suliman and Iles (2000), this approach was first introduced by Kelman (1958) who laid down the foundation through linking compliance, identification and internalization to the change in the individual’s attitude. Another early contribution was made by Etzioni (1961) who describes OC in terms of three dimensions that represent the types of the employee’s involvement i.e. moral, calculative and alienative which incorporate the attitudinal, behavioral and normative aspects of OC. The moral involvement refers to the employee’s positive orientation based on his/her identification with the organisation’s goals. The calculative involvement could either be a negative or positive orientation of low intensity that develops due to an employee receiving inducements from the organisation that match his/her contributions. The alienative involvement refers to the negative attachment to the organisation that occurs when the individual perceives lack of ability to change his/her environment and therefore remains in the organisation only because he/she feels that no other options are available.

Another view to OC was presented by Kanter (1968) who proposed three forms of commitment, including continuance, cohesion and control. Continuance commitment represents the employees’ recognition of an advantage associated with not leaving the organisation. Cohesion commitment represents the loyalty to
the group or a set of social relationships, and control commitment represents the commitment to the group’s authority and an agreement from the individual to uphold the norms of the group (Leow and Khong, 2009).

As a construct OC was an active area of debate among researchers. Some of them dealt with OC as a singular, unidimensional construct (e.g. Blau, 1985; Brown, 1996; Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982; Wiener, 1982), while others looked at it as a multidimensional construct that has different forms with a common element linking them together (e.g., Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Mathieu and Farr, 1991; Spector, 1997; Allen and Meyer, 1990; Angle and Perry, 1981; Gordon et al., 1980; Jaros et al., 1993). Examples of the multi-dimensional commitment include organisational loyalty and commitment to work groups, supervisors, job, career, union (Dirani and Kuchinke, 2011) and other aspects of the work environment, based on the assumption that organisations are coalitional in nature.

The measure of OC also went through several developments. Porter et al., (1974) developed the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) to measure OC as a unidimensional construct (Mowday et al., 1979). After that, Angel and Perry (1981) analyzed the OCQ and came up with two dimensions of OC within the OCQ; affective commitment and continuous commitment. The first is psychological, attitudinal and reflects a positive, affective orientation towards the organisation; while the latter is cumulative and based on the economic exchanges (e.g., Stevens et al., 1978: Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen,
1984) in which the individuals' decision about whether to stay in the organisation depends on the inducements-contributions transactions.

The two-dimension model of OC was followed by the development of a three-dimension model that comprises three themes including affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment (Nagar, 2012; Allen and Meyer, 1990; 1996; Greenberg, 2005; Karrasch, 2003; Turner and Chellandurai, 2005; Joo and Shim, 2010). Affective commitment refers to the employees' identification with and emotional attachment to an organisation or a group (Mowday et al., 1979; Allen and Meyer, 1990). It is a positive affection that is reflected in a desire to see the organisation succeeds in its goals, accompanied with a feeling of pride in being part of it (Cohen, 2003). It is also a strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values (Joo and Shim, 2010). Employees with strong affective commitment continue employment with the organisation because they want to do so (Meyer, Allen and Smith, 1993). They have a strong sense of belongingness and identification that increases their involvement in the organisation's activities and willingness to pursue the organisation's goals (Nagar, 2012). There is a general agreement among researchers on the association of affective commitment to various positive and negative work-related outcomes. Low affective commitment might lead to turnover intentions (Parker et al., 2003), absenteeism and actual turnover (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1982). On the contrary, employees with higher levels of affective commitment have more trust
in management (Kim and Mauborgne, 1993; Pearce, 1993) and are more likely to engage in extra-role behaviors (Morrison, 1994) that benefit the organisation and its employees.

The second form is the continuous commitment that refers to the individuals' awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation based on their evaluation of the economic investments they made and their perception of the cost of leaving (Farrell and Rusbult, 1981). Such costs include losing certain benefits or the seniority status associated with their employment in that particular organisation (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Continuous commitment indicates that the employees continue employment in their current organisation, either because they have invested too much time in it (Witt, Kacmar and Andrews, 2001), or because they lack alternatives. In other words, they remain because they need to do so (Nagar, 2012) not because they want to. They calculate the benefits that they have accumulated during their employment in the organisation such as pensions, seniority, social status or access to important social networks. Based on their calculation, they develop feelings about whether those interests would be at risk if they leave the organisation which makes it a personal sacrifice (McGee and Ford, 1987; Meyer and Allen, 1991, 1997; Dawley, Stephens and Stephens, 2005).

The third form is the normative commitment which is not related to any economic benefits. It refers to the feeling of obligation to continue employment in a certain organisation because it is right and moral to do so (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Mayer, Becker and Vandenberghhe, 2004). It shows dependence on the
individual’s prior values, beliefs and attitudes even before joining the organisation (Newman et al., 2011).

Research suggests that the employees’ commitment towards their organisation is influenced by two factors: (1) reciprocity (Blau, 1964) and (2) equity (Adams, 1965). Reciprocity is based on the argument that employees’ perceptions of their organisation's actions towards them stimulate reciprocity in their attitudes and behaviours (Shore and Tetrick, 1991). When they perceive care and commitment from the organisation towards their needs and career goals, they reciprocate through higher levels of commitment towards the organisation and its goals and interests. The other factor is equity, which anticipates that fair treatment of people increases their motivation to work and commitment towards the organisation. Employees evaluate their input-outcome ratio by comparing it to that of another employee (Carrell and Dittrich, 1998; Robins and Judge, 2007); if they perceive inequity from the organisation towards them, they will react by trying to reduce the ratio, either by reducing their input or taking other actions (Indartono and Chen, 2011).

Research has shown that high levels of OC were associated with job satisfaction (e.g. Price and Mueller, 1986; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Bateman and Stasser, 1984; Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982; Karim and Rehman, 2012). Both attitudes were identified as outcomes of the same antecedents that included pay, social integration, instrumental communication, formal communication, centralization, role overload, promotional opportunity, general training, supervisor
support, coworker support and distributive justice. However, Joo and Shim (2010) argued that when comparing between the two outcomes, OC becomes a more critical criterion than job satisfaction in understanding the employees’ behaviours because it is more stabled, constant and less subject to the daily fluctuations that an employee could go through (Angle and Perry, 1983; Mowday, Steers and Porter, 1982). Within the Arabian Gulf context, Mohammed and Eleswed (2013) and Al Aameri (2000) found positive relationships between OC and job satisfaction. Jehanzeb et al., (2013) found a negative relationship between OC and turnover intentions (TOI) among the employees of a private organisation in Saudi Arabia. They also found a significant correlation between training and both OC and turnover intentions.

2.2.3. Job satisfaction:

As a widely studied subject, several definitions of job satisfaction (JS) were offered by researchers. However, all the variations of definitions relate to one theme which is the individuals’ emotional response, feelings or attitudes towards their job and the organisation in which they perform their jobs (Yaghoubi et al., 2012). Thus, a sense of satisfaction or its absence could result from the individual’s subjective, emotional reaction. One of the early definitions of JS that has been widely cited in literature is the one by Locke (1976:1300). It refers to JS as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. Another early definition was offered by Smith, Kendall
and Hulin’s (1969). It describes JS as the extent to which an employee has a positive affective orientation or attitude towards his/her job, either in general or towards particular facets of it. A similar definition was offered by Bonache (2005) who defines JS as an affective or emotional response towards various facets of one’s job and in which social comparison takes place.

The various definitions and views towards JS indicate that it could be unidimensional towards the job itself or multidimensional comprising an overall satisfaction towards the job and several facets of it towards which the individual might react. These facets could be intrinsic or extrinsic; intrinsic facets could include autonomy, achievement, challenge and feelings of recognition, while extrinsic facets are related to the job environment or context such as pay, working conditions, job security, supervisor, coworkers and the management. These facets are easier to measure and control than the intrinsic facets and they could give clear indications on the employees’ level of JS (Richard et al., 1994).

As a research area, the study of JS was influenced by five theories that could be related to each other when JS is concerned. The first is the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) which suggests that social exchange involves favours that create diffuse future obligations that are not precisely defined (Aselage and Eisenberger, 2003). The social exchange stimulates feelings of personal obligations and gratitude (Blau, 1964) between the employer and employee. The employer is devoted to building long term employment relationships with the employees by fulfilling their needs through offering favourable working
conditions, growth opportunities and support, which will have a positive impact on their JS.

The second theory is the equity theory (Adam’s, 1965), which suggests that satisfaction is a result of an exchange of work in the part of the employee to gain certain rewards from the organisation. An employee will seek to maintain equity between the perceived inputs that he/she contributes to the job and the perceived outcomes that he receives from the job against the perceived inputs and outcomes of others. Example of employees' inputs include time, effort, loyalty, qualifications, flexibility, tolerance, determination and personal sacrifice, while outputs include some hygiene factors and motivators (Walster, Traupmann and Walster, 1978). This comparison might result in one of the following outcomes: (1) the employee perceives his ratio to be equal to comparable others' ratios (Fairness), (2) the employee perceives his ratio to be higher than comparable others’ ratios (Unfairness) or (3) the employee perceives his ratio to be lower than comparable others' ratios (Unfairness).

The third theory that could be linked to JS is the expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964). The individuals' decision to engage in a specific behaviour is based on a value judgment process (Dong-Hwan and Jung-Min, 2012) in which they compare the actual outcomes of their work environment to their desired outcomes such as pay, promotions, employee benefits, conditions of employment, security and the working conditions (Tziner and Vardi, 1984; Misener et al., 1996; Burke, 1989; Brown and Peterson, 1993; Fisher, 2003). The importance and the nature of those
outcomes differ from one person to another; if they believe that the received outcomes are more than the desired ones, they will be more satisfied. On the contrary, if they perceive that the outcomes are less than expected, they start to accumulate unmet expectations. As they grow, the level of their JS deteriorates (Dirani and Kuchinke, 2011; Yaghoubi et al., 2012).

The fourth theory is Maslow's (1943; 1954) theory of needs, which emphasizes that the individuals’ needs determine their behaviours. Maslow's (1943) famous hierarchy of needs comprises five stages of human needs ranging from lower to higher needs. Lower level needs include survival needs and are often referred to as extrinsic needs, while the needs at the higher levels are referred to as intrinsic needs (Martin and Roodt, 1999). Within this framework, intrinsic JS is distinguished from extrinsic JS; the first is derived from performing the work and consequently experiencing feelings of accomplishment, self-actualisation and identification with the task, whereas the latter is derived from the rewards owned by the individual in the form of recognition, compensation, career advancement (Weiss et al., 1967), salary increases and other tangible benefits that the employees get when they climb higher in the organisational hierarchy.

The fifth theory that links to JS is the theory of motivation or the two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction respectively relate to two types of factors: (1) motivating factors that include the intrinsic positive elements of the job such as the social level, self-esteem, self-
actualization, achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the possibility of growth (Herzber et al, 1959). These factors on the whole are task-related and they cause happy feelings or good attitudes. (2) Hygiene factors are related to the individual’s need to avoid pain. They refer to the negative elements that could cause dissatisfaction at work (Samad, 2011) such as supervision, interpersonal relations with the supervisor, subordinates and peers, physical working conditions, salary, company policies, administrative practices, benefits and job security. Herzberg et al., (1959) noted that the employee’s feeling of happiness was most frequently related to success in performing the work and the possibility of professional growth. Conversely, when the employees expressed feelings of unhappiness they were not associated with the job itself but with the surrounding conditions.

Researchers have noted that the employees’ physical, psychological and mental health are highly affected by the level of their JS. Based on that, they suggested different levels of correlations between JS and a number of positive and negative work outcomes. In a meta-analysis of 25 articles, Mor Barak et al., (2001) found that JS was considered as the strongest predictor of turnover intentions among the employees of child welfare, social work and other human services. Chahal et al., (2013) studied JS among banking personnel in India. They found that JS was affected by training and development programs, working hours, salary, promotion strategies, performance appraisal systems, the employees’ relationship with their management and other co-employees, and work burden.
They suggested that increased levels of these factors improve the employees’ overall satisfaction.

In an Arab context, Musa (2011) found a positive significant correlation between JS and age. He also found that employed females with high income were more satisfied with their jobs than those who earn less (Shallal, 2011), which indicates a correlation between the level of pay and JS. An earlier study by Al Ahmadi (2002) showed that work conditions, recognition, pay, technical aspects of supervision, utilization of skills and job advancement were the most important determinants of JS.

Regarding the measures of JS, literature suggests four categories of measures: (1) the nature of the job itself such as being interesting, boring, safe or dangerous, the working hours, coworkers, opportunities for promotion and career advancement, and the physical environment, equipment, machines and tools. (2) The treatment of the management and the supervisory team, rewards, punishment, praise, blame, policies and favouritism. (3) Social relations, including friends and associates, and (4) the personal adjustment, health and emotionality of the individual.

2.2.4. Career success:

Career is defined as the evolving sequence of a person's work experiences over time (Arthur et al., 1999). Career success (CS) refers to the overall emotional directivity about one's career (Gattiker and Larwood, 1988). It is the positive
psychological and work-related outcomes accumulated as a result of one's work experience (Seibert et al., 2001). In the general terms, CS could be viewed as an evaluative process (Jaskolka et al., 1985) that results in certain judgments depending on the person who passes them.

The different views of CS can be summarized in two different perspectives; internal and external (Derr and Laurent, 1989) that are also referred to as intrinsic and extrinsic (Judge et al., 1995; Ng et al., 2005; Hofmans et al., 2008; Hall and Chandler 2005; Heslin, 2005; Baruch and Bozionelos, 2010; Nicholson and De Waal, 2005). These perspectives evolved from the 'career ladder' concept that was developed from the blue-collar workers in the mines for whom CS meant moving to the top of the ladder. In that sense, CS was measured according to the individual's progression in the organisational hierarchy based on the long-term relationship with the company (Judge et al., 1995) and the seniority of organisational tenure, without any regard to other factors like qualifications, skills or performance. The research emphasise was mainly on objective rather than subjective measures. However, since the beginning of the 1970s the definition of CS began to take a new direction with researchers (e.g. Greenhaus, 2003; Hall, 2002) incorporating more subjective measures in their research. They showed that the combination of the two types is necessary to understand CS that reflects the existing standards of the society and at the same time considers the individuals' feelings about their own career (Judge and Bretz, 1994). In line with this perspective, Judge et al., (1999) argued that the individuals who are dissatisfied
with several aspects of their jobs are unlikely to consider their careers to be successful even if they manage to get a promotion or a salary increase.

Although internal/intrinsic CS differs in nature from external/extrinsic CS, they are conceptually similar to each other based on the assumption that individuals who manage to achieve their career goals at the objective measures, are more likely to identify with the subjective measures as well. This argument is supported by Ng et al., (2005) who found correlations between measures of objective and subjective CS in a meta-analysis comprising 140 empirical articles relating to predictors of subjective and objective CS. Aryee et al., (1994) noted that individuals who manage to have a successful career according to the external measures, may still be unhappy if they are unsatisfied by other life factors outside the organisation. Judge et al., (1995) surveyed a diverse sample of 1400 executives in U.S. organisations. They found that the demographics, human capital and motivational variables had an important influence on the individuals' perceptions about their own CS.

Several approaches were identified to explain the predictors of CS (Ballout, 2007). The three well-known approaches are the individual, the structural and the behavioral approaches (Rosenbaum, 1989; Aryee et al., 1994). The ‘individual approach’ suggests that individuals who invest most in human capital attributes such as education, training and experience are expected to show higher levels of work performance and subsequently obtain higher organisational rewards (Beker, 1964) and achieve higher CS. The ‘structural approach’ suggests that the
organisational factors such as the size of the organisation and the internal promotions practices influence the individuals’ CS (Tosi et al., 2000). The third approach is the ‘behavioral approach’ which assumes that career achievement is a function of certain career strategies adopted by the individuals through performing appropriate career plans and tactics that contribute positively to their CS (Gould and Penley, 1984; Greenhaus et al., 2000). This is based on the assumption that career aspirants should take a more proactive role in managing their career. They should also pursue career strategies that are congruent with the context of the organisational strategies (Gunz et al., 1998) rather than relying passively on the organisational career systems. Ferris and Judge (1991) identified a substantial body of research addressing how the influence behaviours affect the selections, performance evaluations, compensation decisions and the organisational promotion systems. They are often seen as political in nature and primary mechanisms through which individuals achieve CS (e.g. Feldman and Klich, 1991; Ferris et al., 1989; Heisler and Gemmill, 1978). Gould and Penley (1981) found a link between the use of such strategies and managers' salary progression. Based on that, they suggest that employees use both interpersonal and intrapersonal career strategies to help them receive favourable performance evaluations.

The construct of CS went through different stages. It was first introduced by Hughes and the Chicago School of Sociology during the 1930s with the early psychological career development theories that focused mainly on more active
roles of the organisations in determining the individual's CS (Wahat, 2011). At that stage, organisations always took the lead and the full responsibility of developing their employees and planning their career (Nadler and Nadler, 1989; Gutteridge, Leibowitz and Shore, 1993), based on the organisational current and future needs. However, with the modern view of individuals planning their own career (Arthur, Inkson and Pringle, 1999) this responsibility moved from the organisation to the individual and eventually CS became a result of the actions taken by individuals in a certain direction and not what the organisations have or have not planned for them. The full responsibility was completely left to the employees without any interference from the organisation. This change was influenced by the development in the career literature and the newly introduced career concepts such as the boundaryless career and protean career that are based on the possibility of individuals having multiple careers of their own choice (Baruch, 2003), rather than the previous single career orientation. With the new career theories, the concept of CS became more open, diverse and less controlled by employers (Foot-ming, 2008). Individuals can take more responsibility for their own career and achieve goals that are personally meaningful to them, rather than those set by peers, employing organisations or the society (Hall and Mirvis, 1996). In this respect, the measure of CS is not related to the hierarchical progression in one particular organisation but by the individual's marketability and employability (Viney, Adamson and Doherty, 1995), which assumes more
responsibility for the individuals in developing their skills, attitudes and behaviours.

As a construct, CS is most frequently operationalized in literature as career satisfaction (Baruch, 2004; Burke, 1999; Judge et al, 1995; Ng et al, 2005). It is measured by a five-item career satisfaction scale developed by Greenhaus et al., (1990). The scale generally has an acceptable level of internal consistency. However, an important point to note, is that the standardized CS scales with items measuring the respondents’ satisfaction with hierarchical success (e.g. Peluchette and Jeanquart, 2000) or job advancement (e.g. Greenhaus et al., 1990) are likely to be of limited relevance to the people who work on temporary contracts, run their own business or value other features of their career such as services and companionships (Heslin, 2005). Apart from that, career measures are also affected by the individuals' career orientation or the new concepts of multiple careers, protean career and boundaryless careers (e.g. Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Hall, 1996a).

The measure of CS might also be influenced by culture. According to Aumann and Ostroff (2006), organisations in similar cultural contexts are likely to develop similar human resources practices (HRM) which might impact the way individuals measure CS. Kats et al., (2010) studied the influence of Hofstede's (1980) five dimensions of national culture on the employees' CS. They explained that individualism verses collectivism orientation of the group might have an important role in the level and type of relationships in the organisation which
might affect the individuals' CS. For example, individuals in a Western culture might be influenced by the Western individualistic culture characterised by loose ties among their members and low power distance (House et al., 2004, Hofstede, 2001; Ho and Nesbit, 2013). Within such context, CS might be viewed in different terms than the collectivistic cultures of the Arab countries in which CS is not always based on efficiency, but rather on networking (Safer et al., 2013) and family connections. Another example of cultural influence is related to the masculinity-feminity (Hofstede, 1980; 1991) dimensions of culture. Women in highly masculine societies are likely to encounter greater discrimination against them. Therefore, they are likely to enter the labour market with lower expectations than women in more feminine cultures. Therefore, in terms of both self-referent and other-referent criteria for CS, women in highly masculine cultures are likely to gauge success differently than women in highly feminine cultures (Heslin, 2005).

2.2.4.1. Objective career success:

This type is the more traditional form of CS that was sometimes referred to as career satisfaction by vocational psychologists. It evaluates success by objective, extrinsic and tangible measures using verifiable criteria that are considered by the external people, society and organisations as success criteria (Gattiker and Larwood, 1988; Judge and Bretz, 1994). Example of objective measures include the salary, managerial level (Rowley, 2013), promotions (Greenhaus, 2003;
Melamed, 1996; Whitely, Dougherty and Dreher, 1994), profession, role, tasks, type of work, career progression and the status associated with the person's position or hierarchal level. Among those, salary growth (Hilton and Dill, 1962) is considered as the most important criteria against which individuals evaluate their own CS (Gerhart and Mikovich, 1989; 1992; Markham, Harlan and Hackett, 1987). However, Thorndike (1963) stated that objective criteria of CS have limited meaning when pay and promotions are institutionalized such as in civil service and military organisations. Apart from that, they are not the only outcomes that people seek from their careers; many people also seek less tangible, subjective outcomes such as the balance between their work and life, and the sense of meaning and purpose from their work that would provide them with more satisfaction and happiness (Heslin, 2005).

2.2.4.2. Subjective career success:

Subjective career success (CS) is defined by the individuals’ reactions to their career experience and their evaluation of their career (De Vos and Soens, 2008; Volmer and Spurk, 2011) based on their subjective judgments and how they feel about what they consider as accomplishments in their career, according to psychological criteria. Judge et al., (1999) argue that the individuals who are dissatisfied with many aspects of their jobs are unlikely to consider their careers to be successful. Therefore, subjective measures may detect important career outcomes that are not attainable and assessable in personal records or by expert
raters (Gattiker and Larwood, 1988). Baruch and Bozionelos (2010) have argued that subjective CS is of particular importance during the times when careers are decelerating or stagnating in the objective measures of organisations or societies. If organisations are unable of providing enough means for objective success, they could still retain good employees by increasing their efforts in subjective success criteria.

2.2.5. Turnover intention:

Turnover intention refers to the conscious and deliberate wilfulness to leave the organisation (Tett and Meyer, 1993). It is also described as a motive to leave a job voluntary (Mobley, 1977). According to Vandenberg and Nelson (1999), the intention to quit refers to the subjective norms affecting an employee to turnover from the current job to another one in the near future. Based on that, an employees' intention to leave the organisation includes a mere thinking of resigning and a declaration of the desire to leave the job as a result of dissatisfaction with the job or certain elements of it. Turnover intention is not explicit; it is a subjective probability that an individual will change his/her job within a certain period of time (Sousa-Poza and Henneberger, 2002).

Several studies (e.g. Fox and Fallon, 2003; Hom and Hulin, 1981; Mobley, 1982; Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth, 1978; Newman, 1974; Tett and Meyer, 1993; Hwang and Kuo, 2006) have demonstrated a moderate to strong correlation between turnover intentions and actual turnover (Ucho et al.,
2012). The relationship between the two constructs could be looked at in the light of the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) of Ajzen (1988; 1991). The theory suggests that behavioural intentions predict actual behaviours (Martin and Roodt, 1999). In other words, the individual’s intention to engage in a specific behaviour is the close predictor of that behaviour. According to the TPB, human actions are guided by three kinds of considerations: (1) behavioural beliefs which refer to the beliefs about the likely consequences of certain behaviours, (2) normative beliefs that include beliefs about the normative expectations of others, (3) control beliefs that refer to the beliefs about the presence of certain factors that may facilitate or impede the performance of a certain behaviour. The combination of the three considerations leads to the formation of behavioural intentions.

Turnover has been divided into two types; voluntary and involuntary (Price and Mueller, 1986). Voluntary turnover occurs when the employee decides to leave the job whereas the involuntary turnover happens when the employee is removed from his or her job by the employer (Aldhuwaihi et al., 2013) or having to leave the job for retirement or other reasons. According to March and Simon (1958), employee’s turnover results from the individual’s perception about the perceived desirability and ease of movement. They summarized the employee’s turnover literature into three broad categories comprising: process models, socialization models and expended models (Maertz and Campion, 2004). Process models emphasize the sequential steps that lead the employee to quit his/her job and the process through which the/she reaches the final decision to quit. These
models tend to concentrate on the antecedents of turnover, such as the scope of the job, group cohesion, procedural justice, organisational rewards, training and career development opportunities, and the overall support provided by the organisation to the employee (Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli, 2001; Allen, Shore and Griffeth, 2003). The second category includes the socialization models (Feldman, 1976; Fisher, 1986; Allen and Meyer, 1990) which associate the individual characteristics with the organisational processes of socialization (Peterson, 2004). They emphasise that the culture of the organisation is a predictor of how well the employees can adjust to and function in the organisational environment. The third type comprises the expanded models that were essentially process models but extended to cover multidimensional organisational factors (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982) and some confounding variables such as the industry nature, size and cost control that could influence the individuals' turnover decisions.

Among the several turnover models introduced in organisational literature, two models are related to the current study to a large extent. The first was developed by Mobley et al., (1977) based on the linkage between the employee satisfaction and quitting through four stages: thinking of quitting, searching for another job, intention to quit and actually quitting. In this model, turnover intention is considered as the final cognitive variable with an immediate casual effect on actual turnover (Bedeian et al., 1991). The second model was developed by Peterson (2004). It emphasizes the role of the organisational human resources
development practices and other internal factors over which the organisation has substantial control. This model focuses on the level of the organisational training and development opportunities provided to the employees, which can play a critical role in their retention or turnover decisions. According to Ram and Prabhakar (2010), the employees’ withdrawal behaviours could take two forms; physical or psychological. The physical form of withdrawal is to quit the job and leave, while the psychological withdrawal entails thinking about quitting as well as talking about it with others (Ferris et al., 1989). For those who have the luxury of job mobility, leaving the organisation is an option (Mobley et al., 1979) that they might consider. However with the limited job mobility and alternatives, psychological turnover becomes a better option.

As explained earlier, turnover intention is usually followed by actual turnover, which indicates a breach in the relationship between the employee and his/her employer organisation (Chang, 1999) that results in the separation or exit. This leads to a significant amount of direct and indirect costs to the organisation as well as the individual, especially when there are no alternatives available. For organisations, turnover reduces productivity, disrupts teams, raises costs and results in the loss of knowledge which affects the overall organisational effectiveness and firm success (Mitchell et al., 2001). It also creates disruption in the operations resulting from losing key skills, knowledge and experience that might not be easily replaced in the short term (Ponnu and Chuah, 2010). Furthermore, it entails direct costs connected with recruitment, selection and
training of new employees (Loi, Hang-yue and Foley, 2006; Kumar, Ramendran and Yacob, 2012). Hence, employees leaving the organisation or intending to leave cost organisations substantially (Moussa, 2013), which makes retaining talented employees one of the major challenges that organisations have to face (Suliman and Al Obaidli, 2011).

Several factors were identified as predictors of employees’ turnover intentions. Those might include demographics, employees' attitudes and the organisational human resource practices. Demographic factors include gender, age, organisational tenure, the educational level and family size (Adenguga et al., 2013). Chen and Francesco (2000) found that age and tenure display a consistently negative relationship with turnover intentions. Thatcher and colleagues (2002) found that the level of turnover is higher among the female than male workers. In a study conducted in the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Suliman and Al Obaidi (2011) found that the employees' perceptions of the corporate climate play a significant role in the rate of staff turnover.

2.3. Predictors of employees’ perceptions and work outcomes:

Two variables were selected to be tested as predictors for organisational justice and politics, and work outcomes; namely the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX), and the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD). The main reason for selecting these two variables is the possibility of considering them as referential points or proxies for two major players in the
individual's work experience which include the organisational leadership model and career management practices.

2.3.1. Leader-member exchange (LMX):

Before looking into leader-member exchange (LMX) as a predictor of other variables, it is important to look into the development of LMX as a leadership model and its relationship with other leadership models. The following section will provide the theoretical and empirical foundation of the LMX theory within the leadership literature.

2.3.1.1. Leader-member exchange (LMX) as a leadership model:

Leadership is described as the ability of an individual to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organisation of which they are members (House and Javidan, 2004). It involves a social influence process in which a person steers the members of the group towards a common goal (Bryman, 1996). In an organisational context, leadership is viewed as a prime force that may determine the organisational competitiveness in a global economy (Bass and Avolio, 1993, 1994; Bryman, 1992).

The concept of leadership has attracted an extensive body of research; it has been widely conceptualized and tested in several research areas, such as behavioural psychology, business management and military studies which has resulted in a variety of definitions for the concept of ‘leadership’ (Truckenbrodt,
2000). In this respect, Stogdill (1974:7) noted that “there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as the persons who have attempted to define the concept”. One of the remarkable changes in the definition of leadership is related to the shift from the traits of leaders to the styles of leadership adopted by leaders. Early theories have emphasized that some individuals are born with the quality to lead, describing them as ‘born leaders’. Those theories focused primarily on the leaders’ effective traits and behaviours (e.g. Fiedler and Chemers, 1974) and sometimes extended to cover the characteristics of the followers, contexts or the combination of those factors (Kaminskas, Bartkus and Pilinkus, 2011). Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) divided the leadership models into four categories each of which represents an area of development within the leadership research: (1) the traditional models, such as the behavioural approaches focus mainly on the leader’s traits or characteristics, (2) the models that focus on the followers, such as the empowerment approaches, (3) the models, that incorporate a combination of multiple domains, such as the situational approach that addresses the combination of the leader, follower and relationships, and (4) the relational models that focus on relationships. Among the four types, the LMX theory falls under the relational models which emphasize that effective leadership occurs when the leaders and followers are able of developing relationships or partnerships that benefit them (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1991), as well as the organisation.
As mentioned earlier, the LMX model focuses on the different leadership styles. It argues that leaders might change their leadership styles according to the group, task, situation and the nature of the interpersonal relationships between them and their followers (Truckenbrodt, 2000). The LMX theory acknowledges that the leaders’ personal characteristics, traits, behaviours and situational styles can influence their relationships with their followers. However, it considers that the two-way relationship and interaction (a dyadic exchange) between the leaders and their subordinates are important factors for effective leadership in any organisation. By doing that, the LMX brings to the forth the importance of communication (Kaminskas et al., 2011) and emphasizes that efficient leadership takes place when the communication between the leader and subordinates is based on mutual trust, respect, understanding and commitment. According to Gerstner and Day (1997), LMX is the only leadership theory that focuses on the workplace relationships and specifically the dyadic relationship between the leader and his/her subordinates. It considers the two-way relationship as a fundamental link between the leader's behaviour and the follower's attitudinal and behavioural reactions (Asgari et al., 2008).

When the LMX theory was first introduced, it was described as path-breaking (Dulebohn et al., 2012) because the traditional leadership theories have mainly focused on the leader’s traits and characteristics (Gerstner and Day, 1997) whereas, the LMX theory suggests that leaders have different leadership styles and various levels of relationships with their followers (Cogliser and Schriesheim,
Based on that, they interact differently with each follower, and in doing so, they determine the type and level of their relationship with each one of them (Ilies, Nahrgang and Morgeson, 2007). In other words, the theory focuses on a dyad or a relationship between a leader and each subordinate independently, rather than focusing on a uniformed relationship between the leader and the whole group of followers or subordinates. Each relationship is likely to differ in its quality; thus, the same leader might have poor interpersonal relations with some subordinates in contrast to open and trusting relations with others.

Among the different styles, two major leadership styles were identified by researchers; transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Odumeru and Ifeanyi, 2013). Both types focus on the relationship between the leaders and their subordinates but they differ in their approach. The transactional leadership style is task-based; it focuses on the tangible incentives that are given for the completion of tasks and other high in-role activities in which recognition and approval are offered for performance. In that sense, transactional leaders give things of value to their followers in return for things of value to the leader (Vigoda-Gadot and Beeri, 2011). Transformational leaders, on the other hand, focus on motivating their followers through nonmaterial incentives and intangible rewards by using the organisational culture to align their subordinates' interests and preferences with their vision (Kotter, 1999). They also enhance the formation of high quality relationships with their subordinates and create a sense of common fate with each one of them (Deluga, 1992). Therefore, it could be argued that the
outcomes associated with transformational leaderships result from the individualized dyadic relationship between the leader and each subordinate independently, which is the baseline of the LMX model of leadership.

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) discussed the nature of LMX and how it fits into the transactional/transformational leadership theory. They explained that at the initial stage of the LMX development, economic exchanges are important in building up good quality LMX which is a transactional relationship stage. However trust, loyalty and respect are essential to maintain a stable relationship between a leader and a member of the group. Thus, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) argue that LMX may lay between transactional and transformational leaderships but the essential nature of LMX is transformational (Leow and Khong, 2009). This argument is supported by other researchers who found transformational leadership to be more related to LMX (Gupta and Krishnan, 2004). For example, in a study conducted recently in Egypt, Shusha (2013) found that both transformational leadership and LMX had a positive impact on job performance in addition to a partially mediating power of LMX on the relationship between transformational leadership and job performance which refers to the similarity between the effects of the two leadership models on performance.

According to Yukl (2006) there are two fundamentally distinct types of leadership; the first is the specialized role within the organisation and it refers to the non-shared functions, in which the leader is the person who occupies the supervisor's or manager's position in the organisation, and the followers are
his/her subordinates. The second type refers to leadership as an influence process between individuals that offers guidance and way forward (Kelloway and Barling, 2010). It describes leadership as a process of social influence, in which anyone in a group or a team can demonstrate leadership styles or behaviours without any regard to the organisational hierarchy or the context in which they operate. Yukl (2006) noted that the majority of leadership research has focused on the second type of leadership and identified the behaviours or styles that constitute effective leadership within a social influence norm. The present study looks into the first type of leaders which refers to the person who occupies the position of the supervisor or manager in the organisation. It looks into his/her impact on the followers' perceptions and work outcomes based on the power and authority provided to him/her by the organisation to reward or punish his/her followers. The term ‘leader’ is used to refer to the manager, supervisor or superior, and the term ‘follower’ is used to refer to the subordinates within their role or position in the organisational structure.

After discussing the literature relevant to LMX within the leadership context and the main areas of difference and similarities between LMX as a leadership model and other leadership models, the following section will look into the literature related to the development of the LMX theory.

2.3.1.2. The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory:
The leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Graen, 1976; Graen and Scandura, 1987) was described as a pattern of mutually contingent exchanges of gratification between two parties with a belief in reciprocity under a generalized moral norm within the organisation (Gouldner, 1960). It was also described as the quality of the dyadic relationship that develops between an employee and his/her supervisor in terms of the interrelated dimensions of respect, trust and mutual obligation (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). The LMX was also defined as the quality of the exchange relationships between leaders and employees in organisations (Graen, Dansereau and Minami, 1972). These definitions look at leadership within the LMX model, as a two way exchange between the leader and subordinates; not at the leader alone and his/her traits and characteristics.

Over the past four decades, studies in this field have expanded rapidly and several other definitions were offered by LMX researchers as the theory develops into a significant area of scientific inquiry and empirical research in organisational sciences (Dulebohn et al., 2012). Schriesheim et al., (1999) examined 13 studies published by Graen and his colleagues over a period of 10 years and noted that the researchers continued to define LMX as the quality of exchange between a leader and followers. However, there were 18 sub-dimensions describing the quality of LMX, including trust, competence, motivation, assistance and support, understanding latitude, confidence, consideration, delegation, innovativeness, talent, expertise, control of organisational resources and mutual control. The
researchers also reviewed 37 dissertations and research papers and reported that there were 11 different theoretical definitions associated with LMX and 35 different sub-content elements. Based on those results, they concluded that “a decade after the inception of LMX theory, there was still so much disagreement as to the basic definition of the LMX construct, as well as no clear or consistent direction provided about where or how to proceed in developing the theory” (p.76).

Research looked into the LMX theory from three perspectives: (1) the social exchange perspective, (2) the role perspective (Graen, 1976; 2003; Kahn et al., 1964) and (3) the attraction or affection perspective. The social exchange theory was originated by Blau (1964) and continued under the vertical dyad linkage (VDL) by Graen and others (e.g. Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen and Cashman, 1975; Johnson and Graen, 1973). It describes the dyadic relationship between the leader and followers, and emphasizes the reciprocal influence processes taking place within the work unit (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden et al., 1997; Bernerth et al., 2008). In this respect, it is important to note that social exchanges were distinguished from economic exchanges (Blau, 1964). They are long-term, informal, involve less tangible resources and do not specify the time frame or the nature of the expected returns (Wayne et al., 2002; Erdogan and Liden, 2002; Kamdar and Van Dyne, 2007; Liao, Liu and Loi, 2010; Wayne and Green, 1993). Work relationships that are built on social rather than economic exchanges are characterized by loyalty, commitment, support and trust (Cropanzano and
Mitchell, 2005; Uhl-Bien and Maslyn, 2003), while economic exchanges are described as short-term, based on formally agreed on, instant and balanced reciprocation of tangible awards. A relevant example of economic exchanges is the employment contracts that focus on pay for performance (Blau, 1964) where high performance ensures high pay and an increase in the financial awards and allowances.

The second perspective within the LMX literature followed the role theory (Graen, 1976; Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Graen and Scandura, 1987), which states that the members of the organisation accomplish their work through roles or sets of behaviours that are expected from the position holders within the organisation (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). The roles are not solely determined by written job descriptions or other formal documents; they are developed through informal role making processes that are agreed among the group members. For example, the leader/manager delegates the resources and responsibilities necessary to accomplish certain tasks or duties. Based on that, the followers who perform well in their tasks will be perceived by the supervisor as more reliable. Consequently, they will be asked to perform more demanding roles (Dienesch and Linden, 1986) and given more important responsibilities. The leader will reciprocate (Madlock et al. 2007) through several positive ways, such as giving them better job assignments, greater access to him/her (Ariani, 2012), and closer relationship with him/her. They also receive more support, formal and informal rewards, benefits and development opportunities. In exchange, those
subordinates will continue contributing expertise and devotion to the work (Blau, 1964; Kelley and Thibaut, 1978; Gouldner, 1960; Tayler and Lind, 1992) which will eventually benefit the leader. During this process, leaders develop different levels of exchange relationships with their subordinates (Danseriau et al., 1975; Graen and Cashman, 1975; Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982) and exhibit different leadership styles (Yukl, 1994). An important point to consider within the role framework is that roles are agreed, developed and negotiated (Dienesch and Liden, 1986) informally between the leader and followers; they are not written or documented. Therefore if the role is ambiguous, it may have a negative impact on the quality of the exchange between them.

The third LMX perspective looked into the attraction, affect or liking between the leader and followers (Barbuto and Gifford, 2012). Researchers identified several reasons for affect between a leader and a follower. One of them is the mutual reciprocation of rewards that would attract individuals in a relationship to each other (Newcomb, 1956). Another reason is the similarity (Byrne, 1971) between the two individuals that can also enhance affect and liking between them (Barbuto and Gifford, 2012). In other words, when a leader and a follower share the same attitudes, opinions or even demographic characteristics such as age, gender, nationality or ethnicity, their relationship would be stronger and more positive. The degree of variance in the relationships within the work unit could be explained on a continuum (Figure 2.1) suggested by Phillips and Bedeian (1994). The continuum shows that the relationships are ranging from high to low quality.
At one end, there is high quality exchanges characterised by affect, loyalty and professional respect and other positive attitudes and behaviours (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Maslyn and Uhl-Bien, 2001; Uhl-Bien, Graen and Scandura, 2000; Uhl-Bien and Maslyn, 2003), while at the other end there is low quality relationships characterized by low levels of mutual trust, respect and obligation and other negative attitudes and behaviours. The quality of the relationship results in some employees enjoying higher-quality or good exchanges with the leader, while others suffering lower-quality or bad exchanges (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen and Cashman, 1975; Graen, 1976) with him/her.

**Figure 2.1:**

![Figure 2.1: The LMX relationships shown on a continuum ranging from high to low quality (Phillips & Bedeian, 1994)](image)

Consequently, two groups will be formed; the ‘in-group and ‘out-group’ (Dansereau et al. 1975; Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982; Madlock et al. 2007). Each group will have its own characteristics that are different from the other. The ‘in-group’ is characterised by high levels of reciprocal trust, respect, loyalty, emotional support (Ariani, 2012), voice (Yrle, Hartman and Galle, 2002) and a high degree of mutual dependence (Yukl, 2001; Dienesch and Liden, 1986)
with the leader. This group is sometimes referred to as the ‘trusted assistants’ who are committed to the leader and enhance his/her effectiveness (Bezuijen et al., 2010). On the contrary, the ‘out-group’ is characterised by mistrust, low respect and lack of loyalty (Dansereau, Graen and Haga, 1975; Graen et al., 1982; Landen and Graen, 1980; Scandura and Graen, 1984; Vacchio, 1982; Deluga, 1998). Subordinates belonging to this group are almost disliked by the leader; they get less attention and fewer acknowledgements from him/her and their relationship with him/her involves basic exchanges that typify the basic employment contract (Bezuijen et al., 2010). They perform the more routine, ordinary tasks of the unit and their exchange with the leader is more formal (Linden and Graen, 1980) and based on economic rather than social measures. The variance in the levels of the exchange relationship between the leader and followers will alter the outcomes for both of them (Avolio et al., 2009; Dulebohn et al., 2012; Greguras and Ford, 2006; Hooper and Martin, 2008). Due to the leaders’ workload, they can manage their teams more effectively by establishing good relationships with a few selected followers who carry on the important tasks of the work unit and act as the leaders’ ‘lieutenants’ or ‘trusted assistants’ during their absence (Dansereau et al., 1975). Good relationships might also result in a more efficient use of the leader’s limited time and resources (Hooper and Martin, 2008). However, this situation raises several questions about the effective utilization of the whole group. A major downside of this arrangement is that, when leaders divide their subordinates into one highly effective group and another less effective (Lunenburg, 2010), they may
undermine their own power and effectiveness. The highly effective group perceive high support from the leader and based on that reciprocate by engaging in actions that benefit him/her, the organisation and the work unit (Ilies et al., 2007). As a result, the leader will feel a sense of obligation to reciprocate those actions (Bernerth et al., 2008) through more positive performance appraisals (Duarte, Goodson and Klich, 1994) and better career progression opportunities (Wakabayasi et al., 1988), which will increase the level of job satisfaction, in-role performance and citizenship behaviours. On the contrary, the differential treatment will lead the other group members to make social comparisons that will impact their self-concept and perceptions of fairness and eventually their relationship with the leader, the other team members and the whole organisation (Buunk et al., 1990; Masterson et al., 2000; Sinclair, 2003). Previous research has highlighted the impact of high quality LMX on several employees’ attitudinal and behavioural outcomes such as lower levels of turnover intentions and higher levels of job satisfaction (e.g., Volmer et al., 2011), performance (e.g., Moss et al., 2009) citizenship behaviours (Ilies, Nahrgang and Morgeson, 2007), organisational commitment (Leow and Khong, 2009) and career success (Yan-Ping and Yi-Dong, 2010).

Similar to other organisational research, the initial and majority of LMX research took place in Western countries. However, recently a wide range of cross-cultural studies covered different cultures and nations in Asia and other parts of the world that have different cultural characteristics, specifically in
relation to the collectivistic-individualistic and power distance characteristics (Obeidat et al., 2012). Some behaviours and attitudes expressed by leaders appear to be different between cultures (Bass, 1997). For example, collectivistic cultures, such as Arab culture, are characterised by trust and loyalty with strong ties and close relationships between their members. Individuals in those cultures share similar behaviours and values and are more dependent on the group rather than on individuals (Hofstede, 2001). In this type of culture, high quality LMX could be described as a characteristic of culture rather than a leadership style.

2.3.2. The corporate succession planning and career development:

The second antecedent selected to be tested in this study is the organisational career management practices including succession planning and career development (SPCD). These two elements will be tested collectively as one construct because of the strong relationship between them and their impact on the employees as well as the organisation. Starting with succession planning (SP), research publications in this area could be divided into two main streams; one of them tackles the processes connected to the inheritance of family businesses and the appointments of successors and heirs to run the business. The other stream deals with the SP processes incorporated within the organisational human resources management practices and aim to satisfy the organisations' needs of leadership continuity. This stream will be dealt with in this study without any reference to the other type of SP.
The corporate/organisational SP refers to the deliberate and systematic efforts by an organisation to ensure leadership continuity in key positions to retain and develop intellectual and knowledge capital for the future (Rowthwell, 2010). In its broadest sense, SP can be defined as the formal or informal process of preparing future leaders for executive positions (Karaevli and Hall, 2003). As an area of research interest, Henri Fayol (1841-1925) was the first to introduce the concept of organisational SP (Rothwell, 1994). He placed high importance on SP and noted that if SP needs were ignored, organisations would not be prepared to make the necessary transitions among their leadership personnel. However, the organisation’s interest in SP did not start till the late 1960s when large organisations started to incorporate formal SP methods within their human resources practices. This included assessing the performance and potential of a group of talented employees, planning their movements through the organisation and establishing detailed career development plans for them in order to take key positions in the organisation.

Over the years, SP took various forms; one of them is the traditional or bureaucratic SP that took the shape of a strategy of loss or replacement. It entailed the grooming of a small number of replacements for top executives positions in the organisation; typically with one replacement per position. Those forms of SP could be described as risk management efforts that aimed to limit the chances of the catastrophic consequences of the immediate, unplanned loss of key job incumbents (Rothwell, 2005). Within this framework, researchers identified two
approaches for SP; the ‘Crown Prince’ approach and the ‘Horse Race’ approach. In the first approach, only one successor was identified and appointed in each vacant position without any consideration for other possible candidates (Guthrie and Datta, 1997) who could be more suitable for the target position. In most cases, successors were not chosen based on their performance level or their ability to implement certain strategies that benefit the organisation, but on the basis of their seniority, similarity to the incumbents or their close relationships with them. Referring back to the previous section on LMX, it could be assumed that a manager might select one of his in-group followers as his successor. This assumption is supported by Ferris and Judge (1991) and Ferris and King, (1991) who argued that managers prefer colleagues who display similarities with themselves (Gilmore and Ferris, 1989) because this similarity facilitates the process of network building and strengthens their power base (Bozionelos, 2005). Furthermore, in a collectivistic culture, like the Arab culture, relationships and networking play significant roles in selecting successors that are most of the time family members or people with high connections in the organisation.

Regarding the ‘Horse Race’ approach, individuals participate either willingly or unwillingly into a race or a competition for a higher position. Winning the race will be mainly based on their past performance, achievements and the recommendations made about them by their previous supervisors. Consequently, successors are appointed in the new positions without appropriate training or preparation for their new roles.
A more recent approach to SP is the systematic human resources succession planning (HRSP). This approach integrates the different organisational human resources processes such as recruitment, retention efforts, performance appraisals and career planning in one comprehensive process that is integrated in the organisation's strategic and business planning processes. The HRSP enables organisations to have a continuous supply of individuals to occupy vacancies in key positions created by the absence, departure, death, retirement or termination of previous incumbents. The HRSP identifies the skill gaps and prepares individuals to fill those gaps (Melymuka, 2002) instead of waiting for key positions to be vacant and then selecting candidates who might not be fully aware of the organisation's needs and culture. Hence, HRSP provides the organisation with a tool for the continuity of culture and the development of the skills necessary to run the business (Blaskey, 2002; Schein, 1999) while developing the individuals and preparing them for further career growth in their organisation.

Rothwell (2010) suggests three components that are essential for the corporate SP; first, the selection of candidates based on their previous experience and background within the formation of the pre-selected organisational talent pools. In this process, the organisational decision makers ensure the availability of alternative potential successors for each position with multiple potential promotion paths for each talent or candidate (Byham, Smith and Paese, 2002) covering all the critical positions in the organisation. The second component is the development processes of the selected successors, and the third component
includes the promotion opportunities, the fulfillment of the candidates’ development needs and the management commitment towards the process and its success. Farashah, Nasehifar and Karahrudi (2011) provided a summary of the best practices in SP as stated by previous researchers (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: Best practices of succession planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Succession planning process component</th>
<th>Best practices</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process &amp; change management</td>
<td>• Top management participation and support</td>
<td>Levy (2002), conger &amp; Fulmer (2003), Rothwell (2010); Karaevli &amp; Hull (2003); Diamond (2006); Ibarra (2005); Waymon (2005), Jarrel et al., (2007); Greer &amp; Virick (2008); Wolfred (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting specific goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measuring real progress against goals regularly, and defining correction plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Designing SP based on internal needs assessment and external benchmarking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centralized structure and formal approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having full time responsible person for SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Details SP planning including work breakdown and schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation of personal development of successors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budgeting of SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Considering motivations and rewards for successors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Considering motivations and rewards for mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linking SP to business strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of successors</td>
<td>• Extend SP to all organisational levels</td>
<td>Christie (2005); Diamond (2006); Burns-Martin (2002); Byham et al., (2002); Larson (2005); Diamond (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of critical positions and prioritizing them in SP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Periodical evaluation of employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishing performance appraisal systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of successors</td>
<td>• Establishing a system for employees competency gap analysis</td>
<td>Greer and Virick (2008); Palton &amp; Pratt (2002); Ingraham &amp; Getha Tylor (2004); Grove (2007); Saungweme &amp; Naicker (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishing a system to discover employee potentials vs. current performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing career and personal development plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishing system of identification of future job competencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linking SP to training plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linking SP to personal interests and careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extensive use of on the job training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Career workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Farashah, Nasehifar & Karahrudi (2011)
Career development is the second component of the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) process dealt with in this study. It refers to the long term personal and professional growth of individuals (London, 1993). At the organisational level, career development programs refer to the organised learning experiences provided by the employers to enhance the employees’ performance (Nadler and Nadler, 1989) and to maintain their effectiveness, while at the same time enabling them to move to other jobs in the organisation (Tansky and Cohen, 2001). In this respect, career development involves organised, formalized and planned efforts to achieve a balance between the individuals’ career needs and the organisation’s workforce requirements (Leibowitz and Kaye, 1986; Lips-Wiersma and Hall, 2007; Gutteridge et al., 1993).

Traditionally, career development was considered as a crucial part of the organisational human resources management practices (HRMP) that aimed to motivate employees for career enrichment and desired performance in the organisation (Nadler and Nadler, 1989). Such programs were believed to help organisations better utilize their employees' skills and knowledge and at the same time serve as important tools for retaining good employees (Eisenberger et al., 1986). As a result, employees were tied to their organisations with a psychological contract (Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Hall and Moss, 1998). Within the framework of that contract, full time permanent workers gave their loyalty to one organisation in exchange for job security, lifetime employment and generous pension plans that ensured high financial security. There was a trust between the
organisation and the employees that made them prefer to stay and rarely think of quitting their jobs voluntarily. They had a sense of pride in being associated with their organisation for a long time and many of them believed that they had a reciprocal obligation that exceeded the formal responsibilities of both parties. The organisation was responsible of taking care of the employees’ career growth took a primitive and a dominant role in developing them (Nadler and Nadler, 1989) and improving their skills.

However, the views towards career has changed with the emergence of the new career models. The majority of career research has moved beyond the organisation to focus on more flexible, individual career models (Baruch and Peiperl, 2000) in which individuals had a major role and an increasing responsibility for their own career development; they became less dependent on and almost separate from the organisational career management practices. This stream of research defines ‘career’ as a development process of an individual along a path of different work experiences and jobs in one or more organisations (Baruch and Rosenstein, 1992; Defillippi and Arther, 1994; Waterman, Waterman and Collard, 1994; Hall and Mirvis, 1996). Within this framework, individuals can have multiple careers of their own choice instead of one career with one employer (Baruch, 2003). Consequently, careers became more open, diverse and less controlled by the employers. Also new and more flexible individual career approaches such as the boundaryless, protean and post-corporate were introduced (Athur, Inkson and Pringle, 1999; Baruch and Peiperl, 2000; Hall, Zhu and Yan,
2002) which shifted the responsibility of career from the organisation to the individual.

Those changes in career perspectives could be attributed to the recent economic, social and environmental changes (Altman and Baruch, 2012) that affected the organisational career development programs. Based on that, employment contracts moved from the long term relational contracts (Hall, Briscoe and Kram, 1997) to short term transactional contracts (Rousseau, 1990) that give organisations more control on the quality and quantity of their workforce. However, the downside of such contracts is that organisations do not expect a high level of commitment or loyalty from their employees simply because the individuals become more concerned with their own career and detach from their current organisations whenever they get a better opportunity elsewhere which affected the organisation's competitive advantage to some extent. However, the impact was less negative when organisations adopted career development strategies that are linked to the employees' career development plans (Ferris et al., 1999). Such strategies would be interpreted as a sign of the organisation's care and support (Tan, 2008). Individuals can achieve better status, job flexibility, intrinsic and extrinsic awards, better opportunities for internal movements, continual growth, increased skills and abilities, better personal and professional development opportunities and more pleasant working conditions (Rousseau and Aquino, 1993). In return, organisations may expect their employees to reciprocate through certain attitudes that benefit the organisation, such as higher levels of
devotion (Chang, 1999), commitment, loyalty, performance and citizenship behaviours. For example, the organisation's staff training events incorporated within the corporate career development initiatives are identified amongst the most important dimensions of the corporate culture that are likely to have remarkable impact on the employees’ behaviours and attitudes (Recardo and Jolly, 1997). They were found to affect the employees’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Apart from that, the availability of highly adaptable pre-trained workers who are engaged in on-going organisational professional development (Garafano and Salas, 2005; Noe et al., 2008) is considered as the best tool for organisations to achieve a competitive advantage (Barney, 1986; Whitner et al., 1998) and address the recent global competition and technological advancements (Tzafrir et al., 2004).

Career literature suggests that the corporate career development represents a form of partnership and mutual commitment between the organisation and the individual (Sturges et al., 2002). Lips-Wiersma and Hall (2007) suggest an ongoing development systems and long term career progression events to help employees identify their skills, values and interests, and seek out career alternatives that fit into their career goals and plans (Baruch and Rosenstein, 1992), and at the same time, aligning them with the strategic direction of the organisation (Table 2.2). As the employees move towards satisfying their personal career goals, the task of the organisation would be to help them align those efforts towards achieving the organisation's goals. Accordingly, the employees’ skills and
Table 2.2: Individual and organisational responsibility in career development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual responsibility</th>
<th>Organisational responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a proactive attitude</td>
<td>• Consequently clarify consequences of career moves, where known or anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set personal long and short term goals</td>
<td>• Provide opportunities to learn new skills such as secondments and project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seek skill enhancement opportunities, such as secondments and project management</td>
<td>• Offer training that provides employees with transferable skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volunteer for training opportunities that result in transferable skills</td>
<td>• Provide training and job opportunities that create networks which support employee and organisational knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess consequences of specialized vs generalized career</td>
<td>• Reassess the balance between providing clarity on career rules and overly bureaucratizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realistically assess the impact of current career choices e.g. specialist career, need for security, future employability, and take some responsibility for past career choices</td>
<td>• Ensure employees remain employable by continuing to update their skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider early on the career the skills and the attitudes that are needed to remain employable</td>
<td>• Realistically assess who is benefiting from the new career rules, the individual and/or the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discover how the individual’s career goals can support the strategic plan of the organisation and communicate this when going for resources or upward/sideway job change</td>
<td>• Replace the old contract with a new contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess whether the individual's career aspiration can be supported by available resources</td>
<td>• Clarify how new career rules link to capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decide whether the organisational culture is suitable for the individual’s career aspirations and how to make the culture work for them</td>
<td>• Ensure all employees receive strategic education so they understand how their career plans are or are not aligned with the strategic direction of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take opportunities to test tradition by volunteering for jobs &quot;outside the square&quot;.</td>
<td>• Decide on desired impact of previous strategic decision on the current career climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lips-wersma & Hall (2007)
abilities would be redefined as they continue learning and developing their skills to remain valuable for their organisation (Ababneh, 2013). In that sense, both the organisation and the employee share various obligations in managing the employee's career, rather than being the sole responsibility of one or the other.

The organisational career development systems allow organisations to match the skills, experience and ambitions of their employees to the corporate requirements. They also enable them to make better decisions regarding recruitment, compensation and succession planning in order to attract, retain and motivate employees, which will result in more engaged and productive workforce (Kapel and Shephered, 2004).

An important point that needs to be highlighted is the debate among researchers about the future of the corporate career management programs. The debate is based on whether organisations should continue their traditional role in organizing career development activities or not. In this regard, Lips-Wiersma and Hall (2007) suggests two future scenarios; the first suggests that organisations should withdraw completely from all the career management activities and leave the responsibility to the individuals to manage their own career in addition to the needs of their organisations without any input from the organisations, while the other scenario suggests that organisations should continue their traditional role in career management. However, it could be argued, that if the career management is left entirely to the individuals, the organisations will be in a completely subjective situation towards their current and future needs of skills which might create skill
gaps that cannot be filled effectively in the short and long terms. Therefore succession planning could be a major drive for organisations to get involved in career management activities. In this respect, the organisational career development can be considered as a means of providing the organisation with suitable candidates for future key positions that incorporates the individuals’ career concerns within the organisation's culture and the individuals' career paths within the strategic direction of the organisation. According to Conger and Fulmer (2003) studied the factors that contribute to the leaders' success or failure. They found that the main reason for certain companies to succeed in developing deep and enduring bench strength leadership, is combining succession planning and career development efforts (SPCD). They argue that within this process, succession planning becomes a highly specialized form of employee development that measures the organisation's capability of having leaders ready to take over when a need arises (Conger and Fulmer, 2003; Soonhee, 2003). With this view, SPCD becomes an ongoing process of systematically identifying, assessing and developing the organisation’s leadership. SPCD spares the organisations the expense of advertising, recruiting, selecting and training of new leaders while at the same time, preventing the leadership gaps from happening at any stage or time. The SPCD highlights the importance of the insider’s greater knowledge of the firm that is not available for the outsiders or external recruits. Such efforts allow the organisation to benefit from the insiders’ attachment and affect towards the organization, which is not the case with the outsiders. According to Simms
and Wallace (2003) the executives who have ambitions for the organisation rather than for themselves tend to be insiders rather than outsiders.

The comprehensive and integrated leadership development processes within the SPCD programs entail relevant and substantial work experience along with performance feedback, coaching, mentoring, training and formal education (Darttner and Faucette, 2003). These activities enable employees to find out the real rather than the assumed career expectations. At the same time, they help them realize the real level of their skills, values and interests, and enable them to seek out career alternatives that fit into their career goals and plans (Hall, 1996; Leibowitz et al., 1986; Baruch and Rosenstein, 1992). Apart from that, the corporate SPCD illustrate the willingness and effort of the organisation to cherish its employees and endorse their career expectations which foster their trust towards the organisation (Bates, 2002) and increase their loyalty. On the contrary, the lack of information about future career prospects might result in fear, anxiety, negative perceptions and unfavourable attitudes towards the organisation.

The model proposed in this study (Figure 2.2) for the corporate succession planning and career development programs (SPCD) is inspired by Slavenski and Buckner (1988). It is divided into three phases: (1) career orientation/counseling in which the individuals receive information about their career paths and the organisational current and future manpower needs, (2) evaluations/assessments that cover two key tasks; the first is the performance reviews that provide feedback to the employees on their skills and knowledge, and identifies the skill
and competency gaps that need to be covered properly in order for the person to move to other positions. The second is the succession planning that connects the individuals to the organisational needs of the human resources based on the results of the assessments carried out earlier and the feedback received. (3) The career development phase which entails the implementation of more visible career development strategies that serve the individuals' career aspirations and the organisational needs, including career discussions between the employees and their supervisors, further career counseling, professional and leadership development workshops and other retention initiatives that attempt to retain the suitable candidates for future key positions.

**Figure 2.2:**

The proposed model of corporate succession planning & career development, inspired by Slavenski & Buckner (1988)
Research on succession planning and career developing is generally scarce in the Arab world and the Arabian Gulf region. Very few studies have looked into this area and most of them were rather concerned with the training component only without any reference to the overall process and its impact on the employees and organisations operating in the Arabian Gulf region. Among those studies, Al-Emadi and Marquardt (2007) found a positive relationship between training and organisational commitment and a negative relationship with turnover intentions. Also, Al-Heety (2004) found a moderate positive impact of career planning and career management on job satisfaction for a sample of 190 employees of public higher education in Jordan. Shdefat (1991) found that joining a training program related to career path by public employees in Jordan impacts their job performance positively. The Qudurat study (Aon Hewitt, 2011) pointed to ‘career growth’ and ‘learning and development’ as being the top two engagement drivers for nationals, followed by ‘pay and benefits’ as the third most important driver of engagement. Thus, organisations will be compelled to move away from an over-reliance on cash that is based on compensation alone, to a richer, more balanced employment deals, where the different components of the employees’ reward packages reinforcing each other to help attract, engage and retain national talents and ultimately create sustainable value for organisations. In another study in the Arabian Gulf region, Singh, Jones and Hall (2012) noted that expatriate workers currently hold an overwhelming majority of private sector jobs across the Gulf Cooperative Council (GCC) countries. Based on that, they suggest holistic
development plans and transparent career paths to increase the national workforce. In addition to that, human resources managers should be concerned with matching the employees’ career needs with the organisation's requirements (DeCenzo and Robbins, 2010).

2.4. Perceptions of organisational justice and politics:

A ‘perception’ has been defined as the “complex process by which people select, organise and interpret sensory stimulation into a meaningful and coherent picture of the world” (Berelson and Steiner, 1964:88). It is “about receiving, selecting, acquiring, transforming and organizing the information supplied by our senses” (Barber and Legge, 1976:7). The importance of perceptions in the workplace stems from their influence on the decisions that individuals make and the outcomes of those decisions. For example, the leader’s allocation of discretionary rewards to his in-group members in a high quality LMX, might have a positive impact on the employees’ justice perceptions which will positively impact their positive work outcomes such as job satisfaction and career success. However, the discretionary treatment to the in-group members might negatively impact the justice perceptions of the out-group members and eventually lead to negative work outcomes such as turnover and other withdrawal behaviours.

2.4.1. Perceptions of organisational justice:
Perceptions of organisational justice pertain to the employees’ views of whether they are being treated fairly by the organisation (Greenberg, 1987; 1990; Moorman, 1991). Justice judgements can affect attitudes, behaviours and decisions across a wide array of social contexts (Lind et al., 1993). They can also play an important role in the way that employees respond to organisational outcomes, procedures and process (Ponnu and Chuah, 2010). For example, if the employees believe that they are treated fairly, they will be more likely to have positive attitudes about their work and their organisation. On the contrary, they may react negatively against any outcomes or processes that they might perceive as inequitable, inappropriate or unfair (Al-Zu’bi, 2010). Furthermore, employees who perceive themselves as victims of injustice may rebel and use various means to punish the source of injustice (St-Pierre and Holmes 2010).

As a field of social sciences, organisational justice was first introduced by Adams (1965) who laid the foundation for the initial work in organisational justice, and formalized equity in the exchange relationships in the ‘Equity theory’ (Karim and Rehman, 2012). Since then, considerable research has been carried out to examine the importance of organisational justice in the workplace (e.g., Roch and Shanock, 2006; Ohana, 2012; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). It has become a frequently researched topic in the fields of industrial/organisational psychology, human resources management and organisational behaviour (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997; Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani, 2009; Dabbagh,
Esfahani and Shahin, 2012) due to its central position for understanding a wide range of human attitudes and behaviours in organisations (Hartman et al., 1999).

Organisational justice was found to be related to a number of organisational variables such as organisational commitment, citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction and job performance (Dabbagh, Esfahani and Shahin, 2012; Greenberg, 1990). Also, Suliman (2007) found that employees' perceptions of organisational justice influenced their job satisfaction, which in turn affected their work performance. A recent study by Karim and Rehman, (2012) found a strong positive correlation between perceived organisational justice and organisational commitment.

Different dimensions of organisational justice were identified by researchers; among those, three were considered as the main dimensions (Figure 2.3) (e.g. Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997; Tyler and Lind, 1992; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Cohen and Keren, 2008; Karim and Rehman, 2012; Elamin and Alomaim, 2011). The first dimension is distributive justice which refers to the fairness of outcomes, the second is the procedural justice that refers to the fairness of the procedures used to determine outcomes, and the third dimension is the interactional justice. Within this dimension, two forms of justice were identified; the interpersonal justice referring to respectful treatment, and informational justice that refers to adequate and sufficient communication (Cropanzano and Folger, 1991). Literature is still not clear about the number of justice dimensions; significant differences are found between the results of the different studies. For
example, a meta-analysis conducted by Hauenstein and colleagues, (2001) of 63 studies on the relation between distributive and procedural justice showed a strong correlation between the two dimensions. Based on that, the authors suggested that organisational justice should be studied as one concept if the research design is predictive, but to study both dimensions (i.e. distributive and procedural) if the research design is exploratory (Hauenstein, McGonigle and Flinder, 2001). Ambrose and Arnaud (2005) found a correlation between distributive and procedural justice despite being accepted as distinct dimensions of the justice construct (Erdogan, 2002). Masterson et al. (2000) also illustrated procedural justice and interactional justice as distinct concepts.

**Figure 2.3:**

Organisational justice research has highlighted the importance of justice for work behaviour and motivation in Western societies (Cohen-Charash and Spector,
However, further research is still needed to find out the extent to which these findings can be generalized to non-Western contexts (Fischer et al, 2011). Leung and Stephan (2001) argued that research on organisational justice must go outside the boundaries of the Western culture to be able to develop more universal and generalizable theories. When expatriate managers make decisions, they may assume that employees in non-Western contexts react in a similar way to their decisions as would employees in their home countries. Yet, a growing cross-cultural literature has demonstrated that these assumptions are often erroneous (Gelfand, Erez and Aycan, 2007; Tsui, Nifadkar and Ou, 2007). The increasing globalization of the workplace requires that managers lead teams consisting of employees from many different cultures. Similarly, greater world-wide standardization of human resources practices means that subsidiaries in other parts of the world will need to consider the cultural differences. In response to those needs, recent studies have started to explore differences in justice effects across cultures. There is some evidence that the effects of justice are not uniformed across cultural contexts (Brockner et al., 2001; Farh, Earley and Lin, 1997; Fischer and Smith, 2006; Lam, Schaubroeck and Aryee, 2002). The following sections will review the literature related to each dimension starting with distributive justice.

2.4.1.1. Distributive justice:
Distributive justice was the first dimension of organisational justice introduced in literature and the years 1950-1975 mark the ‘distributive justice wave’ (Colquitt, Greenberg and Zapata-Phelan, 2005). It refers to the perceived fairness of processes used to make decisions that lead to the distribution of outcomes (Greenberg, 1990; Lind and Taylor, 1988) such as rewards and other benefits that employees get from their employer organisation. It focuses mainly on the equal allocation and distribution of the outcomes (Ohana, 2012) that affect the employees' motivation, well-being, performance, attitudes and behaviours.

The theory of distributive justice could be linked to two other theories; the ‘equity theory’ (Adams, 1965) and the ‘justice judgement’ (Leventhal, 1976). The ‘equity theory’ states that individuals bring to the workplace various contributions such as intensity of effort, time worked and initial training. In return, they receive certain rewards and benefits (Narcisse and Harcourt, 2008) upon which they build certain perceptions that could be positive or negative depending on how equitable those benefits are perceived. Distributive justice is, therefore, concerned with the perceptions or reactions to inequities from the point of view of the individual who receives the outcomes (Yaghoubi et al., 2012). The individuals' justice perceptions are influenced by two perspectives; the first is the individuals' evaluation of fairness through calculating a ratio between their own perceived contributions and the outcomes they receive. If they perceive that the input-outcome ratios are equivalent, they will be satisfied. On the contrary, if they perceive their personal contributions as too high in compare to the received outcomes, they will develop a
feeling of anger and bitterness (Ohana, 2012; Karim and Rehman, 2012) that might generate certain negative attitudes and reactions. The second perspective is the comparison between the individual and a coworker in relation to the input-outcome ratio as well (Narcisse and Harcourt, 2008). If they believe that the referent ratio and their ratio of input to outcome are similar, they will perceive that equity exists. However, if they believe that the referent ratio is higher, they will develop a feeling of inequity that will result in imbalance that influences certain negative attitudes such as reporting sick, stealing, or vandalism (Van Yperen et al. 2000) in contrast to the well-balanced ratios that will raise feelings of satisfaction.

The second theory is the ‘justice judgement’ (Leventhal, 1976a) which follows a rather proactive approach. This model forms a critique for the ‘equity theory’, through studying the conditions under which people employ various norms of justice in a proactive manner rather than the reactive approach of the equity theory (Adams, 1965). The model is based on the notion that people judge their deservingness to certain outcomes by using several justice rules or sets of beliefs that could be divided into three categories: (a) the contribution, (b) the equity, and (c) the needs. According to the ‘justice judgement model’, individuals are selective in evaluating the allocation procedures used by decision makers; they apply different rules at different times and their basic criteria for evaluating fairness may change in various situations (Ohana, 2012).

Distributive justice was found to be related to various positive and negative work outcomes. In a meta-analysis, Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found
significant positive relationships between distributive justice and affective commitment, performance, citizenship behaviours, job satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction and the quality of LMX. They also found significant negative relationships between distributive justice and counterproductive behaviours and turnover intentions. Those results confirm the results of previous studies that found positive relationships between distributive justice and performance, organisational commitment (e.g., Martin and Bennett, 1996; Dansereau et al, 1975; Wayne and Ferris, 1990), job satisfaction (e.g. Schaubroeck, May and Brown, 1994), and organisational citizenship behaviour (e.g. Ball, Trevino, Sims, 1994). On the contrary, negative relationships were found between distributive justice and several negative outcomes such as turnover intentions (e.g., Schaubroeck et al., 1994), theft behaviours (Greenberg, 1994) and retaliation against the organisation (Skarlicki and Folger, 1997).

After discussing the literature related to distributive justice, the next section will review the literature related to procedural justice as a second dimension of organisational justice with a view of highlighting the main areas of difference between the two dimensions.

2.4.1.2. Procedural justice:

Procedural justice refers to the employees' perceptions about the fairness of policies, procedures and processes used to make decisions by which outcomes in the workplace are determined (Greenberg, 1990; Korsgaard et al., 1995; Cohen-
Charash and Spector 2001). This might include the fairness of the rules that regulate certain processes (Nabatchi et al., 2007) such as neutrality (Tyler and Lind, 1992) and trustworthiness of the decision making authority (Tyler and Bies, 1990). It might also refer to the degree to which the rules stated in the organisational policies and procedures are properly followed (Milkovich and Newman, 1996). In a nutshell, procedural justice refers to the means rather than the ends. For example, distributive justice suggests that satisfaction is a function of an outcome while procedural justice looks at satisfaction as a function of a process (Yaghoubi, 2012).

The years 1975-1995 mark the 'procedural justice wave' (Colquitt et al. 2005) during which the research emphasis moved from the outcomes within the study of distributive justice to the processes by which the outcomes are allocated in procedural justice. Research took two approaches to procedural justice; the first was developed through the resource-based theory (Thibaut and Walker, 1975) or the process control model that refers to the employees’ ability to voice their views during the implementation of certain procedures. At the beginning, the main focus was on disputant reactions to judges’ decisions arising from legal procedures such as mediation and arbitration within the courtroom settings. In that context, procedural justice focused on distinguishing the fairness of the verdict from the fairness of the processes leading to issuing the verdict (Fortin, 2008). Thibaut and Walker (1975) noted that disputants perceived procedures to be fair when they perceived that their ‘voice’ was heard. This process is referred to in literature as
the ‘voice effect’ (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993) that includes procedures designed to increase the employees’ voice in management decisions and during the implementation of certain procedures.

The second approach to procedural justice started with Leventhal (1980) who moved the notion from the legal to the organisational context (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). Leventhal (1980) conceptualized procedural justice beyond the concept of process control to cover the decision control and the ability to influence outcomes, stating that a decision should have a set of six criteria in order to be perceived as fair: (1) consistency of procedures across people and time, (2) bias-suppression to ensure that parties have no personal self interests in the allocation processes, (3) accuracy of the information used in the decision-making process, (4) correctability, where mechanisms to correct flawed or inaccurate decisions are in place, (5) representativeness that takes into account the opinion of various groups affected by the decision, and (6) ethicality of the decision making process through following the fundamental moral and ethical values (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; St-Pierre and Holmes, 2010; Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani, 2009).

A significant milestone in the development of procedural justice literature is Greenberg's (1990a) research that identified two components of procedural justice: (a) the structural aspects of the formal rules and policies concerning the decisions that affect the employees. This includes the employees' input in the decision process such as their voice, adequate notice before implementing
decisions and the provision of accurate information (Bayles, 1990 and Yaghoubi, 2012), and (b) the interactional domains that include the social aspects of procedural justice such as the quality of the interpersonal treatment in the allocation of resources, treating employees with dignity and respect and providing them with sufficient information concerning how the outcomes are determined (Rhoades et al., 2001).

Procedural justice is viewed as one of the most important factors in today's workplace due to the importance of procedures in influencing employees' perceptions of fairness (Cohen and Karen 2008). It has also been accepted as the strongest predictor of various organisational outcomes (Erdogan, 2002). Research revealed positive relationships between procedural justice and many favourable organisational outcomes such as work performance, citizenship behaviours, organisational commitment (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992) and the quality of leader-member exchange (Cohen-Charash and Spector's, 2001). In contrast, it was found to be negatively related to negative work outcomes such as turnover intentions (Cropanzano and Greenberg, 1997; Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Dailey and Kirk, 1992; Masterson et al., 2000). According to Tyler and Lind (1992), procedural fairness might be used as the basis by which employees establish longer relationship with their employers and enhancing their loyalty towards the organisation.

In the context of the present study, the employee’s evaluation of procedural justice could be affected by the type of organisational outcomes and how those
outcomes are made (Deutsch, 1975; Thibaut and Walker, 1975; Levental, 1976). This might include their perceptions about the policies and procedures that regulate the decisions made about the allocation of rewards, promotions and career progression, and the methods, mechanisms and processes through which the outcomes are determined (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998).

After procedural justice, interactional justice was introduced as the third dimension of organisational justice. The following section will look into the literature related to this dimension of justice and its impact on the employees' work outcomes.

2.4.1.3. Interactional justice:

Interactional justice was introduced as the third dimension of justice by Bies and colleagues (Bies and Moag, 1986, Bies and Shapiro, 1987; Bies et al, 1988; Tyler and Bies, 1990) who started what was called as the 'interactional justice wave' (St-Pierre and Holmes, 2010). This dimension of justice focuses on the fair dissemination of information and the quality of the interpersonal treatment people receive during the implementation of procedures (Colquitt et al. 2011; Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani, 2009; Bies and Moag, 1986). Interactional justice results from the supervisor's trust-building behaviours such as the availability, competence and the overall trust between him/her and the followers (Deluga, 1994). It exists when the employees feel that the decision makers in their organisations treat them with
respect and sensitivity, and explain the rationale for their decisions thoroughly (Ponnu and Chuah, 2010).

The introduction of interactional justice as a third dimension of justice created a debate among researchers (Aquino, 1995; Barling and Phillips, 1993; Bies and Shapiro, 1987; Skarlicki and Folger, 1997) over whether interactional justice is a separate dimension of fairness or whether it is a portion of procedural justice. Some researchers argued against the introduction of a third dimension to justice. For example, Ponnu and Chuah (2010) stated that the two-factor model of organisational justice i.e. distributive and procedural justice was 'clouded' with the introduction of interactional justice in reference to the confusion created by adding interaction justice as a third dimension. This opinion was supported by other researchers (e.g. Moorman, 1991; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Tyler and Bies, 1990) who considered interactional justice as a subset of procedural justice and some of them (e.g. Mansour-Cole and Scott, 1998; Skarlicki and Latham, 1997) even used separate measures for procedural justice and interactional justice but later combined them together when they found a high correlation between them. The other group of researchers argued for the inclusion of interactional justice as a third dimension (e.g., Mikula et al., 1990). They believe that considerable proportion of perceived injustice did not concern distributional or procedural issues in the narrow sense, but instead referred to the manner in which people were treated interpersonally during interactions and encounters (Yaghoubi et al., 2012). Therefore a third dimension is needed to cover the communication
and interpersonal dimensions that are not fully covered by the other two dimensions.

Greenberg (1990a) analyzed the facets of interactional justice including sensitivity, politeness, respect and explanation. He distributed them between distributive and procedural justice and found that the first three i.e. sensitivity, politeness and respect could be considered as interpersonal facets of distributive justice because they alter the individuals' reactions to the decision outcomes while the fourth facet i.e. the explanation could be considered as an informational facet of procedural justice based on the perception that when people provide explanations, they generally provide the information needed for evaluating the structural aspects of procedures. Greenberg's (1990a) analysis generated a model that identified two dimensions of interactional justice: (1) interpersonal justice, referring to the extent to which individuals are treated with politeness, respect and dignity by authorities or organisational agents during the execution of procedures and the determination of outcomes (Bies and Moag, 1986; Masterson et al., 2000; Niehoff and Moorman, 1993), (2) informational justice that refers to the extent to which individuals receive information, rationale or explanations for the way that decisions that affect them are made (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Colquitt, et al., 2001), the rationale behind the use of certain procedures in certain ways and the distribution of outcomes in a particular fashion (Bakhshi et al., 2009). Although these two subcategories overlap considerably (Yaghoubi et al., 2012), the outcomes show that they could be considered as separate concepts, as each has
a differential effect on the individuals’ perceptions of justice (Colquitt et al., 2001). Both forms of interactional justice focus on the behaviours of the decision makers rather than the systematic structural characteristics of the procedures. The inclusion of these two sub-dimensions created a four-factor model for organisational justice including distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice instead of the previous three dimension model. This model was support by some researchers such as Colquitt (2001) who supported the model in two separate studies.

Interactional justice is considered of great importance in shaping employees' attitudes and behaviours towards the organisation because of its impact on the three dimensions of relationships within the organisation including the manager-employee relationship, employee-employee relationship and organisation-employee relationship (Suliman, 2007). It was found relevant to various positive work outcomes (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001). In a study conducted in Saudi Arabia, Elamin and Alomaim (2011) compared between the Saudi and foreign workers working in different organisations with regard to the justice perceptions and job satisfaction. The study revealed that perceptions of organisational justice influenced job satisfaction for both Saudi employees and foreign workers. In another study conducted in Saudi Arabia and Jordan, Pillai et al., (1999) found that procedural and distributive justice had significant and equally strong effects on job satisfaction across employees' samples obtained (Lam, Schaubroeck and Aryee, 2002).
The next section will review the literature related to perceptions of organisational politics.

2.4.2. Organisational politics:

A widely cited definition of organisational politics is the one by Mentzberg (1983) describing organisational politics as the individual or group behaviour that is informal, ostensibly parochial, typically divisive, and above all in a technical sense illegitimate, sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology nor certified expertise (although it may exploit any one of these). Workplace politics is viewed as a reality of the organisation's life that serves to protest against diverse and often competing interests, particularly within dynamic and uncertain situations (Poon, 2003; Chen and Fang, 2008).

Research on organisational politics could be classified into three categories (Drory and Vigoda-Gadot, 2010) each of which took a different approach in defining the concept: (1) studies on influence tactics, conflict and actual political behaviour in organisations, (2) studies on political skills within the workplace which is an extension to the first approach. They deal with tactics as aggregated ‘skills’ that can be improved and modified over time with experience and training, and (3) studies on the subjective perceptions of organisational politics which is the main concern of the present study. The first and second bodies of research have examined the actual political behaviours and influence tactics in the form of ‘politicking’ (Tushman, 1977; Hochwarter, 2003; Poon, 2003) that is used by
employees in the work place to reach their targets (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001) and achieve their goals. Research in this area followed two themes: (1) the self-serving behaviours in which ‘politicking’ is used as a tool for securing a desired share of organisational outcomes such as pay, career advancement, promotions and other intrinsic or extrinsic rewards that could be unattainable under organisationally endorsed means (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Hochwarter, 2003; Burns, 1961; Gandz and Murray, 1980; Ferris et al, 2000), and (2) ‘politicking’ is done at the expense of others during the time when there is a competition between two entities (Tushman, 1977; Porter, Allen and Angle, 1981). Within those two themes several attempts were made by researchers to define the concept. For example, Mayer and Allen (1977) focused on the individual's motives while practicing politics. They defined the concept as the management of influence to obtain ends not sanctioned by the organisation or to obtain sanctioned ends through non-sanctioned means. Kipnis et al., (1980) focused on the manipulation aspect; they described politics as ways in which people at work influence their colleagues, subordinates and superiors either to satisfy organisational goals or obtain personal benefits. Those may range from the need to support oneself to the need to satisfy complex psychological goals such as achievements, self definition and control over one’s environment (Smidt and Kipnis, 1984). Porter, Allen and Angle (1981) also focused on the individual's purpose of politics, stating that politics refer to the social influence attempts that are discretionary, intended to
promote or protect the self-interests of individuals and groups that could threaten the self-interests of others.

The behavioural aspect of organisational politics was the focus of several definitions offered by researchers. For example, Ferris et al. (1989:145) defined the concept as “a social influence process in which behaviour is strategically designed to maximize short-term self-interests, which is either consistent with or at the expense of others' interests”. Kacmar and Baron (1999:4) defined the concept as “actions by individuals, directed towards the goal of furthering their own self-interests without regard for the well-being of others or their organisation”. In this respect, organisational politics involves different forms of self-serving behaviours that are not formally sanctioned by the organisation (Cropanzano, Kacmar and Bozeman, 1995) or its rules, policies and procedures.

The third body of research, which is the concern of the present study, focuses on the employees' subjective perceptions of organisational politics (Miller, Rutherford and Kolodinsky, 2008) rather than the actual political behavior or influence tactics (Harrell-Cook et al., 1999). This approach is based on the model developed by Ferris and colleagues (1989) in which they examined the employees’ perceptions of politics based on subjective feelings and thinking towards the political maneuvers in the modern organisations and work places, assuming that the reality of politics is better understood via the perceptions of individuals, instead of the actual influence tactics (Porter, 1976; Gandz and Murray, 1980; Ferris et al., 1989; Parker, 1995). Perceptions of organisational
politics refer to the degree to which individuals view their work environment as political in nature, promoting self-interests, and thereby unjust and unfair (Kacmar and Ferris, 1991; Kacmar and Carlson, 1997; Vigoda-Gadot and Talmud, 2010).

Research on perceptions of organisational politics is largely based on Lewin's (1936) notion stating that individuals' responses are determined by their perceptions of reality, rather than on the reality itself. Thus, determining whether an organisational environment is political or not is based on subjective determinants that the organisational members create for themselves, which makes organisational politics a state of mind rather than an objective state (Harris, Andrews and Kacmar, 2007) that could be seen and observed by others. Ferris et al., (1989) argue that it is not the actual politics that matters most to the organisational consequences, rather it is the subjective perceptions of workplace politics that could result in typically adverse attitudes and behaviours.

Organisational politics have been described as a controversial phenomenon that could involve both constructive and destructive effects on the organisation, the employees and the clients dealing with them (e.g., Ferris et al., 1989; Vigoda-Gadot and Kapun, 2005). It might be perceived as posing either an opportunity or a threat (Ashforth and Lee, 1990). Based on that, it could be argued that the way people perceive politics depends to a large extent on their personal experience and the purpose of the political actions they are involved in or affected by. In other words, the individuals' perceptions are largely shaped by their experience, attribution and judgement (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Aryee, Chen and Budhwar,
2004; Poon, 2003; Vigoda-Gadot, 2000). However, most of the theoretical and empirical research in this area has focused on the negative side of organisational politics (Kimura, 2012). It has been described as a representative of the dark side of the human conduct (e.g., Ferris and King, 1991), and an unfortunate fact of life (Ferris et al. 1989; Burns, 1961; Kacmar and Baron, 1999) that triggers intentional acts by individuals or groups to enhance or protect their self-interests (Hochwarter, 2003) at the expense of the organisational goals (e.g. Cropanzano and Grandey, 1999; Drory and Romm, 1990; Ferris and Judge, 1991; Ferris et al., 1989; Kacmar and Ferris, 1993; Gilmore et al., 1996). The term ‘politics’ has always been associated with the misuse and abuse of power, secrecy and backroom deals that people experience with the presence of politics in their workplace (Vigoda-Gadot and Talmud, 2010). Within this framework, Mintzberg (1985) described organisations as ‘political arenas’ referring to the undeniable existence of politics in organisations and its relationship with conflicts and power struggles. Ammeter et al., (2002) have argued that politics has garnered an undesirable reputation. For the average individual, organisational politics is likely to create a host of reprehensible images that include (but not limited to) backroom manipulation, behind-the-scenes maneuvering and self-serving posturing.

The employees’ perceptions about politics in their organisations and their willingness to engage in political behaviours are strongly influenced by the organisation’s context and culture. A politically charged atmosphere reflects actions taken by the individuals that are beyond the parameters of accepted
organisational behaviour (Mintzberg, 1983, 1985). As a result, general political behaviours may be expected though unacceptable. Such environments may be interpreted as inequitable, resulting in employees feelings that there has been a violation of the ‘social contract’ between them and their employer (Cropanzano et al., 1997).

As a construct, perceptions of organisational politics is multidimensional (Ferris et al., 1989). Kacmar and Ferris (1991) described three dimensions: the first is the ‘general political behaviour’ that refers to the individual’s self-serving behaviour to gain preferred outcomes. Such behaviour is influenced by ambiguity, decision making processes and scarcity of resources. The ambiguity resulting from the absence of the guiding rules and policies in the organisation, makes individuals develop their own set of rules and policies to serve their own self interests and to gain more benefits and better positions in the organisation. This situation creates uncertainty in the decision making process with individuals making independent decisions that could sometimes be irrational and involve politics (Cropanzano, Kacmar and Bozeman, 1995). The political environment is also influenced by the scarcity of resources such as transfers, raises, office space and budget that could sometimes be seen as attractive and beneficial causing competition and jealousy among the individuals working in the organisation.

The second dimension is ‘go along to get a head’, in which individuals show silence and act passively for their own benefit. They adopt an avoidance behaviour that appears as a non-political activity, though could be a form of
political behaviour (Kacmar and Carlson, 1997; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992). This behaviour can be a logical and beneficial approach taken by individuals in order to proceed with their self-interests when working in a political environment (Kacmar and Carlson, 1997). The third dimension is the ‘pay and promotion policies’ in which individuals involved in the implementation of policies act politically. It refers to how organisations are affected by political behaviours through the implementation of policies (Ferris et al., 1989). According to Kacmar and Carlson (1997) political activities are involved in the organisational reward systems in different ways. For instance, the individually-oriented rewards induce individually-oriented behaviours that might be political or self-serving. When pay and promotion policies are affected by political behaviours, they might negatively impact the individuals, specifically those who do not act politically. Consequently, people who perceive inequity regarding the rewards may become more involved in political activities in the future. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) called these dimensions as the supervisors’ political behaviour, coworker political behaviour and organisational politics.

The negative impact of politics stems from their impact on the economic and social aspects of the employee-employee exchange (Witt, 1998). Individuals in situations perceived as political may engage in behavioural self management through which they alter their behaviour by reducing their contextual performance when they believe that the terms of their economic or social contracts with the organisation have been violated. Some researchers related the negative reactions
towards politics to the ‘expectancy theory’ which emphasizes that employees will be motivated to adjust their behaviour in order to earn more valuable rewards such as pay and recognition. In highly political organisations, rewards are not necessarily related to work performance (Kacmar and Ferris, 1990) or objective measures but may instead be tied to relationships, power and other nonobjective factors. This situation makes the employees less confident that their positive work behaviours will be recognised or that valuable organisational rewards will be allocated according to those behaviours (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Thus, high perceptions of politics are likely to be linked to low expectations because individuals fail to see the full effort-reward relationship. In contrast, when the work environment is perceived as being low in politics, the link between the behaviour and rewards becomes clear and relatively high, leading employees to be more motivated to adjust their behaviour to maximize their chances of earning the desired reward (Witt et al., 2002).

The work environment was described as a marketplace in which individuals engage in multiple transactions aimed at obtaining favourable returns on their investments (Rusbult and Farrell, 1983). They invest time and effort in return for tangible and intangible rewards. Therefore the high levels of organisational politics in the workplace could be considered as a source of stress (Ferris et al., 1994; Vigoda, 2002) and anxiety (Kacmar et al., 1999; Poon, 2003; Valle and Perrew, 2000) for the employees as they think of losing their investments. A large body of empirical research has provided evidence for the correlation between
strong perceptions about the presence of organisational politics and several negative work outcomes such as weaker job involvement (Cropanzano et al., 1997) and poor performance (Vigoda, 2000; Witt, 1998). In relation to the outcomes assessed in the present study, previous research has emphasized the negative relationship between POP and job satisfaction (e.g. Gandz and Murray, 1980; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Ferris et al., 1996; Harris et al., 2007; Vigoda-Gadot and Talmud, 2010; Ferris et al., 1989) suggesting that individuals who perceive their organisation as political tend to exhibit low job satisfaction. Pfeffer (1989) looked at the relationship between politics and career success and suggested that a political focus may be an important, yet overlooked perspective in understanding career success and how it is determined in many organisations. He suggested that by investigating how political behaviours adopted by individuals can affect their careers, it becomes easier to analyse careers from a more realistic perspective (Pfeffer, 1989). More recently, Vigoda (2000) found negative relationships between organisational politics and different job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and a positive relationship with intention to leave the organisation. Also Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013) found a main interaction effect of ‘going along to get ahead’, and pay and promotion policy on job satisfaction. Malik, Danish and Ghafoor (2009) measured three dimensions of perceptions of organisational politics i.e., general political behavior; go along to get ahead and pay and promotions in relation with different facets of job satisfaction while controlling
for age. The results showed that general political behavior, go along to get ahead and pay and promotions, are highly and negatively correlated with different dimensions of job satisfaction.

2.5. Chapter summary:

This chapter provided the theoretical background related to the development of the conceptual model tested in the study. It presented the theoretical and empirical literature that formed the foundation for understanding the eight constructs of the study, starting with the four work outcomes i.e. organisational commitment, job satisfaction, career success and turnover intentions. This was followed by a review of the literature related to the two organisational variables of leader-member exchange (LMX) and succession planning and career development (SPCD), that were proposed as predictors of employees’ perceptions about justice and politics, and work outcomes. The chapter concluded with a review of the literature related to the employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics.

The next chapter will look into the hypothesized relationships between the constructs of the study.
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Introduction:

This chapter looks into the possible relationships between the constructs of the study. It starts with looking into the relationships between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX), the four work outcomes and the employees’ perceptions about justice and politics. This is followed by looking into the relationships between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), the four work outcomes and the employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics.

3.2. Theoretical development of the research model:

The research questions of this study, stated earlier are:

RQ1: What are the relationships between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX), the employees' perceptions about organisational justice and politics, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

RQ2: What are the relationships between the corporate succession planning and career development, employees' perceptions about organisational justice and
politics, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

RQ3: What are the mediation effects of organisational justice and politics on the relationships between the quality of LMX, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

RQ4: What are the mediation effects of organisational justice and politics on the relationships between the corporate succession planning and career development, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, career success and organisational commitment?

In view of the research questions stated above, the following sections will present the hypotheses of the study.

3.3. The relationship between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and work outcomes:

The employees view their supervisors as the agents who carry out several tasks on behalf of the organisation; they give directions, evaluate performance, coach, reward and punish. Based on that, they generalize their views concerning the favourableness of their exchange relationship from the supervisor to the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Levenson, 1965). This concept was supported by two published meta-analysis studies that provided support for different levels of correlations between the quality of LMX and a host of
attitudinal and behavioural outcomes (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Ilies, Nahargang and Morgeson, 2007).

Starting with the quality of LMX and organisational commitment (OC), previous research has shown consistent positive relationships between the two variables (e.g. Ansari, Daisy and Aafaqi, 2001; Masterson et al., 2000; Leow and Khong, 2009; Duchon et al., 1986; Liden, Wayne and Sparrowe, 2000). The positive relationship was confirmed by a literature review of 23 studies conducted by Wayne et al. (2009). The results revealed a general positive relationship between the quality of LMX and OC. Previous research has also shown a positive relationship between the quality of LMX and career success (CS) (e.g. Gerstner and Day, 1997; Graen and Graen, 2005; Scandura and Schriesheim, 1994; Schriesheim, Castro and Coglisor, 1999; Wakabayashi and Graen, 1984; Wayne et al., 1999). However, the relationship is determined by the individuals’ perspective and how they view their own CS. Their perspective can refer to either objective ‘hard’ measures such as the rank and income, or subjective ‘soft’ measures that are mostly concerned with the personal feelings of achievements (Baruch, 2004). High quality LMX is associated with a number of advantages that result in achieving higher CS for both the supervisor and the subordinate (Harris and Ogbonna, 2006) with regard to both the ‘soft’ and ‘hard measures’. Langford (2000) examined a model in which the quality of the managers’ work-related relationships and networking behaviours contributed positively to their objective and subjective CS. Greenhaus et al., (1990) has shown a positive relationship
between career satisfaction (Mobley, 1982; Stupf and London, 1981). On the contrary, employees in low quality LMX are usually given less challenging tasks and they lack the supervisors’ interest in their career aspirations. They also receive negative performance feedback that is likely to hinder their opportunities for professional growth (Greenhaus, 1987), detract them from objective and subjective career satisfaction, and could lead to feelings of professional failure. However, Yan-Ping and Yi-Dong (2011) found that high quality LMX did not always benefit the subordinates’ CS; its impact on their CS was moderated by the subordinates’ political skill.

Regarding the relationship between the quality of LMX and the employees’ turnover intentions (TOI), most empirical research findings demonstrate that the relationship between the two variables is significant and negative (e.g. Major et al., 1995; Vecchio and Gobdel, 1984; Wilhelm et al., 1993; Wayne et al., 1997; Dansereau et al., 1975; Ferris, 1985; Graen and Ginsburgh, 1977; Graen et al., 1982). It has also been argued that the number one reason for people to leave their organisations is the treatment they receive from their bosses (Mardanove, Sterrett and Baker, 2007). Tepper (2000) found that those who decide to remain in their jobs, working for poor bosses, have lower job and life satisfaction, lower commitment, higher conflict between work and family, and psychological distress (Ariani, 2012). Kim, Lee and Carlson (2010) found evidence for a U-shaped curvilinear relationship between the quality of LMX and TOI for non-supervisory employees in the South Korean hospitality industry. Also Ansari, Daisy and
Aafaqi (2000) found a strong negative prediction of the quality of LMX among the employees’ TOI (Ansari, Daisy and Aafaqui, 2001). In-group members can be counted on by the supervisor to perform unstructured tasks, to volunteer for extra work and to take on additional responsibilities (Truckenbrodt, 2000). In return, they receive more extrinsic rewards, better performance ratings (Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp, 1982), more favourable career outcomes (Scandura, Schriesheim, 1994; Wakabayashi and Graen, 1984; Wakabayashi et al., 1988), better career growth opportunities (Liden, Wayne and Sparrowe, 2000; Masterson et al., 2000; Pillai, Scandura, and Williams, 1999) and better promotions and rewards (Liden and Maslyn, 1998; Scandura and Schriesheim, 1994; Wakabayashi et al., 1988). Those benefits provide the employees with a motivational force to retain attachment to the organisation (Wilhelm, Herd and Steiner, 1993). Buckingham and Coffman (2000) noted that the key to retaining talents and making talented employees more productive is determined by their relationship with their immediate supervisor; a high quality relationship is an important factor for employees to stay and have a long-term career with the organisation (Dixon-Kheir, 2001).

With respect to the relationship between the quality of LMX and the employees’ job satisfaction (JS), several studies (e.g., Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen, Liden and Hoel, 1982; Scandura and Graen, 1984; Mardanov et al., 2007; Erdogan and Enders, 2007) have provided evidence for a significant positive relationship between the two variables. For example, Allinson, Armstrong and
Hayes (2001) found that in-group members are generally more satisfied when compared to members of out-groups. Also Pillai, Scandura and Williams (1999) found a high correlation between the quality of LMX and JS across multiple countries and cultures.

Within the cultural context of the current study, Arab managerial styles have been described as profoundly influenced by the tribal traditions and the collectivistic Arab culture. According to Abdulla and Al-Homoud (2001), the collectivistic values, teamwork skills and values outside the in-groups are not well developed in Arab contexts. They are high in in-group collectivism (House et al., 1999) and they have high loyalty to their in-group members which might have a negative impact on the outcomes of the other group members. Abu Elanain (2014) found a functional impact of the quality of LMX on TOI in the UAE. Therefore a high-quality exchange with leaders is expected to increase retention (Maertz and Campion, 1998) and reduce TOI among followers (Price and Mueller, 1986; Ferris, 1985; Gerstner and Day, 1997; Graen, Liden and Hoel, 1982). Based on the previous discussion, the following hypotheses are suggested:

**Hypothesis 1a:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 1b:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 1c:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to career success.

**Hypothesis 1d:**
The quality of LMX is negatively related to turnover intentions.
3.4. The relationship between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and organisational justice:

The quality of the exchange relationship between the leader/manager and his/her followers (LMX) is an integral part of the employees’ relationship with the organisation. The employees’ view their managers as the primary gatekeepers to organisational rewards (Kelloway et al., 2004), due to the leaders’ official roles within the organisational hierarchy. For example, bonuses, merit pays, rewards and career decisions are very often based on the manager’s evaluation of the subordinates’ performance and the recommendations he/she makes about them (Murphy and Cleveland, 1995). However, evidence from empirical research suggests that such ratings are often a function of whether the leader likes the subordinate (Lefkowitz, 2000) or not, which influences the subordinates perceptions about justice in the organisation. If they are treated fairly they will perceive the leader’s decisions regarding their development, promotion, rewards and career advancement as fair as well (Sparr and Sonnentag, 2008). The perceived benefits received from the manager will require reciprocation from the subordinates (Blau, 1964; Kelley and Thibaut, 1978), who will likely cooperate and reinvest in their relationship with him/her (Blader and Tyler, 2005). On the contrary, if they perceive their manager as the likely source of unfair treatment (Baron et al. 1999), they might develop negative attitudes and behaviours towards him/her and the organisation.
The relationship between the quality of LMX and procedural justice (PJ) is supported by the concept of ‘voice’ (Greenberg, 1986, 1988; Folger, 1977), which suggests that the opportunities that employees get to present their views and talk about their concerns is an important factor in forming their perceptions of procedural fairness. The close relationship between the in-group members and the manager gives them an access to him/her and allows them to express their opinions more freely than the out-group members who are already distant from him/her. However, the high-quality exchange with one group is more likely to provoke feelings of unfairness among the other group consisting of the lower-quality exchange subordinates (Deluga, 1994). This might result in the lack of trust in the fairness of procedures in the organisation, although employees are likely to perceive the fairness of procedures as primarily based on the organisational policies, over which the manager has little control (Masterson et al., 2000). They tend to perceive both the manager and the organisation as jointly responsible for the fair or unfair distribution of outcomes because they view their managers as the organisation's agents in allocating rewards and benefits to their subordinates (Randall et al., 1999; Lawler and Jenkins, 1992). Within this context, the leader’s neutrality (Tyler, 1989) and consistency (Leventhal, 1980) are key factors that affect the subordinates’ procedural justice perceptions (Hooper and Martin, 2008).

Previous empirical studies have confirmed the positive correlation between the quality of LMX and the different dimensions of organisational justice. For
example, Rupp and Cropanzano (2002), and Masterson et al., (2000) found a positive correlation between the quality of LMX and interactional justice (IJ). Also Mikula et al., (1990) reported that a large proportion of perceived injustice concerns the manner in which people were treated interpersonally, rather than the procedural or distributive elements of their jobs, which puts more emphasis on interactional justice rather than the other two forms of justice.

Due to their collectivistic (Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 1999), high context culture (Hall, 1977), Arab managers may place more weight on maintaining the social relationships and networks in the workplace than on efficiency and procedures (Al-Faleh, 1987; Ali, 1990). Based on that, it is expected that the respondents' perceptions about justice in their organisation are affected by the quality of their relationship with their manager. Those who have high quality relationships are expected to perceive higher levels of fairness than those with low quality relationships.

Apart from the direct relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational justice, there is a possibility that organisational justice plays a mediating role in the relationship between LMX and work outcomes. This relationship is influenced by two factors; the first is the way employees react to inequitable organisational processes and outcomes, and the second is the way they attempt to change unfair situations and try to establish equitable conditions (e.g. Greenberg, 1982; Folger and Greenberg, 1985), which highlights the relationship between justice and work outcomes in addition to its relationship with LMX.
Justice perceptions play important roles in the employees’ attitudinal and behavioural reactions towards the organisational outcomes, procedures and processes (Ponnu and Chuah, 2010; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Lind et al., 1993). They influence the relationship between the employees and the organisation, co-workers and managers, and eventually impact their behaviours and work outcomes (Suliman, 2007; Bingham, 1997; Tyler and Lind, 1992). The three forms of justice (procedural, distributive and interactional) were identified as predictors of organisational commitment (OC) (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992) and job satisfaction (JS) (Conlon and Fasolo, 1990). Employees feel more committed to the organisation, if they believe that it adopts procedures that treat them with respect and dignity making it easier for them to accept even the outcomes that they do not like (Suliman, 2007). However, if they believe that the decision-making procedures carried out by the manager, were unjust, they show lower OC and higher turnover intentions (TOI) (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997; Dailey and Kirk, 1992). Lee et al., (2010) found that both DJ and PJ played mediating roles in the relationships between LMX and TOI. Those results support the findings of Lee (2000) and Lee (2001) studies that reported similar mediating effects of DJ and PJ on the relationships between LMX and several work outcomes. Scandura (1999) explains that in the early stages of the relationship between the leader and followers, all forms of justice i.e. DJ, PJ and IJ contribute to the decision to become part of the manager’s in-group or out-group. Once the decision is made, LMX positively affects the outcomes through the perceptions of
PJ and DJ. Scandura also proposed PJ as a mediator for the relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes for those reporting high levels of LMX, while proposing DJ as a mediator for the relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes for those reporting low levels of LMX. Scandura (1999) strongly indicated that the search for a mediator such as PJ must continue in order to understand the relationship between the quality of LMX and the various organisational outcomes. Consistent with the previous discussion, the following hypotheses are made:

**Hypothesis 2a:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational justice.

**Hypothesis 2b:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 2c:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2d:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and career success.

**Hypothesis 2e:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and turnover intentions.

3.5. The relationship between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and organisational politics:
Previous empirical research did not give the same level of attention to the relationship between the quality of LMX and perceptions of organisational politics (POP) that was given to the relationships between other forms of perceptions and organisational variables. This could be attributed to the Western individualistic (Hofstede, 1980), low context (Hall, 1976) culture, where most of the management research has taken place. The Western culture might not consider POP as a factor that might affect and get affected by the level and quality of the relationship between the leader/manager and his/her followers/subordinates. Nevertheless, the relationship was not totally ignored. For example, Pfeffer (1981) stated that management is itself a political activity in which managers practice some political influence techniques and act upon their perceptions of politics. Other researchers also argued, that managers play a major role in forming employees’ perceptions of their work environment as being political in nature or not (Ferris and Rowland, 1981). They form political coalitions with their in-group subordinates due to the close relationship and affect between them (Ferris and Judge, 1991; Villanova and Bernardin, 1989; Wayne and Ferris, 1990). Those coalitions are believed to affect the way organisations operate and who is benefiting or losing from their activities, processes and operations (Berkowitz, 1972; Isen, 1970; Isen and Levin, 1972). They enable their in-group members to have more control over their work environment (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Witt, 1995) and the decisions that affect their job (Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar et al., 1999; Andrews and Kacmar, 2001). As a result, members of those
coalitions never suffer from the ambiguity of rules and unfairness which makes them view their work environment as less threatening and eventually less political (Vigoda-Gadot and Beeri, 2012). However, when the other subordinates view their manager as promoting his/her in-group interests only, they might feel less protected and perceive their work environment as political in nature (Kacmar et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2005; Shore and Shore, 1995; Fasolo, 1995), which might have a negative impact on their work outcomes.

The views towards politics are nearly always negative (Vigoda and Cohen, 1998: Othman, 2008) with potential dysfunctional outcomes at both the individual and organisational levels (Vigoda, 2002). Miller, Rutherford and Kolodinsky (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 79 independent samples from 59 published and unpublished studies. The results revealed that OP had significant negative correlations with job satisfaction (JS) and organisational commitment (OC), and moderate positive correlations with turnover intentions (TOI). Randall et al., (1999) found that political perceptions were negatively related to both OC and JS, and positively related to TOI. Poon (2003) noted that the individuals who are engaged in higher levels of political behaviours would be less inclined to leave the organisation than those who are less involved in organisational politics. By leaving the organisation, they attempt to avoid engaging in political activities even though quitting might not prove feasible due to the lack of suitable external opportunities or other restrictions.
The negative relationship between POP and JS was repeatedly emphasized in previous studies (e.g. Gandz and Murray, 1980; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Ferris et al., 1996; Harris et al., 2007; Vigoda-Gadot and Talmud, 2010; Ferris et al., 1989), suggesting that individuals who perceive their organisation as political tend to exhibit lower JS (e.g., Ferris et al., 1996; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Gandz and Murray, 1980; Zhou and Ferris, 1995). Vigoda, (2000) found that POP was negatively correlated with JS and OC, and positively related to TOI.

In the Arab world and the Arabian Gulf region, there is a dearth of empirical research on organisational politics. However, organisational politics is present in Arab organisations. Due to the Arab culture, the manager's behaviour is heavily influenced by the social structure, values, norms and expectations of people. Connections are utilized at various levels to influence decisions, reach personal goals and achieve personal benefits. Within this context, employees of all social levels develop networking systems and invest part of their work time nourishing their social network in order to ensure that their needs are well served (Ali and Wahabi, 1995). Furthermore, it is frequently observed that newly appointed managers remove, distance or freeze the in-group of their predecessors and appoint their own people (Abdalla and Al-Homoud, 2001). Those political gestures would either negatively or positively impact the employees' perceptions about politics, depending highly on the benefits they gain from their relationship with the leader/manager.
It has been established earlier that there might be a direct relationship between the quality of LMX and POP. Apart from that, there is a possibility that POP mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes. Boemer et al., (2007) found that individuals in low quality LMX experienced higher perceptions of subjective career success (CS) when they possess high levels of political skills. Also, Pfeffer (1989) looked at the relationship between politics and CS and suggested that a political focus may be an important, yet overlooked perspective in understanding CS and how it is determined in many organisations. By investigating how political behaviours adopted by individuals can affect their careers, it becomes easier to analyse careers from a more realistic perspective (Pfeffer, 1989). Boemer et al., (2007) found that individuals in low quality LMX experienced higher perceptions of subjective CS when they possessed high levels of political skills. Ansari and Kapoor (1987) found that subordinates reported willingness to use certain political behaviours with their supervisors in order to obtain personal benefits such as career advancement. Based on the previous discussion, the following hypotheses are suggested:

**Hypothesis 3a:**
The quality of LMX is negatively related to organisational politics.

**Hypothesis 3b:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 3c:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3d:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and career success.

**Hypothesis 3e**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and turnover intentions.

3.6. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), and work outcomes:

SPCD is part of a wide range of organisational resourcing and development processes that encompass management resourcing strategies, aggregate analysis of demand/supply, skills analysis, job filling and different management development programs (Hirsh and Jackson, 1994). When such processes are tailored in a way that meets the employees’ career goals and aspirations, they will reflect the organisation’s care towards the employees, which will have a great impact on the employees’ overall job satisfaction (JS) (Puah and Ananthram, 2006; Bashir and Ramay, 2008), and lead to higher levels of organisational commitment (OC) (Jackson and Vitberg, 1987). This is based on the assumption that when employees feel that the organisation adheres to career-oriented employment practices, their psychological attachment to the organisation increases (Gaertner and Nollen, 1989). Tansky and Cohen (2001) found that when managers become satisfied with the career development programs in their organisations, their levels of OC increases. Also Bartlett (2001) found a positive correlation between the employees’ attitudes towards training and OC. Boon and Arumugam (2006) found
a high impact for the organisational training and development practices on OC. Agba, Nkpoyen and Ushie (2010) also found a high significant impact of the different career development processes i.e. career advancement, career counseling and career opportunities on OC. Based on that, they suggest that the management should adopt comprehensive career development programs to help them retain talent and improve their employees’ commitment towards the organisation.

Regarding the relationship between the corporate SPCD and career success (CS), the relationship is obvious between the two constructs. Career is described as a lifelong process made up of sequential activities with relevant attitudes and behaviours that take place throughout the individual's work life (Hall, 1986). Literature suggests that in addition to the overt extrinsic CS that takes the form of promotions, career progression, remunerations and status (e.g., Judge et al., 1995; Seibert et al., 1999) provided to the employees through the corporate SPCD programs, individuals are also motivated by intrinsic career aspirations (Harris and Ogbonna, 2006). Promotions from within, which is a key element of the corporate SPCD is considered as a primary mechanism that enables individuals to achieve both extrinsic and intrinsic CS (Judge and Bretz, 1994). Apart from the positive correlations between the corporate SPCD and positive work outcomes, there is also a possible negative relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI). The relationship is influenced by several factors; the first is the selection of successors for future appointments. In this process, the managers usually represent the organisation in setting the selection criteria (Hirsh and
Jackson, 1994). Therefore it is expected that they choose their successors among their in-group members. Those individuals are most of the time similar to them in appearance, background and values which will result in a bureaucratic kinship system (Rothwell, 2005). This feature of poor succession planning translates into higher TOI (Charan, 2005) among the other members who will suffer from the low morale.

The second factor that connects the corporate SPCD to TOI is ‘time’ that could be considered as a major unavoidable pitfall for the corporate SPCD. Due to the nature of the process, the corporate SPCD could be too slow and too likely to fail in the long-term to produce candidates with the capabilities to lead (Lynn, 2001) which could result in losing top candidates. Apart from that, the needs of the organisation could change after some time and deciding whether the selected person would be suitable to occupy a certain position after a number of years is a difficult task. Charan (2005) explains this situation by stating that recognising which five saplings in a 3000-tree forest are the ones to nurture requires a high degree of judgment that most line managers and human resources departments’ lack.

The third factor is related to the ‘confidentiality’ and ‘secrecy’ that are usually surrounding the organisational SPCD programs. Most organisations cover the traditional succession planning with secrecy in order to avoid making promises that could lead to hurting the morale of those who are not selected, or not on the fast track list (Armour, 2003). However, leaving employees uninformed of the directions of their own career development within their organisations might
encourage them to look for other employment opportunities elsewhere. However, organisations that invest in career development are more likely to reduce turnover among their employees (Lee, 2000). Chen et al., (2004) reported that career development programs negatively influenced turnover among employees. Also Schnake et al. (2007) found that the use of career activities and practices was significantly and inversely associated with turnover activities. Huselid (1995) provided evidence for a positive correlation between career development and lower turnover. Gutteridge, Leibowitz and Shore (1993) reported that having internal career-related human resources management practices (HRMP) will likely have positive results such as enhancing the retention of their employees, increasing their skills, building morale and encourage their empowerment (Tan, 2008). The same results were reported by two previous studies by Tylor and McGraw (2004) and Benson (2006). Both studies confirm the relationship between the organisational employee development efforts and low turnover rates. Also Kraimer et al., (2011) found an association between the organisations’ support for the employees’ development and reduced voluntary turnover, when perceived career opportunity was high. However, it was associated with increased turnover when perceived career opportunities were low.

International empirical research results are supported by the results of empirical research that took place in Arab countries. Jehanzeb et al., (2013) found a significant correlation between training and both OC and turnover intentions. Ababneh (2013) found that career development had a positive influence on OC
and a negative influence on turnover. Chami-Malaeb and Garavan (2013) found a significant positive relationship between talent and leadership development practices, and both intentions to stay and OC. Based on the previous discussion the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 4a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 4b:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4c:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to career success.

**Hypothesis 4d:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is negatively related to turnover intentions.

### 3.7. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and organisational justice:

The hypothesized relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and organisational justice could be explained in connection with two perspectives; the social exchange and the resource-based view. Within the social exchange view, it is predicted that when a person or entity does a favour to another, the recipient of the favour will be obliged to reciprocate (Gouldner, 1960) on the same manner. When individuals receive better career opportunities in their organisations, they will most probably reciprocate through
behaviours that benefit the organisation (Tzafrir et al., 2004). Thus, the corporate SPCD programs might be viewed as an exchange relationship between the organisation and the employees. Within this relationship, the organisation offers opportunities for career growth and advancement and in return, they might feel obligated to reciprocate through higher levels of commitment (Lemons and Jones, 2001) to the organisation and its goals and values, and adopt more positive attitudes and behaviours that benefit the organisation and its members (Albrecht and Travaglione, 2003; Gilliland, 1994; Konovsky and Folger, 1994). However, if they believe that the organisation is unfair, they might respond negatively through having some negative attitudes and behaviours. Further support is given to the relationship between the corporate SPCD and organisational justice is through the resource based view that emphasizes the importance of the organisational internal resources (Hoskisson et al., 1999). The theory suggests that the organisation should internally develop and maintain the employees’ skills that are central to the firm’s competitiveness and help improve its business performance (Lepak and Snell, 1999). This perspective is emphasized by the corporate SPCD programs which entail different human resources programs that reflect the organisation's concern and care towards the employees as internal resources.

The relationship between interactional justice and the corporate SPCD could be based on the description of interactional justice as reflecting the quality of the interpersonal treatment during the implementation of formal procedures and decisions (Bies and Moag, 1986), and the employees’ perceptions about being
treated with kindness, consideration, respect and dignity (Posthuma, Dworking and Swift, 2000). The corporate SPCD entails opportunities for employees to discuss, negotiate and make decisions about their career moves within the organisation which will possibly influence their opinion about the fairness of the decision making processes in the organisation (Bies, 1987; Gopinath and Becker, 2000; Greenberg, 1990; Leung and Li, 1990). Their judgement about fairness is a reference point for their future attitudes and behaviours (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991, Barling and Philips, 1993; Brockner and Wiesenfeld, 1996). When employees receive incentives that correspond to their knowledge, skills, and abilities, they will more likely think that the outcomes are fair and just as well (Ang et al., 2003; Greenberg, 1990). Crawshaw et al., (2012) found that high procedural justice may reduce the negative effects of unfavourable career development opportunities when the employees identify with and are committed to their organisation.

In the Arab world, Abdul-Khalik (1998) stated that Arab managers often concentrate on seniority and family ties, instead of academic qualifications or merit. In addition to that, some managers are often concerned about maintaining their social relationships in the organisation. Such cultures facilitate the use and the practice of ‘Wasta’, which is a common Arabic term used to indicate the act of supporting, favouring and being generous to certain people within families or community networks. ‘Wasta’ fosters the progress of an individual or a group of people who have reached their positions though befriending influential people,
which is a hindrance for those who struggle to get things done by the rules (Cunningham and Sarayah, 1994). The practice of 'Wasta' contradicts with the value of justice and equal opportunities (Tlaiss and Kauser, 2011; Loewe et al., 2007) and any form of equality because it provides advantages to individuals who may not necessarily merit them (Tlaiss and Kauser, 2011).

In addition to the hypothesized direct relationship between SPCD and work outcomes, organisational justice might have a mediating role in the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes. This is based on the assumption that employees act upon their subjective perceptions of the reality, rather than having objective measures. Based on that the following hypotheses are made:

**Hypothesis 5a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to organisational justice.

**Hypothesis 5b:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 5c:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and career success.

**Hypothesis 5d:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 5e:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and turnover intentions.
3.8. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and organisational politics:

The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), and perceptions of organisational politics (POP) is diverse. It depends entirely on the individuals’ experience with organisational politics and its impact on the benefits they receive. According to Ferris and Kacmar (1992), those who may have been negatively affected by a certain political incident, organisational politics (OP) is perceived as an evil that threatens their existence and interests in the organisation. While others, mostly those whose position was advanced by political means, view it as a useful tool in the organisation that could be used to gain more benefits and progress higher in their career. Parker et al., (1995) found that the employees who believe that opportunities exist for career development and rewards in their organisations, perceive lower levels of politics. However, if they perceive that others managed to advance in their career by acting politically, they will be more likely to perceive higher levels of politics and get engaged in political behaviours themselves in order to reach the targets others achieved (Ferris et al., 1989). Based on that, it could be argued that the individuals’ perceptions of politics, will be negatively related to their perceptions about the promotion and career advancement opportunities in their work place (Valle and Perrewé, 2000). Considerable anecdotal evidence exists to suggest that succession processes and decisions are highly political in nature (e.g., Brady and Helmich, 1984; Rowan, 1983; Vance, 1983; Feldman and Klich, 1991; Heisler
and Gemmill, 1978; Ferris and Buckley, 1990; Riley, 1983; Dyke, 1990; Ferris et al., 1989b). Rules might change (Kimura, 2012) to suit certain individuals. Such unfair environments raise feelings of unhappiness and stress, and reduce the employees’ job satisfaction (Ferris et al., 1989; Ferris et al., 1996; Poon, 2003). OP plays an important role in the organisation’s promotion decisions, which are considered as primary mechanisms through which individuals achieve and evaluate their own job satisfaction and career success. Malik, Danish and Ghafoor (2009) measured three dimensions POP i.e. general political behaviour, go along to get ahead and pay and promotion in relation to different facets of job satisfaction. The results revealed that the three dimensions of POP are highly and negatively correlated with different dimensions of job satisfaction.

As stated earlier, in the Arab world, individuals tend to utilize their networks in different aspects of life through what is called 'Wasta' According to Loewe et al., (2007), ‘Wasta’ is favouritism that is based on preferential treatment of relatives, friends and neighbours or other acquaintances (Loewe et al, 2007). In the Arab diffuse culture (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998), such concept is very influential in the organisation's decisions about succession planning and promotions, which might impact the individuals’ perceptions about politics.

Apart from the direct relationship between SPCD and POP, there is a possibility that POP plays a mediation role in the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes. Political environments tend to raise questions about the fairness of the organisational decisions and suggest that the management is not offering
adequate levels of directions and guidance (Hochwarter et al., 1999). In such environments, favouritism becomes an effective strategy to help others overcome barriers to career advancement, which might lead to a mediating role for POP in the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes.

**Hypothesis 6a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is negatively related to organisational politics.

**Hypothesis 6b:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and career success.

**Hypothesis 6c:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 6d:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 6e:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and turnover intentions.

3.9. Chapter summary:

This chapter has discussed the hypothesized relationships between the predictors, perceptions and outcomes. It began with the relationship between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and the employees’ work outcomes followed by the relationship between the quality of LMX and the employees’ perceptions about justice and politics. After that, it discussed the hypothesized relationships between the corporate succession planning and career development,
the employees’ work outcomes and the employees’ perceptions about justice and politics. Each section was followed by a set of hypotheses for the predicted relationships among the constructs.

**List of hypothesis:**

**Hypothesis 1a:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 1b:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 1c:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to career success.

**Hypothesis 1d:**
The quality of LMX is negatively related to turnover intentions.

**Hypothesis 2a:**
The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational justice.

**Hypothesis 2b:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 2c:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2d:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and career success.

**Hypothesis 2e:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and turnover intentions.

**Hypothesis 3a:**
The quality of LMX is negatively related to organisational politics.

**Hypothesis 3b:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 3c:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3d:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and career success.

**Hypothesis 3e**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and turnover intentions.

**Hypothesis 4a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 4b:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4c:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to career success.

**Hypothesis 4d:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is negatively related to turnover intentions.

**Hypothesis 5a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to perceptions of organisational justice.

**Hypothesis 5b:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 5c:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development and career success.

**Hypothesis 5d:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 5e:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development and turnover intentions.

**Hypothesis 6a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is negatively related to organisational politics.

**Hypothesis 6b:**
Organisational politics mediates the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and career success.

**Hypothesis 6c:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 6d:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 6e:**
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development, and turnover intentions.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction:

It has been established in the previous chapters that the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) are important factors in forming employees' perceptions and work outcomes. Based on that, six hypotheses were developed from literature about the possible relationships between them. This chapter outlines the methods used to test the hypotheses.

4.2. Research design:

A research design is defined as a systematic plan or strategy that guides the researcher in collecting and analyzing the data of a study (Churchill, 1979). Research designs are categorized into three major strategies; quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. For the purpose of this study, the quantitative method was found more appropriate.

The survey questionnaire was developed in several stages that could be summarized into four major steps; first, the measures were selected from previous published research. After that, the questionnaire was developed following the guidelines suggested by Sarantakos (1998) for constructing questionnaires.
including the layout, content and the format that motivate participants. Then, the questionnaire was translated to Arabic. In this stage various translation methods were used to identify and modify inconsistencies between the English and Arabic versions (Brislin, 1970; Sperber, Delvellis and Behlecke, 1994). After that, the Arabic and English questionnaires were pilot tested separately. The questionnaire was revised and modified based on the lessons learnt from the pilot tests. Finally, the main study was implemented. The population of this study has been identified as the employees working in a large industrial organisation in Bahrain. The reasons for choosing this sample will be explained later.

4.3. The pilot study:

Pilot testing aims to evaluate the internal reliability and level of content validity, to examine the questionnaire for readability and clarity, and to identify any poor items that should be removed. It is also a crucial step (Van Teijlingen et al., 2001) to detect any weaknesses in the questionnaire design (Cooper and Schindler, 1998; Fink, 2003), highlight any changes that would improve the response rate and to ensure that there are no problems in answering the questionnaire and recording the data.

In this study, piloting the questionnaire went through several stages to ensure the face validity and readability of the scale items and their suitability for the context. During all the stages of the pilot study, special attention was given to the appropriateness of the wording and the length of the questions because both
impact the response rate (Neuman, 2003). First, the original English version of the questionnaire was reviewed by the academic supervisor who amended some items and commented on the suitability and representativeness of the questions. After that the questionnaire was shown to three managers; one was working in the host organisation and the others were working in two other industrial organisations in Bahrain. Based on their feedback, the wording of some questions was modified. Then, the questionnaire was given to two groups of respondents to pilot test it as suggested by Saunders et al. (2008). The first group consisted of MBA students at a local institute. All of them were employees in different organisations doing their studies on part time basis. Therefore this group was a good representative for employees in Bahrain. 35 questionnaires were distributed and 31 were received back, making 88.57% response rate. Before meeting the group, the endorsement of the institute's manager for conducting the pilot questionnaire was sought. He allocated the group and the coordinator who gave the questionnaires to the respondents and collected them back. The questionnaires were distributed individually to students and the purpose of the study was explained clearly. They were encouraged to answer all the questions and highlight any changes that they feel will improve the response rate. A space was provided at the end of the questionnaire for that purpose and the written comments were collected and noted. Four main issues were raised by this group; they said that the questionnaire was too lengthy, some of the statements were repeated and there were some
typographical errors. Based on their comments the necessary amendments were made.

After completing the pilot questionnaires, the respondents were asked to give oral and written feedback about the questions, especially with regard to the appropriateness of the vocabulary and the overall clarity and acceptability of the questions. Upon their request, additional verbal explanation was provided for the meaning of the term ‘succession planning’ in Arabic and English. All the suggestions were considered and changes were made to the final version of the questionnaire before distributing it to the population of the main study.

The second group comprised five employees working in the same organisation as the sample of the main study. However, they were not included in the main study. Respondents were timed and were also asked to provide their feedback in terms of clarity, readability and comprehension of the questions and the scales used. This group did not have any major comments except for the length. They said that the questionnaire was too long and suggested a reduction in the number of statements.

4.3.1. The content of the pilot questionnaire:

The pilot questionnaire comprised three parts as follows:

1. A covering letter highlighting the following:
   - Thanking respondents for agreeing to participate in the pilot study.
   - Telling them who the researcher is and providing them with contact details.
- Telling them the purpose of the questionnaire.
- Asking them to be patient as much as they can and answer all the statements.
- Promising confidentiality and that no one except the researcher will have an access to their answers.
- Asking them to write their comments and suggestions in the spaces provided at the end of the questionnaire.

2. The survey questionnaire comprising the research instruments.

3. Three questions related to the administration of the questionnaire and requesting the respondents to suggest areas of improvements with sufficient space to write their comments:
   a. How much time did you take to complete the questionnaire?
   b. Were there any statements in the questionnaire that were unclear?
   c. Did you notice any mistakes in the questionnaire (spelling, grammar …etc)?

4.3.2. Checking internal consistency reliabilities of the pilot questionnaire:

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 18.0) was used to screen the data, check the internal consistency reliabilities of the scales and calculate the correlations between the study variables. The Cronbach's alpha was employed to test the reliability of the instruments. According to Hair et al. (1998, p.88) “Cronbach’s alpha is used to measure reliability that ranges from 0 to 1 with values of 0.60 to 0.70 deemed as the lower limit of acceptability.” Based on that, some items were deleted in order to improve the reliabilities of the scales before
conducting the main study. Two items were deleted from the perceptions of organisational politics scale (POPS). Those were item number (2) ‘Since I have worked in this department, I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically’ and number (11) ‘I can’t remember when a person received a pay increase or a promotion that was inconsistent with the published policies’. In the SPCD scale five items were deleted. Those were items (1): ‘I need more training to perform my job effectively’, SPCD (7) ‘I believe my knowledge, skills and abilities are underutilized in my current job position’, SPCD (12) ‘I participate in the mentoring program in this company’, SPCD (13) ‘I would like to participate in the mentoring program in this company’, and SPCD (15) ‘I participate in the secession planning program in this company’.

4.3.3. Lessons learned from the pilot study:

The main purpose of the pilot study was to identify any weaknesses in the questionnaire that might affect the response rate and the results of the study. Some problems were detected in this stage. Based on that, the necessary changes were made to the following areas:

a. The wording of the questionnaire:

To produce reliable and valid results, the wording of each question should be precise and unambiguous to ensure that each participant can interpret its meaning
easily and accurately. The questions should also be short, simple and consistent. Based on that, the following issues were noted and amended in the main study:

- Some items were sensitive to cultural barriers. For example, people might not feel comfortable revealing their name, age or salary. Therefore, making the questionnaires anonymous improved the response rate.

- All the typographical errors or misspelled words that were detected in the pilot questionnaire were corrected in the final version of the questionnaire in order to ensure the maximum possible level of respondents reading exactly what was asked in each statement.

- Some items were reworded to match the rest of the questionnaire using the seven-point Likert scale from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”. These items are SPCD (3) ‘The management strives to provide me with verified job assignments and opportunities on special project teams’, was changed to ‘The management strives to provide me with verified job assignments and career development opportunities’, SPCD (8) ‘The succession program in this company should include all the employees’ was changed to ‘The succession program in this organisation includes all the employees’, SPCD (9) ‘I participate in the mentoring program in this company’ was changed to ‘I am satisfied with the mentoring program in this company’, SPCD (11) ‘The mentoring program in this organisation should include all the employees’ was changed to: ‘I am satisfied with the mentoring program in this company’, SPCD (14) ‘I know what the succession planning
program in this company is all about’ changed to ‘I know everything about the succession planning program in this company.’ The removal of those items and the changes made, resulted in significant improvements in the scales’ alpha (Table 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of instrument</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The questionnaire design:
- Respondents suggested reducing the length of the questionnaire. Based on that, the font used in writing the questionnaire was changed from the 'Times New Roman' font size 12 to ‘Arial’ size 10. Furthermore, the size of the introduction in the covering letter was reduced to around 10 lines. Also some low loading statements were removed and some statements were rewritten in shorter forms.
- Separate introductory statements were used for each section to avoid the confusion that might be created while reading from one section to another.
- Pink printing paper and black ink was used for printing the questionnaires in order to catch the respondents’ attention.

- Enough spaces were given between the sections to help respondents move smoothly from one section to another.

4.4. The research instrument:

A research instrument is a tool used to collect data to measure knowledge, attitude and skills (Parahoo, 1997). As mentioned earlier, the instrument used to collect data in this study, was a self-administered questionnaire. This method enables researchers to examine and explain relationships between constructs (Saunders et al., 2007). It also allows them to understand certain attitudes, opinions and behaviours of a relatively large number of individuals in a population of interest.

A good questionnaire design is crucial (Bulmer, 2004; Creswell, 2003; De Vaus, 2002; McGuirk and O'Neill, 2005; Oppenheim, 1992; Parfitt, 2005; Patton, 1990; Sarantakos, 2005) to generate data that is conducive to the goals of the research. This study considered several issues related to the design of the questionnaires in order to ensure reliability, validity and sustainability of the respondents’ engagement. Those issues could be summarized in three points: (1) the sequence of the questions in a logical order that allows a smooth transition from one topic to the next (Sarantakos, 2005). This ensures that participants understand the purpose of the research and will carefully answer the questions to
the end of the survey (McGuirk and O'Neill, 2005). All the related questions were grouped under short headings describing their themes. (2) A suitable length of the questionnaire. It contains the necessary number of questions to cover the study variables (Sarantakos, 2005) to avoid the respondents loosing interest in completing the questionnaire. (3) The response format included closed questions in order to ensure easy analysis and administration (Sarantakos, 2005).

The questionnaire used to generate data in this study comprised pre-published scales that were successfully used, measured, validated and translated in previous studies within the international context and mainly in Western countries. However no Arabic translation was available for all the scales during the stage of the questionnaire design and administration in this study. Although some of the variables were used in previous research that took place in Arab countries, it was difficult and costly to get access to them.

All the scales used were originally created in English and were translated to Arabic before using them in Bahrain. This study is the first attempt to translate them to Arabic. Therefore some difficulties were encountered; one of them was related to culture. Some statements did not fit the Arab culture and when translated to Arabic, the Arabic version did not match the intended meaning. To overcome this problem in the main study, I spent some time explaining the statements to the respondents who needed that. Another problem was the use of the standard written Arabic verses the spoken Arabic. The difference between the two versions of Arabic did not affect the higher level respondents but the lower
levels ones found it difficult to understand some standard Arabic terms. This was also solved by providing additional verbal explanation when needed.

The original instruments used different response formats. For example, one measure used a 7-point scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”, another measure used a 5-point scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (5) “strongly agree” and another one used Yes-No format. Although Podsakoff and colleagues (2003), and other scholars suggested employing multiple responses to reduce the effect of CMV, the variety of those scales were confusing for some respondents in the pilot questionnaire, especially those who answered the Arabic version. To avoid that in the main study, the 7-point scale was used in the majority of the questions. According to Matell and Jacoby, (1971) minor changes to questionnaire response formats do not affect their validity and a magic number seven with a neutral position is suggested as an optimal choice (Cox, 1980; Tang, Shaw and Vevea, 1999). Based on that, the 7-point Likert scale was used in this study. According to Nunnally (1978), psychometric literature suggests that having more scale points is better. The 7 points provide respondents with more options and a good range of preferences. It is broad enough to accommodate and match different options that the respondents might have; behind 7 points, the options could be rather confusing and the respondents might have difficulty in identifying their own responses. Furthermore, a 7-point Likert scale helps in pin-pointing and narrowing down responses when more specific analysis is required. The provision of additional answer alternatives through the 7 points provide respondents with a
higher incidence of an extreme response style and an option to express a relatively strong agreement without having to resort to the scale extremes. It also provides respondents with an option to express a relatively mild agreement/disagreement without necessarily having to resort to the middle of the scale (Harzing et al., 2009). Therefore the 7 points provide a wide range of relatively neutral and extreme responses.

Ten scales were used to measure the constructs of the study including (1) the leader-member exchange (LMX), (2) the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD), (3) distributive justice, (4) procedural justice, (5) interactional justice, (6) organisational politics, (7) overall job satisfaction, (8) organisational commitment, (9) turnover intentions, and (10) career success.

The questionnaire included 80 items divided into 5 sections (see Appendix 1). Section 1, comprises 12 statements about the respondents' demographics in two parts; general demographics and work-related information that might influence the employees' perceptions and work outcomes. Section 2, contains 7 statements related to the leader-member exchange (LMX). Section 3, included questions related to the three forms of organisational justice (i.e. distributive, procedural and interactional), organisational politics and organisational commitment. Section 4, included statements related to job satisfaction, career success and turnover intentions.
4.4.1. Leader-member exchange (LMX):

The quality of the exchange between the respondents and their leader/manager was assessed using the LMX-7 (Gerstner and Day, 1997). According to Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), the LMX scale went through continuous redefining over the years that sometimes resulted in controversy and the use of measures that are altogether different from their original formulation. The number of items also varied over the years. For example, it comprised 2 items in Dansereau et al. (1975), 4 items in Graen and Schiemann (1978) and Linden and Graen (1980), 5 items in Graen, Linden and Hoel (1982), 12 items in Wakabayashi and Graen (1984), 14 items in Wakabayashi, Graen and Uhl-Bien (1990) and 7 items in Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp (1982), Scandura and Graen, 1984 and Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995).

Previous researchers have shown that LMX-7 is highly correlated with and had the same effects as the expanded measures (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). It was described as providing the soundest psychometric properties available for LMX measures (Gerstner and Day, 1997). It has also been identified as the preferred instrument to measure the three dimensions of LMX including: (1) the level of respect, (2) trust, and (3) obligation between employees and their leaders/supervisors. The scale evaluates the quality of the dyadic exchange with two-items for each dimension in addition to one item providing an overall assessment of the relationship (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). The LMX scale was
originally developed by Scandura and Graen (1984) and validated by Scandura, Graen and Novak's (1986).

In this study, the original items were reworded to accommodate the use of a 7-point rating scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”. For example, ‘How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?’ was changed to ‘I have an effective working relationship with my supervisor’. The original scale was measured on a four-point Likert-type scale from (1) “less than average” to (4) “extremely effective”. The Cronbach’s alpha for the 7-item scale was found to be consistently high in previous studies. For example, Gerstner and Day (1997) reported an alpha of 0.89, Wayne, Shore and Linden's (1997) reported 0.90, Kozlowski and Doherty's (1989) reported 0.86, Tetrck (2002) reported 0.89, Harris, Kacmar and Carlson (2006) reported 0.83 and more recently Asgari et al., (2008) and Sparr and Sonnentag (2008) both reported 0.92, and in this study it was 0.89.

4.4.2. Succession planning and career development (SPCD):

A scale adopted from ‘DOE/NV Employee Assessment Survey’, Soonhee (2003) was used to measure the employees' perceptions about the corporate SPCD practices and the extent to which they are involved in and satisfied with them. The original survey included 18 items related to career development, skill utilization, participation in the corporate succession planning, mentoring, workforce diversity
and employees’ retirement plans which form the basic structure of the corporate SPCD proposed in this study.

In the original study, the first 13 items were measured with a 7-point Likert scale; highest score (1) “strongly disagree” and lowest score (7) “strongly agree”. The remaining statements were measured with a “Yes/No” scale. Among those, 16 items were utilized in the pilot study. However the respondents commented that they found it confusing to have different scales. Therefore those statements were modified in the main study. Instead, the 7-point Likert scale was used, similar to the rest of the questionnaire. Also some repeated items were removed.

In the final version, 11 items were used to assess the corporate SPCD as follows: Items (1,3,6) refer to the organisational career development opportunities, item (2) skills utilization, items (4,7,11) promotions, items (8,10) succession planning, item (5) assessment and item (9) the mentoring opportunity provided to the employees.

4.4.3. Distributive justice (DJ):

DJ were measured by the five Distributive Justice Index (DJI) items, developed by Price and Mueller (1986) and Neihoff and Moorman (1993). The scale comprises five items measuring the employees’ perceptions about the organisation's formal procedures and the extent to which they consider the individuals' needs in relation to the fairness of different work outcomes including pay level, work schedule, workload and job responsibilities. It also measures the
degree to which they believe that they have been fairly rewarded given their job responsibilities, experience, effort, performance, education and training, and the stress and strains of their jobs (Wayne et al., 2002). The items were re-worded to enable the use of the 7-point scale used in the questionnaire, ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”. For example, “How fair has the company been in rewarding you when you consider the responsibilities you have?” was changed to “Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair. The term “company” was changed to “my supervisor” as supervisors are usually seen as the proxies of the organisation in the application of rewards and other benefits. The original scale was measured on a five-point scale from (1) “very unfair” to (5) “very fair”. Price and Mueller (1986) provided strong evidence for the convergent and discriminant validity of the Distributive Justice Index (DJI); they demonstrated an internal consistency of above 0.93. The scale reliability in previous studies was high. For example, in Moorman et al., (1998) it was 0.90 and in Niehoff and Moorman (1993) it was 0.74, in Amah and A.Okafor (2008) it was 0.80, in Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani (2009) it was 0.82 and in Yaghoubi et al., (2012) it was 0.79. The value obtained in the current study was 0.82.

4.4.4. Procedural justice (PJ):

PJ was measured using 6 items developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Consistent with the taxonomy of PJ, the scale consists of two factors: systematic and informational justice. Six items (1,2,3,4,5,6) were designed to measure the
fairness of the organisation’s formal procedures (i.e. systematic justice) based on six rules proposed (Leventhal, 1980) that are used by individuals to evaluate the fairness of procedures in their organisations i.e. consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness and ethicality. Some of the interactional justice rules such as the fair quality of communications and decision justifications are also relevant to procedural justice perceptions (Barrett-Howard and Tyler, 1986; Bies and Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1983; Tedeschi, Riordan et al., 1983). However, they are treated as two separate scales in this study. The Cronbach alpha reported in Neihoff and Moorman (1993) was 0.90, in Yaghoubi et al., (2012) it was 0.82, and in this study it is 0.94.

4.4.5. Interactional justice (IJ):

IJ was measured with nine items developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993). The scale measures the supervisor's consideration of the employees’ rights, treatment with respect and kindness, and provision of explanations and justifications for decisions made (Moorman, 1991). The alpha coefficient of the scale in Neihoff and Moorman (1993) was 0.90, in Amah and Okafor (2008) it was 0.81, in Yaghoubi et al., (2012) it was 0.80 and in this study it was 0.96.

4.4.6. Perceptions of organisational politics (POP):

This study used the 12-item short version Perceptions of Organisational Politics Scale (POPS) to measure the extent to which employees view their work
environment as political. Ferris and colleagues provided the most comprehensive model of POP (Ferris et al., 1989) that could be considered as an important milestone in the development of the organisational politics study. The scale went through several developments that aimed to understand the various complexities of POP, and resulted in several multi-dimensional scales (Miller et al., 2008). Kacmar and Ferris (1991) extracted the 12-item scale from the 40-item original scale to measure the multi dimensions of POP. The items are divided into three factors: (1) general political behaviour, (2) going along to get ahead, and (3) pay and promotion.

The shorter 12-item version of the POPS was developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1991), and later re-examined by Kacmar and Carlson (1994) and Kacmar and Carlson's (1997). The internal consistency of the scale in Hochwarter et al., (1999) was 0.76. Also Kacmar and Carlson (1997), Vigoda (2000) and Vigoda-Gadot (2003) showed that these items represent the original full set of 40 items and they provided evidence of reliability and validity. Harrell-Cook et al., (1999) used a 31-item measure of the POPS with internal consistency reliability estimates of 0.91 and 0.77 for subordinates and supervisors, respectively. Ferris et al., (1989) suggested that the POPS is a good measure of the extent to which respondents perceive their work environment as being political and therefore unjust and unfair. POPS has been tested in many studies (e.g., Ferris et al., 1989, 1991, 1994; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar and Carlson, 1994; Kacmar and Ferris, 1991) and proved good psychometric properties and high reliability.
coefficient. For example, it was 0.77 in Vigoda (2000), 0.87 in Randall et al., (1999), 0.74 in Ferris and Kacmar (1992), 0.76 in Parker et al, (1995), 0.77 in Vigoda (2000), 0.83 in Vigoda-Gadot (2006), 0.74 in Vigoda-Gadot and Talmud (2010), 0.89 in Grimland, Vigoda-Gadot and Baruch (2012) and in this study it is 0.85.

Consistent with the rest of the measures, respondents reported the degree to which they agreed with the items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”; a higher score meant a stronger POP. In the pilot study, two items loaded low: (1) I can't remember when a person received a pay increase or a promotion that was inconsistent with the published policies, and (2) since I worked in this department I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically. Both items were removed in the main study in order to improve the scale’s internal consistency.

4.4.7. Career success (CS):

CS was measured by the CS scale developed by Greenhaus al., (1990). The scale was described as the best measure available in literature (Oberfield, 1993; Judge et al., 1995). The ratings used to measure the responses comprised: “strongly disagree”, “disagree to some extent”, “uncertain”, “agree to some extent” and “strongly agree” (Hofmans, Dries and Pepermans 2008). In the present study respondents were asked to rate their agreement with each statement using a 7-point Likert scale (1) “strongly disagree” (7) “strongly agree” similar to
the rest of the questionnaire. All the items are considered as indicators of intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of the respondents’ career. Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1990) reported an acceptable level of internal consistency 0.88, Volmer and Spurk (2011) 0.84, De Vos and Soens (2008) 0.87, Grimland, Vigoda-Gadot and Baruch (2011) 0.86, and in this study 0.90.

4.4.8. Organisational commitment (OC):

OC was measured by the nine-item short form of the Organisational Commitment questionnaire (OCQ) by Porter, Crampon and Smith's (1976). The short form has shown a high positive correlation with the original fifteen-item OCQ (Huselid and Day, 1991). The scale is relatively valid and reliable (Price and Mueller, 1986). It has been described as the most visible measure of affective commitment which enjoyed widespread acceptance and use (Griffin and Bateman, 1986; Vigoda-Gadot and Talmud, 2010). The nine items characterize OC along three dimensions: (1) four items cover the respondents’ strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation's goals and values (identification), (2) two items cover the respondents' willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation (involvement), and (3) three items cover the respondents’ strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation (loyalty) (Edger and Geare, 2005; Tansky and Cohen, 2011; Yousef, 2000).

Similar to the other measures used in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate their responses to the statements on a 7-point Likert scale
ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly disagree”. The higher scores indicate higher levels of OC. The reliability evidence of the scale proved to be high in previous studies. For example, it was ranging from 0.82 to 0.93 in Porter et al., (1974), Steers and Spencer (1977) and Stone and Porter (1975), in Vigoda (2000) it was 0.88, in Tansky and Cohen (2001) it was 0.89, in Grimland, Vigoda-Gadot and Baruch (2012) it was 0.81, in Hollet-Handebert, Mulki and Fournier (2011) it was 0.89, in Dirani and Kuchinke (2011) it was 0.89 and in this study it was 0.75.

4.4.9. Turnover intentions (TOI):

TOI was measured by four single indicators; namely desire to quit, thinking of quitting, search for another job and intent to leave if an alternative was found (Cammann, et al., 1979; Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth, 1978; O’Reilley et al., 1991). Consistent with the rest of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with the given statements on a-7 point Likert scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”. Reliability evidence reported in the original study was 0.80, in Randall et al., (1999) 0.83, Tumwesigye (2010) 0.78 and in this study it is 0.85.

4.4.10. Job satisfaction (JS):

Previous researchers used several instruments to measure JS. For example, Price and Muller (1986) used a six-item measure adapted from Brayfield and
Rothe (1951). They reported an alpha reliability of 0.83 (Rice et al., 1991). Harrell-Cook et al., (1999) used the Job descriptive index to measure both satisfaction with supervision and general JS. The alpha reliability for the JDI supervision scale and the JDI general scale were 0.82 and 0.86, respectively. Quinn and Shepard's (1974) used the job satisfaction index and reported an internal consistency of 0.72. In the present study, JS was assessed using three items of the overall JS scale of the Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1979). The scale assesses the employees’ overall affective responses to their jobs on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) “strongly disagree” to (7) “strongly agree”. The scale is widely used in a variety of research settings and shown to be internally consistent with reliability ranging from 0.77 to 0.87 (Cammann et al., 1979; Jex and Gudanowski, 1992). The Cronbach alpha reported in Randall et al., (1999) was 0.88, in Bowling, Beehr and Lepisto (2006) 0.72, Spector et al., (2006) 0.82 and in this study it is 0.86.

4.4.11. Control variables (demographic variables):

The data in this study is derived from the respondents' self-rating questionnaires. Therefore it was important to control for potential biasing influences (Bommer, Dierdoff and Rubin, 2007) in order to minimize the potential confounding effects that might result from such ratings. The analysis controlled for the influence of two groups of demographic variables that might influence the employees’ work-related attitudes and behaviours (Broschak and Davis-Blake,
The first group is the general variables that cover age (measured as a ratio variable) and educational level (measured as ordinal variable on a scale from 1=less than high school/Towjeeheya to 6=PhD). The other group is the work-related demographics including work experience and organisational tenure in years. These variables were demonstrated in previous research as having an impact on the variables used in this study. For example, Cohen and Vigoda (1999) and Ferris et al. (1989) presented three personal characteristics including gender, age and organisational tenure as predictors of POP. Other researches such as Witt et al., (2002), Field et al., (2000), Parker et al., (1995) and McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) included job status, gender, age and organisational tenure as predictors of JS. Also Lum et al., (1998), Guest, (1999), Ghiselli et al., (2001), Hemdi and Nasurdin (2005), Boon and Arumugam (2006) and Hollet-Handeber, Mulki and Fournier (2011) noted that age, gender, education and organisational tenure may influence organisational commitment. Marsh and Mannari (1977) have argued that older employees with higher levels of tenure may experience higher levels of OC than younger workers who invested less time in the company (Brief and Aldag, 1980; Meyer and Allen, 1984).

Gender is one of the commonly used controlling variables in organisational research and it could have been very useful in this study. However it was not possible to use it because the number of female employees working in the host organisation was very low, which resulted in a very low unusable sample of responses. Table 4.2 shows the internal consistency reliabilities of the
measurement scales, their sources and the Cronbach’s alphas in this study, as well as in previous studies.

**Table 4.2: Internal consistency reliabilities of measurement scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Measurement scales</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Example of previous Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LMX Leader-member exchange</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.91 -.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SPCD Succession planning &amp; career development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DJ Perceptions of distributive justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.92 -.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PJ Perceptions of procedural justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88 -.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>INJ Perceptions of interactional justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.90 – .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>POP Perceptions of organisational politics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.90 – .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OC Organisational commitment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.93 -.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JS Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.88 -.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CS Career satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88 -.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TOI Turnover intention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.89 -.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*  
(2) SPCD "DOE/NV, Employee Assessment Survey", Soonhee Kim, Ph. (2003)  
(6) POP; Kacmar & Carlson (1994)  
(7) Organisational Commitment: OCQ, Mowday, Steers & Porter (1979)  
(8) Job Satisfaction: Locke (1976)  
(9) Career Success: Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley (1990)  

4.5. Translation of the questionnaire:

In international research, such as the present study, translation is extremely important if the questions are to have identical meanings for all participants (Saunder et al., 2007). The major challenge was related to adopting the questionnaire into a form that maintains the meaning and psychometric properties of the original instruments and establish generalizable scales across a different
cultural setting (Chen and Bates, 2005). In order to identify and modify any inconsistencies between the English and Arabic versions of the questionnaire and to ensure the equivalence of the measures in Arabic and English, three types of translation procedures were applied; standard translation, back-translation (Brislin, 1970; Sperber, Delvellis and Behlecke, 1994) and collaborative translations (Douglas and Craig, 2006; 2007). The back translation (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994) refers to the process of translating the questionnaire from one language to another, and then back into the original language by a second, independent translator (Zikmund, 1997). This approach is the most commonly used in multi-country research (Brislin, 1970). However, there are certain limitations that need to be considered when using this approach. First, it lacks the consideration of meaning asymmetry of the same word-constructs that exists in different languages. Apart from that, a different use of language may exist between bilingual and monolingual speakers (Brislin, 1970); bilinguals (i.e. translators) are fluent in both languages and accordingly they may not use a language in the same way as monolinguals. Secondly, back translation only provides a literal translation from one language to another; therefore, it may not capture the intended sense of meaning. Based on those limitations, international research used the parallel translation along with the collaborative translation (Douglas and Craig, 2006; 2007) in order to support the back translation and ensure that respondents understood the statements the same way they were intended to. This method has been advocated as a preferred method of achieving
equivalence in meaning (Hambleton, 1993), bringing disciplinary expertise and cultural knowledge to the translation of the questionnaire (Douglas and Craig, 2007).

As mentioned earlier, the questionnaire was prepared in English and then translated to Arabic to allow a higher response rate among respondents who might find it difficult to understand some of the English terms used in the original scales. After that, the back translation (Chen and Bates 2005) technique was used; the questionnaire was translated back into English by three professional Arab translators. The purpose was to provide respondents with a clear understanding of the questions and enable them to answer the questionnaire with confidence. Also to ensure that the purpose of each question was understood in the same way it was intended to. In this stage some amendments were made to the wording of the Arabic version.

Before distributing the questionnaires and collecting the data, it was important to assess the respondents’ comprehension and understanding of the questions (Fink; 2003; Krosnick, 1999). The Arabic version was pilot tested in two stages; in the first stage, five Arab individuals were asked to complete the questionnaires. They were asked to think aloud while writing their answers and ask questions whenever they needed to do so. The purpose was to identify any confusion, potential ambiguities and any other difficulties that the respondents might encounter while completing the questionnaire. Their suggestions were
mainly related to the wording of the statements that in some cases impacted their comprehension of the intended meanings.

The second stage of the Arabic questionnaire pretest, aimed to ensure that there were no ambiguous or confusing questions, and to obtain the internal validity of the questions and the likely reliability of the data that will be collected in the main study. In this stage, five other Arab employees answered the questionnaires; no errors or significant comments were detected.

4.6. The main study:

4.6.1. Questionnaire format and layout:

Self-administered questionnaires were designed to collect data in this study. This method was found appropriate for several reasons; first, it was used by previous major studies on employees’ perceptions, their predictors and outcomes (e.g. Meyer and Smith, 2000), which adds validity to the results of the study. Second, it is suitable to investigate larger, more representative samples that aim to test relationships between variables (Sarantakos, 1998; Salant and Dillman, 1994), and third, the distribution of respondents in various sites of the host organisation and the limited budget required the use of a mail survey that could be completed anonymously at the respondent's convenience (Sarantakos, 1998; Cooper and Schindler, 1998).

The study followed various guidelines provided by researchers to improve the response rate. First, the appearance of the questionnaire and the impression it
gives is a catalyst for the respondents to participate in the research. In this respect, the researcher should consider the presentation of the questionnaire as a complete document, size, paper colour and the size of print (Sarantakos, 1998, Salant and Dillman, 1994). Sarantakos (1998) suggests that the questionnaire should include a tight introduction, clearly organised questions and clear guidelines to avoid any misunderstanding or confusion that might affect the responses. Salant and Dillman (1994) also suggest that the questions should establish an easy vertical flow throughout the questionnaire. This was applied and further assisted by clear instructions using bold headings for each section. For example, the demographic information section was subdivided into ‘General Information’ section and ‘Work related Information with separate titles. The questionnaire was further simplified by providing clear instructions on how to answer each section and repeating the scales at the top of each page. The statements were placed in tables to add clarity and minimize confusion.

The covering letter was placed at the first page, providing clear introduction to the purpose of the research, the identity of the researcher and attempts to motivate respondents to provide honest and complete responses. It also included a clause regarding confidentiality and deadline, and encourages a prompt response. The emblem of the University of East Anglia was displayed prominently at the head of the cover letter (Cooper and Schnidler, 1998). A reply envelope was also provided. After sending the questionnaires out, different reminders were sent
followed by continuous follow-ups (Ticehurst and Veal, 1999) through emails and telephone calls to the individuals and their supervisors.

4.6.2. Definition of population in the main study:

Population has been defined as “the total number of units from which data can be collected” (Parahoo, 1997:218), such as individuals, artifacts, events or organisations. To identify the eligible population, a screening approach was required that was operationally feasible and provided a standardized set of data for the research (Fink, 2003). Having a sample of employees from all the sectors in Bahrain has proven to be impossible for financial and practical reasons. Therefore, a sample from a large industrial organisation was found suitable as a proxy for the population of employees in Bahrain because of the variety of professions and the ease of reaching the people working in it.

The population was limited to full time employees, excluding part-time and contractor employees because they report to other organisations and undergo different working conditions that might influence their responses. To control the population, respondents were limited to section heads and lower levels employees who are not holding managerial positions.

The host organisation employs around 3000 full time employees, whereby female employees form only 10% of the total population. The company sites spread on a large landscape in many cities and villages in Bahrain. After identifying the sample, a request was sent to the manager of the Human Resources
department, to have his endorsement for conducting the study in his company. Two months later, I received the approval and immediately I made a list of the departments, sections and the target respondents in order to decide the best way of distributing the questionnaires. I tried to personally contact as many section heads as possible requesting their support in distributing the questionnaires. The reason for selecting this group is their close relationship with their subordinates in compare to line managers who are distant from their staff due to the size of the departments and the nature of their operations in more than one geographical location.

The questionnaires were sent to the section heads in sealed envelopes labeled by the employee's names in order to make it easier to track the distribution of the questionnaires. They were asked to distribute them to their subordinates, collect them and send them back to me through the company's internal mail or by hand where possible. Participation was completely anonymous, voluntary and not paid. There was no request, instructions or pressure from the management to the employees to complete the questionnaires. Therefore, there was no reason for not responding other than not wanting to participate. This decline could be attributed to the low level of satisfaction (Baruch, 1999; Spitzmuller et al, 2006) among the staff or their fear of revenge if their bosses did not like their answers which could be considered as one of the limitations in this study.

The study was conducted between February and May 2011. The initial plan was to distribute one thousand questionnaires and receive them within less than
two months because of the relatively small size of the host organisation. However, it was only possible to distribute 700 questionnaires due to the difficulty in reaching a larger number of respondents. Literature suggests that the prepaid monetary incentive could make an increase from 15% to 26% in the response rate (Rose, Sidle and Griffith, 2007; Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2008). It could also assist in improving the respondents' motivation to answer and ultimately improve their response rate (Aaker, Kumar and Day, 1998; Cooper and Schnidler, 1998). However, monetary rewards were unacceptable according to the company's ethical criteria.

4.6.3. The sample of the main study:

According to Polit et al., (2001:234), a sample as “a proportion of a population”. In this respect, the sampling technique aims to determine the representativeness of the sample to the population of interest. It also reflects the characteristics of the population such as age, socioeconomic status, education, gender and marital status. Openheim, (1992) noted that a representative sample is one where every member of a population has a statistically equal chance of being selected.

It is uncommon for a research to survey the entire population due to time and financial constraints especially when the population is very large. Therefore a conclusion can be made from the sample about the population to achieve the research objectives (Saunders et al., 2007). Aaker, Kumar and Day (1989) suggest
four factors that determine the size of the survey sample: (1) the number of groups and subgroups to be analysed, (2) the required accuracy of the results, (3) the costs associated with sampling and (4) the variability of the population. Hair et al., (1995) suggested that the minimum size is to have at least five times as many observations as there are variables to be analyzed and a more acceptable range would be ten-to-one ratio (Hair et al., 1995:373). However Holloway and Wheeler (2002) assert that the size of the sample does not influence the quality of the study.

As there were 10 variables to be tested in this study, the range of observations from minimum to the more acceptable range (70-140) means that a sample of 333 falls within an acceptable range. Among 3000 employees, a total of 700 questionnaires were sent (23.3% of the total population), 405 questionnaires were returned (57.8% of the questionnaires sent). Among those 333 (82.2% of the returned questionnaires) were useable containing complete data which makes the percentage of the incomplete questionnaires among the returned questionnaires negligible (Baruch, 1999). The rest (17.8%) questionnaires were excluded for one of three reasons: (a) the questionnaire was returned unanswered completely, (b) more than 50% of the items were unanswered, and (c) the same answer was given for all or the majority of the items. This represents a response rate of 82.2% and an effective response rate of 47.5% which is acceptable by the norm in social sciences (Babbie, 1995; Baruch, 1999; McBurney and White, 2004; Newman, 2000; Roth and BeVier, 1998).
4.6.4. Demographics of respondents:

The sample was fairly heterogeneous except for the fact that the majority of respondents were male employees; this is due to the low population of female employees working in the host organisation which does not exceed 10% of the total workforce, according to the human resources department. Out of the complete questionnaires received, there were only 6 females (1.8%) in compare to 327 male (98.2%). The low number of female employees could be attributed to the nature of the operations in the host organisation that does not attract women to work in it. The average age of respondents was 42.2, which is fairly high. The minimum age was 23 and the maximum was 66, which is also an indication of an aging workforce. Respondents had an average work experience of 20.86 and an average organisational tenure of 17.74 years. This might indicate that not much recruitment for young employees has taken place during the last few years. Respondents had different organisational tenures, 33.3% working in the company between 1-10 years, 27.6% between 11-20 years, 21.9% between 21-30 years, 16.5% 31-40 years, and 0.6% more than 40 years. As a general observation, a high number of tenured employees participated in the study. Although there is no evidence that this represents the whole population, it will have some correlation with their responses in the other parts of the questionnaire.

Respondents represented a diverse set of functional areas; including operators (48.6%), engineers (15.3%), administrative assistants (3%), Chemists (2.1%), accountants (1.2%), IT specialists (0.9%), drivers (0.6%), instructors (0.6%),
security officers (0.3%) and buyers (0.3%). (Table 4.3 shows the demographic characteristics of the official sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahraini</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bahraini</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineer</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT specialist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than BD 500</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1000</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work experience (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic variables</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7. Chapter summary:

This chapter discussed the research design and methodology utilized to investigate the relationships among the employees' perceptions about justice and politics in their organisations, their predictors and outcomes. It also presented the characteristics of the study sample, data collection procedures, the administration of the questionnaires and the measures used in addition to the statistical methods used to analyse the data. Chapter 5 will present the test of the study hypotheses and the results obtained.
CHAPTER 5
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1. Introduction:

The previous chapter discussed the research methodology utilized in this study. It has been established that the quantitative approach will be used because it is more suitable for the objectives of the study. The chapter also discussed the content of the questionnaires, and the scales and measures used to collect data, giving examples of their previous uses and statistical characteristics.

This chapter continues the work that has been done in the previous chapter by analyzing the data collected from the questionnaires and making inferences about them. The chapter is divided into three sections; the first outlines the procedures used to screen the data entry and check the reliability and internal consistency of the scales utilized in the study. This is followed by an overview of the factor analysis procedures used to examine the distinctiveness among the measurement instruments. Finally, the procedures of the ANOVA and multiple regression analysis used for testing the research hypotheses are presented.

5.2. Data screening:

Before conducting any statistical analysis, all the variables used in the study and the responses were examined to check the accuracy of data entry, missing values and the fit between the distribution of the data and the assumptions of the
multivariate analysis. Also, the descriptive statistics such as, means, standard deviations, and skewness and kurtosis were calculated to analyse the shape of the data distribution and the value of each item included in the different factors of the study. Additionally, the validity and reliability analysis were conducted to determine the psychometric properties of the data. The main purpose of using these analyses methods is to reach acceptable research findings (Edward and Thomas, 1993; Morgan et al., 1999) that could be generalized to a certain extent. The first step was handling the missing data.

5.3. Handling missing data:

It is important to address the issues of missing data and non-response errors in order to avoid any misleading results. Previous researchers used several techniques to deal with such issues. Examples of those techniques include: (1) ‘listwise’ method that refers to the deletion of all data for an entire case that has missing entries, and (2) ‘pairwise’ method that is based on the partial deletion of only the missing entries in a case (Oppenheim, 1992). (3) Researchers sometimes dealt with incomplete data by logically correcting them (Sekaran, 2000), and (4) in some cases they inferred the missing data. In this study, all the incomplete data were treated as non-response questions (Luck and Rubin, 1987), and the entire cases were completely deleted and disregarded from any further analysis to avoid introducing bias into the data or giving inaccurate results.
5.4. Data analysis:

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v. 18.0) was found suitable and easy to use in this study. The SPSS is considered as the most popular program because it offers powerful, fast and reliable statistical analysis for quantitative data. It can also test the correlations between the study variables, assess the significance and evaluate the extent to which the results from the study sample can be applied and generalized to the whole target population (Sarantakos, 2007).

Several tests were conducted in order to analyze the data in this study; first a frequency test was conducted in order to detect any missing data and to identify the main characteristics of the study sample. Second, descriptive statistics were conducted to show the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values of the study sample. Third, the Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to test the bivariate correlations among the variables. Finally, the multiple regression analysis was conducted to further confirm the correlations between the variables and to test the prediction effects of the leader-member exchange (LMX), organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD), distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ) and organisational politics (OP). The hierarchical regression analysis was also used to test the mediating effects of organisational justice and politics, as will be shown later in this chapter.
5.5. The test of multivariate normality:

The sample of the study consists of 333 respondents which is the number of the completed questionnaires received. According to Field (2005) and Kline (2005), in sizeable samples of 200 or more, univariate distribution is assessed by looking at the value of the ‘skewness’ and ‘kurtosis’ statistics associated with each item. The ‘skewness’ is an index that characterizes the shape of the data distribution; the larger the absolute value of the index, the more extreme the characteristics of the index are. When the skewness is approximately 0 the distribution will be considered as even. The kurtosis, on the other hand, measures the peakness or flatness of the data distribution. Copper and Schnidler (2003) identified three different types of kurtosis: (1) peaked or leptokurtic distributions, whereby scores cluster heavily in the centre forming a positive kurtosis value, (2) flat or platykurtic distributions, whereby scores and facts are evenly distributed forming a flatter shape than a normal distribution which is considered a negative kurtosis value, (3) intermediate or mesokurtic distributions that are considered neither too peaked nor too flat. A kurtosis value is close to zero; the further it is from zero, the more likely the data is not normally distributed (Field, 2005). An extreme univariate non-normality exists when absolute values of skewness index are greater than 3 and absolute values of kurtosis index are greater than 5 (Kline, 2005). In this study, all the variables had acceptable skewness and kurtosis values (Table 5.1).
Table 5.1: The skewness and Kurtosis values for the data used in the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader member exchange (LMX)</td>
<td>-1.741</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice (DJ)</td>
<td>-.815</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice (PJ)</td>
<td>-1.184</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour (GPB)</td>
<td>-1.370</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along to get ahead (GATGA)</td>
<td>-.830</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning &amp; career development (SPCD)</td>
<td>-.418</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment (OC)</td>
<td>-1.475</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions (TOI)</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (JS)</td>
<td>-1.734</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career success (CS)</td>
<td>-1.476</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. Checking the validity of the scales:

Validity refers to the extent to which the indicators or questions accurately measure what they are intended to and claim to measure, and whether they reflect the underlying theories of the scales (Hair et al., 1995; Openheim, 1992). Sources of validity include evidence based on three elements: (1) the content of the scale or instrument, (2) the internal structure and the relationships between the items of the instrument, (3) the correlations between the scale and the other variables (McMillan, 2004). Constructing and evaluating the validity of a research instrument is an important ongoing process that is necessary to ensure that the findings are trusted and credible (Merriam, 1995). To achieve that, the data need to exhibit evidence of two forms of validity; convergent validity and discriminant validity. Following is a summary of each form and how they were used in this study.
a. Convergent validity:

Convergent validity refers to the common proportion of variance shared by the items of a certain construct emphasizing that all the items should be interrelated. In this study, convergent validity was assessed by two methods; (1) the factor loading of the constructs which confirmed that each item in the constructs was statistically significant and standardized, and (2) the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) (Chen and Indartono, 2011) in which the variance extracted of 0.5 or greater was considered as suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981). The results of the factor loadings of the items and the varimax extracted of the scales (Hair et al., 2006) examined in this study, indicated that all the variance-extracted estimates were higher than 0.5 and most of them were above the level of 0.7. The results supported the convergent validity of the measurement model; it fitted relatively well and all the items were retained at this point. The results also showed that all the $t$-values were significantly different from zero at $p<.05$, providing evidence of the convergent validity of the constructs. The factor loadings and the $t$-values are presented in the coming sections of this chapter.

b. Discriminant validity:

Discriminant validity refers to the extent to which the different instruments used in a study differ in their constructs. It assesses the degree to which a construct is unique and not a manifestation of another measure (Cherchill, 1979). Discriminant validity is assessed by reviewing the $t$ tests for the factor loadings
(Anderson and Gerbing, 1988) and it is achieved when the intercorrelations between the constructs are not too high; they should be at a minimal level. In this study, the statistical analysis showed one factor for most of the scales except for organisational justice and organisational politics. For the two scales, the discriminant validity supported the convergent and discriminant validity of the revised 2-factor models of the two scales; the fit statistics suggested that the two models fitted relatively well. Based on that, the revised 2-factor models of the two scales were used for further analysis.

5.7. Testing common method variance (CMV):

CMV refers to the variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs that the measure represents (Podsakoff et al., 2003). According to Chang, Witteloostuijn and Eden (2010), the CMV creates a false internal consistency and apparent correlation among the variables. When self-report questionnaires are used to collect data from the same participants, CMV becomes a source of concern (Spector, 2006) that needs to be addressed properly.

This study depended solely on self-report questionnaires for collecting data on perceptions, attitudes and behaviours, which makes CMV a potential methodological problem (Campbell and Fiske, 1959; Podskoff and Organ, 1986) that needs to be addressed properly in order to have reliable data. Such self-report data can create false correlations between the variables if the respondents have a tendency to provide consistent answers to the questions of a survey that are
otherwise not related. Therefore, the CMV can be a main source of measurement error (Podsakoff et al., 2003) that might undermine the validity of the conclusions between the measures (Nunnally, 1978). Measurement error has systematic components that are serious because they provide an alternative explanation for the observed relationships between the measures of different constructs that is independent of the one hypothesized. Such variance can have a serious confounding influence on empirical results, yielding potentially misleading conclusions (Campbell and Fiske, 1959); it either inflates or deflate the observed relationships between the constructs (Chang, Witteloostuijn and Eden, 2010).

However these problems can be avoided through proper test construction, administration, scoring and statistical analysis of results. In the present study, the data were gathered through self-report questionnaires because no other resources were possible for data collection. Several techniques related to the questionnaire design were applied in order to minimize the effect of CMV. These techniques included: (1) careful construction and clarity of each scale item in English and Arabic, (2) ‘psychological separation’ of the questions (Podsakoff et al., 2003), which makes the measurement of the dependent variables appear not connected with or related to the measurement of the criterion variables, and (3) grouping the related questions together and putting them under different general topic sections to make them appear unrelated. Also each section had a brief instruction indicating what is being asked to avoid the problems created by respondents trying to establish relationships between the sections, (4) guaranteeing anonymity
and confidentiality and providing detailed information about the precautions taken by the researcher to ensure the confidentiality of the responses. The purpose was to reduce the socially desirable responses and to increase the respondents’ openness. Finally, (5) respondents were assured that there were no right or wrong answers. The sentence ‘there is no right or wrong answer’ was placed in the questionnaire's cover letter. According to Podsakoff et al., (2003), these techniques or procedures are expected to reduce the respondents' apprehension and make them less likely to edit their responses to make them more socially desirable, lenient, acquiescent and consistent with how they think the researcher wants them to respond.

5.8. Internal consistency:

Internal consistency measures the degree to which all the items in a scale measure the same attribute (Clark and Watson, 1995). Researchers use two methods to assess the internal consistency of the scales; the first is the 'variance extracted', which refers to the amount of common or shared variance among the constructs’ indicators. The variance extracted value for a construct should exceed 0.50 (Hair et al., 1995); higher values represent a greater degree of shared representation of the indicators with the construct. The results of the total variance explained for the scales used in this study show 12 items that have eigenvalues greater than 1.0, explaining 68.61% of the cumulative variance. The first factor explained 34.19% of the common method variance, which indicates that multiple
factors emerged and the first factor did not account for the majority of the variance (Table 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Variance Explained</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.251</td>
<td>34.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.131</td>
<td>7.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.554</td>
<td>5.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>4.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>3.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>2.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>2.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>2.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>1.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>1.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The second method used to assess the internal consistency, is the reliability analysis, which refers to the agreement between independent attempts to measure the same theoretical concept (Bagozi, 1994). Reliability is concerned with the extent to which the measures are repeatable; producing the same or similar results on different occasions by different observers and by similar or parallel tests (Nunnally, 1978; Streiner and Norman, 2003). The estimates of reliability are indicated by a reliability correlation coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) ranging between 0.00 and 0.99. A common threshold value that is used for acceptable reliability is 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978; Nunnally and Berstein, 1994). When the correlation coefficient is high, the reliability is described as high or good. However, the correlation coefficients that are below 0.60 are generally considered
as inadequate or weak. According to Field (2005), a reliable scale should satisfy two conditions: (1) all the single items should correlate at least 30% with the total score, and (2) the deletion of any single item in the scale should not improve the alpha substantially, greater than the overall alpha (Field, 2005).

The interpretation of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient in this study was based on Nunnally's (1978) recommendation that a reliability of 0.70 or higher is acceptable. All the measures displayed good reliabilities and good psychometric properties. The values of the Cronbach's alphas for the scales exceeded the threshold of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978), except for the organisational politics (OP) and organisational commitment (OC) scales. The reliability of OP was (0.49) and OC slightly lower than 0.7 (0.68). Each measurement item was also examined on its values of corrected item total correlation and alpha if item deleted. The value of the corrected item total correlation shows the correlation between a single item and the total score; a value of above 0.25 indicates that the item correlates well with the scale overall (Field, 2005). The value of alpha if item deleted shows the overall alpha if a specific item of a scale is not included in the calculation (Field, 2005). The values of corrected item-total correlation and alpha if item deleted indicated potential problems with seven items (Table 5.3). Those items either had values of corrected item-total correlation’ lower than .25, or alpha if item deleted substantially higher than the alpha calculated for all the items of the relevant scales. Based on that, items OC3 (I feel very little loyalty to this company) and OC8 (Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organisation's policies on
important matters relating to its employees) were reverse coded in the analysis, which improved the internal consistency of the OC scale. The same process was applied to items OP2, OP3, OP6 and OP7. They were also reverse coded, which improved the internal consistency of the OP scale. Furthermore, item SPCD2, (I am confident that I have the skills necessary to be promoted) loaded on a different factor than the rest of the scale. Therefore, it was removed completely, which improved the reliability of the SPCD scale. (Table 5.4).

Table 5.3: Items did not satisfy reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Corrected item-total correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
<th>Alpha if item deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OC3</td>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OC8</td>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OP2</td>
<td>Organisational politics</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OP3</td>
<td>Organisational politics</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OP6</td>
<td>Organisational politics</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OP7</td>
<td>Organisational politics</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SPCD2</td>
<td>Succession planning &amp; career development</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Internal consistency reliabilities of the POP, OC and SPCD scales after revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Measurement Scales</th>
<th>Before revision Number of items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>After revision Number of items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisational politics (POP)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organisational commitment (OC)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Succession planning &amp; career development (SPCD)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliabilities of the scales used in this study are consistent with previous studies; there are no significant differences. Some of the reliabilities are higher, some are lower and some are similar. Table 5.5 presents the internal consistency
reliabilities of the scales used in this study, as well as examples of their reliabilities in previous studies.

Table 5.5: Internal consistency reliabilities of all scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Measurement scales</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha in this study</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha in previous studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LMX Leader-member exchange</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.91-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SPCD Succession planning &amp; career development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DJ Distributive justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.92-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PJ Procedural justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.88-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IJ Interactional justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>POP Perceptions of organisational politics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OC Organisational commitment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.84/.82-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TOI Turnover intention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CS Career success</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JS Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*  
(2) SPCD "DOE/NV, Employee Assessment Survey", Soonhee Kim, Ph. (2003)  
(6) Perceptions of organisational politics: Kacmar and Carlson (1994)  
(7) Organisational commitment questionnaire: OCQ, Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979)  
(9) Career success: Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley (1990)  
(10) Job Satisfaction: Locke (1976)

5.9. Factor analysis:

Factor analysis is a statistical method that can be used to analyze interrelationships among a large number of variables and to explain the variables in terms of their common underlying dimensions or factors (Hair et al., 2006:17). Most of the measures utilized in this study were used, validated and their factorial structure and reliability were confirmed by past empirical research. However a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was needed to confirm the factorial structure
of each variable. All the scales were translated to Arabic; therefore the CFA was necessary to confirm that they had the same factors as their original English versions and to ensure that the statements were interpreted the same way they were intended to by the originators. Also several variables were related conceptually related; therefore it was important to conduct a series of CFA to verify their distinctiveness (Farh, Hackett and Liang, 2007).

The CFA was conducted for each scale independently. In this stage, some of the items that loaded onto different factors were either removed to enhance the unidimensionality of the constructs or maintained when more than one factor was detected and confirmed by previous research. The OP scale had two factors; both were maintained in consistence with previous research (e.g. Byrne, 2005). The analysis revealed 15 clear factors, representing the constructs: the leader-member exchange (LMX), the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD), general political behaviour (GPB), go along to get ahead (GATGA), distributive justice (DJ), procedural justice (PJ), organisational commitment (OC), career success (CS), job satisfaction (JS) and turnover intentions (TOI). Two criteria were used to determine the appropriateness of the factor model: eigenvalues above (1.00) and communality (0.20). An overall CFA was also conducted to estimate the factorial structure and designated factor loadings by statistically testing the fit between the proposed measurement model and the data (Yang, 2005).
1. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for LMX:

CFA was conducted to assess whether the seven items of the LMX scale load onto one factor. The results are consistent with previous research; the seven LMX items loaded on one factor. The scale also had sufficient internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.89. (Table 5.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th></th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX1</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>I usually know how satisfied my boss is with what I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX2</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>My boss understands my job problems and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX3</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>My boss recognises my potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX4</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>My boss would use his/her power to help me solve problems in my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX5</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>My boss would bail me out at his/her expense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX6</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>I would defend and justify my supervisor's decision if he/she were not present to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX7</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>I have an effective working relationship with my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD):

There was no previous factor analysis reported for the SPCD scale. The CFA carried out in this study revealed two-factor loadings for the scale; the first factor comprised statements SPCD1 (career development), SPCD3 (management support), SPCD4, SPCD7, SPCD11 (promotions), SPCD6 (training), SPCD8, SPCD10 (perceptions of succession planning), SPCD9 (mentoring), SPCD5 (management assessment), while the second factor comprised item SPCD2 (skill utilization). The cut-off point for the item loading was 0.5; based on that, item
SPCD2 was deleted completely from any further analysis. This resulted in a unidimensional SPCD scale that possessed sufficient internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.91 (Table 5.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPCD1</td>
<td>.787 The management strives to provide me with verified job assignment and career development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD3</td>
<td>.781 My promotion from one grade to the next has been timely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD4</td>
<td>.849 The managers’ assessments of my job performance and competencies are fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD5</td>
<td>.762 I have made maximum use of job and educational opportunities by consistently participating in conferences and training workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD6</td>
<td>.810 I believe that all the promotions in this company are based on good assessments of individual's leadership, planning and decision making abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD7</td>
<td>.765 The succession program in this organisation includes all the employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD8</td>
<td>.762 I am satisfied with the mentoring program in this company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD9</td>
<td>.607 I know everything about the succession planning program in the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD10</td>
<td>.599 I am expecting a promotion within the next few years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for organisational justice:

CFA was conducted to examine the distinctiveness of the three constructs of organisational justice; namely procedural (PJ), distributive (DJ) and interactional justice (IJ). Accordingly, a series of four nested plausible factor models were constructed and examined:

M0: A null model, where each item was treated as an independent factor.

M1: A one-factor model, where all the items loaded onto one factor.

M2: A two-factor model, where all the items loaded onto two factors.

M3: A three-factor model, where all the items loaded onto three factors.
As explained earlier, first, each dimension of organisational justice was tested separately (Tables 5.8, 5.9, 5.10). After that, the three dimensions were tested together. The CFA showed that the items loaded onto two factors (Table 5.11); all the items of DJ loaded onto one factor, while the items of IJ and PJ loaded on the second factor. The findings are consistent with previous studies that divided organisational justice into two dimensions. Based on that, the two factor model was used for further analysis in this study.

**Table 5.8**: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for distributive justice (DJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DJ1 .714</td>
<td>I believe that my work schedule is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ2 .782</td>
<td>I think that my level of pay is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ3 .784</td>
<td>I consider my workload to be quite fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ4 .784</td>
<td>Overall, the rewards I receive her are quite fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ5 .787</td>
<td>I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.9**: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for procedural justice (PJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PJ1 .839</td>
<td>Job decisions are made by my boss in an unbiased manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ2 .925</td>
<td>My boss makes sure that all employees' concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ3 .875</td>
<td>My boss clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ4 .891</td>
<td>All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ5 .789</td>
<td>Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ1</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ2</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ3</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ4</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ5</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ6</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ7</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ8</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ9</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.11: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for interactional justice (IJ), procedural justice (PJ) and distributive justice (DJ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJ1</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss treats me with kindness and consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ2</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss treats me with respect and dignity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ3</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss is sensitive to my personal needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ4</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss deals with me in a truthful manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ5</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss shows concern for my rights as an employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ6</td>
<td>Concerning decisions about my job, my boss discusses the implications of the decisions with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ7</td>
<td>My boss offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ8</td>
<td>When making decisions about my job, my boss offers explanations that make sense to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ9</td>
<td>My boss explains very clearly any decisions made about my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ1</td>
<td>Job decisions are made by my boss in an unbiased manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ2</td>
<td>My boss makes sure that all employees' concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ3</td>
<td>My boss clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ4</td>
<td>All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ5</td>
<td>Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ1</td>
<td>I believe that my work schedule is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ2</td>
<td>I think that my level of pay is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ3</td>
<td>I consider my workload to be quite fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ4</td>
<td>Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ5</td>
<td>I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for organisational politics (OP):

Consistent with previous research (e.g. Byrne, 2005; Kacmar and Ferris's, 1991), the CFA conducted in this study for the OP measure revealed two factors:
(1) go along to get ahead (GATGA), comprising four items (OP2, OP3, OP6, OP7), and (2) general political behaviour (GPB) comprised six items (OP1, OP4, OP5, OP8, OP9 and OP10). According to Byrne (2005), GATGA refers to the covert, indirect behaviours used by employees to gain advantages. A sample GATGA item includes ‘there is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even when it means disagreeing with supervisors. The second component i.e. GPB refers to the overt, self-serving behaviours that ensure advancement of personal gains. These behaviours are blatant actions (e.g. spreading rumors, belittling others) that are taken to advance oneself or one's group. A sample item of GPB includes ‘favouritism, rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here’.

Previous research has often combined the two scales into one measurement of OP. However, research evidence is inconsistent regarding whether OP is a unidimensional or multidimensional construct (Kacmar and Baron, 1999). Previous research reported the use of the two dimensions as separate scales, as well as combining them into one measure. Evidence of the scale validity in previous studies can be found in Ferris and Kacmar (1992), Ferris et al., (1993) and Hochwarter et al., (1999) and Byrne (2005).

As explained earlier, the CFA carried out in this study showed that the OP scale loaded onto two factors (Table 5.12). None of the items loaded less than expected; therefore, all the items were kept and the two factor model was used for further analysis. The alpha reliability coefficient obtained in Byrne (2005) for
GATGA was 0.67, and in this study it was 0.80. The GPB obtained in Byrne (2005) was 0.82 and in this study it was 0.84.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Favouritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well established ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There has always been an influential group in this department that one ever crosses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People here usually don't speak up for fear of retaliation by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewards come only to those who work hard in this organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotions in this department generally go to the top performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People in this organisation attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have seen changes made in policies here that only serve the purposes of a few individuals, not the work unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a group of people in my department who always get things their way because no one wants to challenge them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for organisational commitment (OC):

CFA was conducted to test if the OC items load on one factor. The negative items were reverse coded to improve the reliability of the scale and reduce the number of factors. The scale possessed sufficient internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.75 (Table 5.13). In a previous study, Commeiras and Foumier (2001) found that certain items were not significantly correlated with the OCQ dimensions. For example, item OC4 was poorly represented in the
dimensions of both the 15-item and the 9-item OCQ questionnaires used in their study.

| Table 5.13: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for organisational commitment (OC) |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Component 1 | Items | 
| OC1 | .969 | I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this company be successful. |
| OC2 | .833 | I talk up this company as a great company to work for. |
| OC3 | .994 | I feel very little loyalty to this company. |
| OC4 | .923 | I find that my values and the company's values are very similar. |
| OC5 | .755 | I am proud to tell them that I am part of this company. |
| OC6 | .776 | This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance. |
| OC7 | .837 | I am extremely glad that I chose this company to work for over others I considered at the time I joined. |
| OC8 | .995 | Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organisation's policies on important matters relating to its employees. |
| OC9 | .967 | I really care about the fate of this company. |

6. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for turnover intentions (TOI):

The CFA showed that the three items of the TOI scale loaded on one factor. The scale had a sufficient internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.85. (Table 5.14).

| Table 5.14: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for turnover intentions (TOI). |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Component | Items | 
| TOI1 | .816 | I would like to leave my current employer within the next year. |
| TOI2 | .898 | I frequently think of quitting my job. |
| TOI3 | .820 | I have searched for a job with another company during the past year. |
| TOI4 | .797 | If another employer offered me a similar job I would leave. |
7. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for job satisfaction (JS):

CFA showed that the three items of JS loaded on one factor (Table 5.15). The scale possessed sufficient internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.86.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 JS1</td>
<td>.875 Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 JS2</td>
<td>.923 I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 JS3</td>
<td>.860 I enjoy my work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for career success (CS):

The CFA revealed one factor loading for the CS scale (Table 5.16). The scale possessed sufficient internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.90.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CS1</td>
<td>.853 I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CS2</td>
<td>.894 I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CS3</td>
<td>.820 I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CS4</td>
<td>.883 I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CS5</td>
<td>.827 I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.10. Descriptive statistics:

As mentioned earlier, 333 complete questionnaires were received, the minimum response was 1 and the maximum was 7 for all the variables. The minimum value was .00 except for the organisational commitment (OC) scale it was 0.47 and the maximum was 1.95 for all the variables. The descriptive statistics showed acceptable results. The minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values show that all the variables range from about 1 to 7 indicating no constraints on their variability. The means reported show that among the two components of organisational justice, the level of procedural justice (PJ) is slightly higher than distributive justice (DJ) and among the two components of organisational politics, the level of ‘get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) is slightly higher than ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB). Table 5.17 shows the minimum and maximum values, the means and standard deviations of the scales used in the present study (Table5.17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader-member exchange (LMX)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.5282</td>
<td>.36140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice (DJ)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.3239</td>
<td>.40795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice (PJ)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.4116</td>
<td>.45900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour (GPB)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.4040</td>
<td>.42445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along to get ahead (GATGA)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.4093</td>
<td>.39498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning &amp; career development (SPCD)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.0966</td>
<td>.49753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment (OC)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.6387</td>
<td>.29610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions (TOI)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.8627</td>
<td>.65266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career success (CS)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.4219</td>
<td>.47772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (JS)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.5086</td>
<td>.46258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.11. Test for collinearity and multicollinearity:

Collinearity or Multicollinearity is created by multivariate correlations (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Collinearity refers to the correlation between two independent variables, while multicollinearity refers to the correlation between three or more independent variables (Hair et al., 2006). Collinearity and multicollinearity can create a threat to the validity of the multiple regression analysis (Field, 2005); with high level of collinearity and multicollinearity, “each independent variable becomes a dependent variable and is regressed against the remaining independent variables” (Hair et al., 2006:227), which makes it difficult and ambiguous to assess the importance of each independent variable to the regression (Miles and Shevlin, 2001; Tabacnick and Fidell, 2007). In this study, the presence of collinearity and multicollinearity was tested by two methods: (1) bivariate correlation or the examination of the correlation matrix. This type of analysis is considered as the simplest and most obvious means to identify collinearity (Hair et al., 2006). It focuses on the analysis of two variables at a time in order to uncover whether they are related or not (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The correlation matrix provides an initial examination of the hypothesized relationships. For maximum prediction, independent variables should have low correlations with other independent variables, but have high correlations with the dependent variable (Hair et al., 2006).

(2) The examination of the variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance statistic (+VIF). It refers to the uncertainty of regression coefficients, which is the
amount of the increase in the variance of each regression coefficient relative to a situation, in which all of the independent variables are uncorrelated (Cohen et al., 2003; Miles and Shevlin, 2001). +Tolerance (+VIF) refers to the accuracy of regression coefficients and the amount of variance of an independent variable that is not explained by the other independent variables (Hair et al., 2006; Miles and Shevlin, 2001). A common rule of thumb is that any VIF of (>10), which corresponds to a tolerance of (<0.1), indicates high multicollinearity (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001) and provides evidence of serious multicollinearity involving the corresponding independent variable (Cohen et al., 2003; Hair et al., 2006).

5.12. Correlation analysis:

Correlation analysis refers to the extent to which changes in one variable are associated with changes in the other. In order to examine the correlations between the variables in the present study, bi-variate correlations were calculated for the constructs and their respective dimensions. A bivariate correlation is a relational statistic that measures the strength of the relationship between two variables. Researchers have suggested that a bivariate correlation higher than 0.9 (Hair et al., 2006; Kline, 2005) or 0.8 (Brown, 2006; Field, 2005) is too high and one of the variables should be eliminated before proceeding with the analysis. McMillan (2001) suggested that correlations above 0.70 are highly positive relationships, correlations between 0.40 and 0.60 as moderate positive relationships, and between 0.10 and 0.30 is considered as a small or weak positive relationship. The
coefficients are statistically significant if they are at 0.01 levels (Glass and Hopkins, 1996) \((P<0.01)\). Correlations are indicated by the correlation coefficient \((r)\) value that can range from +1.00 to -1.00. When the correlation is at +1.00, it indicates a perfect positive relationship between the two variables measured. A correlation of 0.00 indicates no relationship and a correlation of -1.00 indicates a perfect negative relationship (Welman and Kruger, 1999) between them (Table 5.18). In other words, the correlation analysis determines the existence of a correlation between two variables, the nature and strength of the relationship, and the direction and magnitude of the relationship between them (Diamantopoulos and Schlegelmich, 1997).

The next sections will present the correlation analysis between the variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</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>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>42.28</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work experience</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisational tenure</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>-.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nationality</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LMX</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Distributive justice</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Procedural justice</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. GPB</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>-.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. GATGA</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>-.488</td>
<td>-.639</td>
<td>-.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SPCD</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Organisational</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Turnover intentions</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Career success</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.390</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>-.342</td>
<td>-.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Correlations among demographic variables:

Data collected for this study included six demographic variables; namely, gender, age, education, nationality, work experience and organisational tenure. As shown in Table 5.19, age had high positive non-significant correlations with work experience \((r=.898, p>.01)\) and organisational tenure \((r=.672, p>.01)\), indicating that the respondents prefer to stay with the same organisation for a long time. This might be related to the Arab culture that was described by Hofstede (2001) as uncertainty avoiders. They avoid the ambiguity connected with changing their job and prefer to stay with the same employer for a long time. However age had a low negative significant correlation with education \((r=-.140, p<.05)\), which might indicate that the educational level of the older workers is lower than the educational level of younger employees. This indicate that higher education was not an employment requirement till recently when high technology was introduced that needed more educated people to run the business. The correlation between age and nationality was weak and not significant \((r=-.315, p<.01)\).

Regarding the relationship among the other variables, the analysis revealed that education has significant negative correlations with work experience \((r=-.210, p<.01)\) and organisational tenure \((r=-.397, p<.01)\), which might indicate that tenured employees are less educated than their younger colleagues. The analysis also revealed that gender had weak significant relationships with all the other variables; with age it was \((r=128, p<.05)\), education \((r=-.099)\), work experience \((r=120, p<.05)\), organisational tenure \((r=.120, p<.05)\) and nationality \((r=-.052)\).
This could be attributed to the low number of female participants in the study, which may not indicate the real correlations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: 5.19: Correlations between demographic variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2. Correlations between the demographics and other variables:

Starting with age, the analysis revealed that had weak positive non-significant correlations with LMX (r = .115, p > .01) and SPCD (r = .021, p > .01), which might indicate that senior workers may not necessarily have better relationships with their supervisors or benefiting more from the corporate SPCD programs than their younger counterparts.

Age also had weak positive relationships with distributive justice (DJ) (r = .167, p < .01), and procedural justice (PJ) (r = .130, p < .01). On the contrary, age had negative correlations with both dimensions of perceptions of organisational politics; ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) (r = -.191, p < .01), and ‘get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) (r = .186, p < .01), which indicates that age had no impact on the employees’ perceptions about justice and politics in their organisations.
The analysis also showed that age had weak positive significant correlations with the four work outcomes; job satisfaction (JS) ($r=.209, p<.01$), organisational commitment (OC) ($r=.164, p<.01$), career success (CS) ($r=.160, p<.01$) and turnover intentions (TOI) ($r=.022, p<.01$). Among the four outcomes age had the lowest correlation with TOI and the highest correlation with JS, which might indicate that older workers are more satisfied with their jobs and think less of leaving.

The second demographic variable tested in this study was education. The analysis showed that education had a weak significant positive relationship with LMX ($r=.115, p>.01$) and SPCD ($r=.042, p>.01$). The analysis also showed that education had a low negative significant correlation with DJ ($r=-.021, p<.01$), but a positive correlation with PJ ($r=.050, p<.01$). It also had a very weak positive correlation with GPB ($r= .002, p>.01$) and a low negative correlation with GATGA ($r=-.012, p>.01$).

The correlation between education and work outcomes was also low. It had a negative correlation with OC ($r=-.041, p>.01$), CS ($r=-.061, p>.01$) and JS ($r=-.037, p>.01$). However, it had a slightly higher, though relatively low, positive correlation with TOI ($r=.119, p>.01$). Putting the results together, it could be inferred that higher levels of education do not lead to higher levels of career success or job satisfaction, which might lead to less organisational commitment and higher levels of turnover intentions among the employees with higher education.
Regarding the relationship between work experience and the other variables, it had a low positive significant correlation with LMX ($r=.105, p<.01$), and a very weak negative correlation with SPCD ($r=-.016, p<.01$). It also had a low positive significant correlation with DJ ($r=.125, p<.01$) and PJ ($r=.104, p<.01$). However, work experience had low negative correlations with GPB, ($r=-.157, p>.01$) and GATGA ($r=-.168, p>.01$). The results indicate that the respondents with more experience perceive lower levels of justice and higher levels of politics in their organisation.

Work experience had low correlations with the four work outcomes; with OC ($r=.111, p>.01$), CS ($r=.153, p>.01$) and JS ($r=.195, p>.01$), but it had a negative correlation with TOI ($r=-.017, p>.01$). This might indicate that more experienced people are more committed to their organisation and achieving higher levels of job satisfaction and career success, even with lower levels of education. They also think less of quitting their jobs, even with the lack of SPCD programs and less opportunities for career development.

Regarding the relationship between organisational tenure and the other variables, the analysis showed it had weak negative significant relationships with both LMX ($r=-.013, p>.01$) and SPCD ($r=-.106, p>.01$). This shows that staying longer in the organisation does not guarantee a better relationship with the supervisor or a better career progression and involvement in the organisational SPCD programs.
Organisational tenure also had low negative correlations with DJ \( (r=-0.013, p<0.01) \) and PJ \( (r=-0.034, p<0.01) \). However, it had a very weak positive correlation with GPB \( (r=0.045, p>0.01) \) and a weak negative correlation with GATGA \( (r=-0.037, p>0.01) \). This might indicate that when employees spend more time in the organisation, they get less involved in politics but can still observe the political activities taking place in the organisation.

Organisational tenure had very weak positive correlations with all the four outcomes; with OC \( (r=0.044, p>0.01) \), CS \( (r=0.101, p>0.01) \), and JS \( (r=0.080, p>0.01) \). However it had a negative relationship with TOI \( (r=-0.009, p>0.01) \), which might indicate that the more people stay in one organisation, the less inclined they get to look for other opportunities elsewhere.

3. Correlation between the quality of LMX and the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD):

The correlation analysis revealed a moderate significant positive correlation between LMX and SPCD \( (r=0.446, p<0.01) \). This indicates that the individuals who have high quality relationships with their leader/manager will have positive views about the SPCD processes in their organisation. This result was expected due to the influence of leaders on the individuals’ opportunities for career growth and advancement in the organisations.

4. Correlations between LMX and organisational justice and politics:
The next correlation was made between LMX and organisational justice and politics. As explained earlier, the CFA employed earlier reduced the number of justice dimensions to two factors, which are distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ). The analysis revealed that LMX has a moderate positive correlation with DJ (r=.418**, p<.01), and a very high positive correlation with PJ (r=.731**, p<.01). This indicates the high positive impact of the employees’ relationships with the manager on their perceptions about justice in their organisation.

The correlation analysis between LMX and the two dimensions of politics showed that LMX had a low negative significant correlation with ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) (-.249**, p<.01), but a moderate positive correlation with ‘get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) (.466**, p<.01). This indicates that employees with higher levels of LMX are less involved in general political behaviours, but put more effort in maintaining good relationships with the manager in order to advance in their career.

5. Correlations between the quality of LMX and work outcomes:

The correlation analysis between LMX and the four work outcomes, revealed that LMX had positive correlations with organisational commitment (r=.440**, p=.01), job satisfaction (r=.350**, p=.01) and career success (r=.304**, p<.01). However, it had a low negative correlation with turnover intentions (r=-.220, p<.01). This indicates that a high quality exchange with the supervisor reduces
the employees’ intentions to quit their jobs and increases their job satisfaction, career success and commitment towards their organisation.

6. Correlations between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), and organisational justice and politics:

The analysis showed that SPCD had a moderate significant positive correlation with both distributive justice \((r=0.481, p<.01)\), and procedural justice \((r=0.621, p<.01)\). The analysis also revealed that SPCD had a moderate significant negative correlation with ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) \((r=-0.361, p<.01)\) and a high negative correlation with ‘general political behaviour’ (GATGA) \((r=-0.615, p<.01)\). The results indicate that the career growth opportunities that the employees get through the corporate SPCD programs increase their perceptions about justice and fairness and reduce their perceptions about politics in their organisations.

7. Correlations between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and work outcomes:

The analysis revealed that SPCD had a moderate significant positive correlation with organisational commitment \((r=0.486**, p=.01)\), job satisfaction \((r=0.537**, p=.01)\) and career success \((r=0.540**, p<.01)\). However it had a low significant negative correlation with turnover intentions \((r=-0.268**, p<.01)\). This indicates that the employees’ involvement in the corporate SPCD programs
increases their job satisfaction, career success and commitment towards their organisations, while reducing their intentions to quit their jobs.

8. Correlation between organisational justice and politics:

The correlation analysis conducted between the two forms of organisational justice and the two forms of organisational politics showed that DJ had a low negative correlation with ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) (r=-.310, p<.01), and a moderate negative correlation with ‘get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) (r=-.488**, p<.01). Procedural justice also had a moderate significant negative correlation with GPB (r=-.393**, p<.01), and a high negative correlation with GATGA (r=-.639**, p<.01). Distributive justice had higher correlations with GATGA than GPB. The results indicate that higher perceptions of justice correlate with lower perceptions of politics (Table 5.20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice (DJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice (PJ)</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General political behaviour (GPB)</td>
<td>-310**</td>
<td>-393**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along to get ahead (GATGA)</td>
<td>-.488**</td>
<td>-.639**</td>
<td>.379**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

9. Correlations between organisational justice and work outcomes:

The correlation analysis showed that distributive justice (DJ) had significant moderate positive correlations with job satisfaction (JS) (r=.406**, p<01), career success (CS) (r=.345**, p<.01) and organisational commitment (OC) (r=.316**,
p<.01). However, it had a low significant negative correlation with turnover intentions (TOI) \((r=-.182^{**}, p<01)\). Although the correlation is low, it indicates that DJ increases the employees’ loyalty and commitment towards the organisation and encourages them to maintain employment in it. However, the weak correlation could be attributed to the availability of other employment options for the respondents or other factors that might affect their turnover intentions.

The correlation analysis between procedural justice (PJ) and work outcomes showed that PJ had moderate positive correlations with JS \((r=.458^{**}, p<01)\), CS \((r=.394^{**}, p<.01)\), and OC \((r=.453^{**}, p<.01)\), while it had a low negative significant correlation with TOI \((r=-.220^{**}, p<01)\). The results indicate that when the employees perceive fairness in the organisational procedures, they will be more committed to the organisation and satisfied with jobs and career.

10. Correlation between organisational politics (OP) and work outcomes:

The correlation analysis between each dimension of OP and work outcomes revealed that ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) had weak negative correlations with job satisfaction (JS) \((r=-.177^{**}, p<.01)\), career success (CS) \((r=-.150^{**}, p<.01)\) and organisational commitment (OC) \((r=-.152^{**}, p<.01)\), while it had a low positive significant correlation with turnover intentions (TOI) \((r=.264^{**}, p<.01)\). GATGA had higher correlations with work outcomes. It had moderate negative correlations with JS \((r=-.390^{**}, p<.01)\), CS \((r=-.352^{**}, p<.01)\) and OC \((r=-.434^{**}, p<.01)\).
p<.01), while it had a lower positive correlation with TOI (r=.216**, p<.01). The results are consistent with the results of previous research (Ferris et al. 1993; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Kacmar et al., 1999; Valle and Perrew 2000; Vigoda, 2000). Both dimensions of politics had negative correlations with OC, CS and JS and positive correlations with TOI.

11. Correlations among work outcomes:

Regarding the correlations among the outcomes, as expected, turnover intentions (TOI) had negative correlations with the other three outcomes. The highest correlation was with organisational commitment (OC) (r=-.504, P<.01), less with job satisfaction (JS) (r=-.342, P<.01) and the least correlation was with career success (CS) (r=-.275, P<.01). This indicates that the lack of job satisfaction and career success might lead to higher levels of turnover intentions.

The analysis also revealed that OC had a moderate positive significant correlation with JS (r=.557, P<.01) and CS (r=.467, P<.01). These findings are consistent with previous research (e.g. Hackett et al., 1994). JS also had a strong positive significant correlation with CS (r=.701 p<.01), which indicates that both intrinsic and extrinsic success measures are equally important for the employees (Table 5.21).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.21: Correlations among work outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

12. Correlations between demographic variables and work outcomes:

Demographic issues have been studied by other researchers with mixed results. For example, Hrebiniai and Alutto (1972) found that women were more committed to their organisations than men. However, another study conducted later by Bruning and Snyder (1983) did not find a correlation between gender and OC. A meta-analysis study by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) suggests that age and organisational commitment (OC) are significantly, albeit weakly, related (.175). This relationship exists even when variables that are often confounded with age (e.g. organisational and position tenure) are controlled (Allen and Meyer, 1993). Meyer and Allen (1984) explain that older workers become more attitudinally committed to an organisation for a variety of reasons, such as greater satisfaction with their jobs, having received better positions and having ‘cognitively justified’ their continuance in an organisation. In this study, age had low positive correlations with OC (r=.164, P<.01), job satisfaction (JS) (r=.209, P<.01) and career success (CS) (r=.160, P<.01). However, it had a weak negative correlation with turnover intentions (TOI) (r=-.022, P<.01). The results indicate that older workers are more satisfied with their jobs and less inclined to leave, even with the
low levels of JS and CS. This could be attributed to the continuance commitment that individuals build by age. Organisational tenure had weak positive correlations with OC (r=.044, P<.01), JS (r=.080, P<.01) and CS (r=.101, P<.01). However, it had a very weak negative correlation with TOI (r=-.009, P<.01). The correlation analysis also showed that education had weak negative correlations with OC (r=-.041, P<.01), JS (r=-.037, P<.01) and CS (r=-.061, P<.01), while it had a slightly higher positive correlation with TOI (r=.119, P<.01). The results might indicate that the respondents with higher levels of education are less satisfied with their jobs and careers, and are more likely to leave. These results correspond with the results of previous research in which education was often found to be inversely related to OC (Angle and Perry, 1981; Morris and Sherman, 1981). The inverse relationship might be a result of the employees' growing expectations when they progress higher in their education. Apart from that, people with higher levels of education are more committed to their profession and career, rather than being committed to a particular organisation.

The relationships between work experience and outcomes was generally low; it had low positive correlations with OC (r=.111, P<.01), JS (r=.195, P<.01) and CS (r=.153, P<.01), while it had a very weak negative correlation with TOI (r=-.017, P<.01), showing that workers with more work experience prefer to stay longer with the organisation than the less experienced workers.

5.13. Hierarchal multiple regression analysis:
According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) there are three major analytical strategies in multiple regression analysis: standard multiple regression, statistical or stepwise regression, and sequential or hierarchical regression. The standard regression tests the relationships among the variables and answers the basic question of multiple correlations. The second strategy is the statistical regression, which is a model-building rather than a model testing procedure. The third form of regression is the sequential or hierarchical multiple regression analysis in which the independent variable or set of independent variables is assessed in terms of what it adds to the equation at its own point of entry. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggested that the sequential regression is the best for testing explicit hypotheses, because it allows the researcher to control the advancement of the regression process and test the hypothesized proportion of variance attributed to the independent variables.

The main purpose of the present study is to test a series of theoretical hypotheses. Based on that, the sequential (hierarchal) multiple regression strategy was found the most appropriate for this purpose. Hierarchal regression analysis is used to analyze the relationship between a single dependent variable (DV) and several independent variables (IV) in order to use the IV to predict the DV(s) (Hair et al., 2006). In the present study, a set of multiple regression analyses was employed (Cohen et al., 2003) to test the hypothesized relationships between the variables, the prediction powers of the IVs on the DVs and to test whether the
perception variables have any mediation effects on the relationships between the IVs and DVs.

The study looked into the possibility of having mediation effects of organisational justice and politics on the relationships between LMX and the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), and work outcomes. Before explaining the mediation process, it is important to explain that the mediator is a variable that accounts for all or part of the relationship between an IV and a DV (Baron and Kenny, 1986; MacKinnon, Warshi and Dwyer, 1995). By conducting a mediation analyses, researchers attempt to identify the intermediary process that leads from the manipulated IV to the outcome or DV (Muller, Judd and Yzerbyt, 2005). According to Baron and Kenny (1986) mediators come between the IV and DVs and represent the generative mechanism through which the IV influences the DV. According to this approach, a mediating relationship occurs if it satisfies four conditions as shown below (Figure 5.1):

1. The IV is significantly related to the DV.
2. The IV is significantly related to the mediator (Tan, 2008).
3. The MV is significantly related to the DV.
4. When the MV and IV are used simultaneously to predict the DV, the previous significant relationship between the IV and the DV becomes less or non-significant (full mediation).

Baron and Kenny's (1986) method was followed to test for mediation in this study. This method comprises a series of three regression analysis equations while
controlling for demographic variables and examining the regression coefficients (standardized). In the first analysis, the IV was regressed on the DV. In the second analysis the IV was regressed on the MV. In the third analysis, the IV was regressed on both the MV and the DV (Figure 5.1).

**Figure 5.1:**

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), if the impact of the IV on DV drops statistically after controlling for the effect of the mediating variable in the final step, then a full mediating effect exists for the mediator on the relationship between the IV and DV. If not, then the MV has no mediation effect on the relationship between the IV and DV. However, if the first three conditions are met, then the MV will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between the IV and DV.

**5.14. Test of hypotheses:**
The regression analysis was conducted to test the hypotheses and measure the prediction effects of the IVs on the other variables. The following values were analyzed and reported: $R^2$, Beta, t value, Adjusted R-square ($AR^2$), F statistics and their significance. The $R^2$ refers to the proportion of the variation in the dependent variable (DV) explained by the independent variable IV in the regression model. The $R^2$ values range from 0 to 1; small values indicate that the model does not fit the data, whereas the higher values indicate that the model fits the data. The Analysis of Variance, ANOVA, was also used to check how well the model fits the data. This method is described as the most common statistical technique in psychological research (Howell, 2002), used to test the variances between categories when there more than one categorical variables (Filed, 2005; Howell, 2002). One-way ANOVA is used to uncover the main interaction effects of categorical IV on an interval DV. The F-test of difference, tests whether the group means formed by values of the IV are different enough not to have occurred by chance; if the group means do not differ significantly, then it could be concluded that the IV(s) did not have an effect on the DV. If the significance value of the F statistics is small (less than 0.05), then the independent variable explains the dependent variable. The B value unstandardized coefficients are the coefficients of the estimated regression model that shows the increase in the dependent variable with each unit increase in the independent variable. The standardized path coefficient (Beta) value coefficients explain the number of standard deviations that outcome changes as a result of one standardized deviation change.
in the predictor. The value of Beta varies between -1 to 1. The higher the absolute value of Beta, the more important the variable is in predicting the DV. The Beta explains the strength of the IV; it indicates the individual contribution of each predictor to the model and provides better insight into the 'importance' of a predictor in the model. The t value coefficients determine the relative importance of each variable in the model. A high t value below -2 or above +2 and a smaller value of Sig. refers to a greater contribution of the predictor. The next section will look into the results of the analysis conducted to test the hypotheses.

5.14.1. The relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes:

Hypothesis 1a:
The quality of LMX is positively related to career success.

Hypothesis 1b:
The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational commitment.

Hypothesis 1c:
The quality of LMX is positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1d:
The quality of LMX is negatively related to turnover intentions.

Four regression tests were conducted to assess the relationships between LMX and work outcomes. The analysis showed a significant positive relationship between LMX and career success (CS) ($Beta=.304$, $t=5.801$, $F=33.657$), a slightly higher relationship with job satisfaction (JS) ($Beta=.350$, $t=6.790$, $F=46.104$) and organisational commitment (OC) ($Beta=.440$, $t=8.923$, $F=79.624$) and a low negative significant relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI)
The analysis revealed a prediction power of LMX on all the four outcomes; LMX is responsible for 19% of the variance in OC (R²=.227), 16% of the variance in JS (R²=.161), 11% of the variance in CS (R²=.116), and 7% of the variance in TOI (R²=.074). Among the four work outcomes, LMX had the highest impact on JS and the lowest impact on TOI. The results provide full support to hypotheses 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d (Tables 5.22-5.26 show the results of the regression analysis and the descriptive statistics).

| Table 5.22: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standardized Coefficients) for the relationship between LMX and work outcomes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Beta | OC | TOI | CS | JS |
| .440 | -.220 | .304 | .350 |
| .194 | .048 | .092 | .122 |
| .191 | .045 | .090 | .120 |
| 8.923 | -4.099 | -5.801 | 6.790 |
| 79.624 | 16.799 | 33.657 | 46.104 |
| .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |

| Table 5.23: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and OC |
| --- | --- | --- |
| OC | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| 1.6387 | .29610 |
| LMX | 1.5282 | .36140 |

| Table 5.24: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and TOI |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TOI | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| .8627 | .65266 |
| LMX | 1.5282 | .36140 |

| Table 5.25: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and CS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CS | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| 1.4219 | .47772 |
| LMX | 1.5282 | .36140 |

| Table 5.26: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and JS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| JS | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| 1.5086 | .46258 |
| LMX | 1.5282 | .36140 |
5.14.2. The relationship between LMX and organisational justice:

Hypothesis 2a:
The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational justice.

H2a suggests a positive correlation between LMX and organisational justice. The factor analysis conducted earlier revealed two factors for organisational justice; distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ). The five items of DJ loaded on one factor and the fifteen items of IJ and PJ together loaded on another factor. Based on that, the name of the construct 'distributive justice' (DJ) will be maintained for the first factor and the term ‘procedural justice’ (PJ) will be used for the second factor that comprises the procedural and interactional justice items.

The analysis revealed that LMX had a significant moderate positive relationship with DJ ($r=.418^{**}$, $p<.01$), and a higher positive correlation with PJ ($r=.731^{**}$, $p<.01$). The analysis also revealed a significant positive prediction power for LMX in DJ ($Beta=.418$, $t=8.378$, $F=70.194$); the relationship had a moderate strength. LMX is responsible for 17.5% of the variance in DJ ($R^2=.175$).

Regarding the relationship between LMX and PJ, the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between the two variables ($Beta=.731$, $t=19.500$, $F=380.257$), LMX is responsible for 54.6% of the variance in PJ ($R^2=.535$), which is higher than the effect of LMX in DJ ($R^2=.175$). The results of the analysis provide full support to the hypothesis. (Tables 5.27-5.29 show the results of the regression analysis and the descriptive statistics).
Table 5.27: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standardized Coefficients) for the relationship between LMX and the two forms of organisational justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distributive justice (DJ)</th>
<th>Procedural Justice (PJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-square</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8.378</td>
<td>19.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>70.194</td>
<td>380.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F sig. 000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.28: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and distributive justice (DJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>1.3239</td>
<td>.40795</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>1.5282</td>
<td>.36140</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.29: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and procedural justice (PJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>1.4116</td>
<td>.45900</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>1.5282</td>
<td>.36140</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.14.3. The mediation effect of organisational justice on the relationship between LMX and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 2b:

Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational commitment.

Two mediation analyses were conducted to test the hypothesis. The next section will explain the steps of the analysis carried out for procedural justice followed by distributive justice.

a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC):
The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on OC. The analysis showed that LMX explained 19.4% variance in OC ($R^2=.194$). The relationship is significant ($\text{Beta}=.440$, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on PJ. The analysis showed that LMX explained 53.5% variance in PJ ($R^2=.535$). The relationship is significant ($\text{Beta}=.731$, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** PJ was regressed on OC. The analysis showed that PJ explained 20.5% variance in OC ($R^2=.205$). The relationship is significant ($\text{Beta}=.453$, $\text{sig}=.001$), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on OC, controlling for the effect of PJ. The analysis revealed that the relationship between LMX and OC became non-significant and the impact of LMX on OC dropped ($\text{Beta}=-.234$, $\text{sig}=.001$), which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. Based on that, PJ has a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC. (Table 5.30 explains the analysis steps).
Table 5.30: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX on OC</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>8.923</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on DJ</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>19.500</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: PJ on OC</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>9.252</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on OC (controlling for PJ)</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on OC. The regression revealed that LMX explained 19.4% of OC (R²=.194). The relationship was significant (Beta=.440, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on DJ. The regression revealed that LMX explained 17.5% (R²=.175) variance in DJ. The relationship is significant (Beta=.418, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
Step 1: DJ was regressed on OC. The analysis showed that DJ explained 10.1% of the variance in OC (R²=.101). The relationship is significant (Beta=.418, p<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.
**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on OC, controlling for the effect of PJ. The analysis revealed that the two variables exert 21.6% of the variance in OC. The relationship between LMX and OC remained significant after controlling for the effect of OC (Beta=.372, sig=<.001), which does not meet the fourth mediation condition. However, the first three mediation conditions were met. Based on that, PJ had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC. (Table 5.31 shows the steps of the analysis).

| Table 5.31: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC). |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Analysis 1                       |     |     |     |     |     |
| LMX on OC                       | .440| .194| .194| .440| 8.923| .000|
| Analysis 2                       |     |     |     |     |     |
| LMX on DJ                       | .418| .175| .175| .418| 8.378| .000|
| Analysis 3                       |     |     |     |     |     |
| Step 1: DJ on OC                | .318| .101| .101| .318| 6.112| .000|
| Step 2: LMX on OC (controlling for PJ) | .465| .216| .114| .372| 6.936| .000|

H2b suggests a mediation role for organisational justice on the relationship between LMX and OC. The results partially supported the hypothesis; PJ had a full mediation effect, while DJ had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC.

**5.14.4. The mediation effect of organisational justice on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS):**

**Hypothesis 2c:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and job satisfaction.
To test the hypotheses, two mediation analysis were conducted. The next section will explain the steps of the analysis carried out for procedural justice followed by distributive justice.

a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that LMX explained 12.2% variance in JS (R²=.122). The relationship is significant (Beta=.350, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on PJ. The analysis showed that LMX explained 38.6% variance in PJ (R²=.386). The relationship is significant (Beta=.731, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** PJ was regressed on JS. PJ explained 21% variance in JS (R²=.210). The analysis revealed that the relationship between JS and LMX was significant (Beta=.458, sig<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on JS, controlling for the effect of PJ. The two variables together exert 21% of the variance in JS. The analysis revealed that the
relationship between LMX and JS was no longer significant after controlling for the effect of PJ (Beta=.032, sig=.660), which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. Based on that, PJ has a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS. (Table 5.32 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

**Table 5.32:** The regression analysis for the mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX on JS</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>6.790</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on PJ</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>19.500</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on JS (controlling for PJ)</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

LMX was regressed on JS. The regression revealed that LMX explained 12.2% of JS (R²=.122) and the relationship was significant (Beta=.350, p<001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**

LMX was regressed on DJ. The regression revealed that LMX explained 17.5% (R²=.175) variance in DJ. The relationship was significant (Beta=.418, p<001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.
**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** DJ was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that DJ explains 16.5% (R²=.165) of the variance in JS. The relationship is significant (Beta=.406, sig=<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on JS, controlling for the effect of PJ. The two variable exert 20.4% of the variance in JS (R²=.204). The analysis revealed that the relationship between LMX and JS remained significant after controlling for JS (Beta=-.218, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), if the relationship remains significant, then the mediation does not exist. However, if the first three conditions are fulfilled then the mediator will have a partial mediation role. In this case, DJ has a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS. (Table 5.33 shows the steps of the regression analysis).

| Table 5.33: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS). |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analysis 1 | LMX on JS | R | .350 | R² | .122 | R² Change | .122 | Beta | .350 | t | 6.790 | Sig | .000 |
| Analysis 2 | LMX on DJ | .418 | .175 | .175 | .418 | 8.378 | .000 |
| Analysis 3: | Step 1: DJ on JS | .406 | .165 | .165 | .406 | 8.081 | .000 |
| Step 2: LMX on JS (controlling for DJ) | .452 | .204 | .039 | .218 | 4.032 | .000 |

H2c suggests a mediation role for organisational justice on the relationship between LMX and JS. The results partially support the hypothesis; PJ had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS, while DJ had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between the two constructs.
5.14.5. The mediation effect of organizational justice on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS):

**Hypothesis 2d:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and career success.

Similar to the previous sections, in order to test the hypotheses, two mediation analysis were conducted. The next section will explain the steps of the analysis carried out for procedural justice followed by distributive justice.

**a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS).**

Following are the steps of the mediation analysis carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between the quality of LMX (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that LMX explained 9.2% of CS (R²=.92). The relationship is significant (Beta=.304, p<.001), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on PJ. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 53.5% of the variance in PJ (R²=.535). The relationship is significant (Beta=.731, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
Step 1: LMX was regressed on PJ. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 15.5% variance in PJ ($R^2=.155$). The relationship is significant (Beta=.394, p<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

Step 2: LMX was regressed on CS, controlling for PJ. The analysis revealed that the relationship between LMX and CS is no longer significant (Beta=0.34, sig=.651) after controlling for the effect of PJ, which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. Based on that, PJ has a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS. (Table 5.34 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

| Table 5.34: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS). |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| Analysis 1                      | R      | $R^2$  | $R^2$ Change | Beta  | t      | Sig.  |
| LMX on CS                       | .304   | .092   | .092          | .304  | 5.801  | .000  |
| Analysis 2                      | R      | $R^2$  | $R^2$ Change | Beta  | t      | Sig.  |
| LMX on PJ                       | .731   | .535   | .535          | .731  | 19.500 | .000  |
| Analysis 3                      | R      | $R^2$  | $R^2$ Change | Beta  | t      | Sig.  |
| Step1: PJ on CS                 | .394   | .155   | .155          | .394  | 7.803  | .000  |
| Step2: LMX on CS (controlling for PJ) | .395   | .156   | .001          | .034  | .452   | .651  |

b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS):

Following are the steps of the regression analysis carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and CS (DV).

Analysis 1:
LMX was regressed on CS. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 9.2% of the variance in CS ($R^2=.092$), the relationship is significant (Beta=.304, p<.001) which satisfies the first mediation condition.
Analysis 2:
LMX was regressed on DJ. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 17.5% of the variance in DJ ($R^2=.175$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.418, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

Analysis 3:
Step 1: DJ was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that DJ explained 17.5% of the variance in CS ($R^2=.175$), the relationship is significant (Beta=.418, sig=<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

Step 2: LMX was regressed on CS, controlling for the effect of DJ. The analysis revealed that the relationship between LMX and CS became no longer significant (Beta=-.345, sig=<.001), which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. Based on that, DJ has a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS. (Table 5.35 explains the analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.35: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on CS (controlling for DJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2d suggests a mediation role for organisational justice on the relationship between LMX and CS. The results fully support the hypothesis; both distributive and procedural justice had full mediation effects on the relationship between LMX and CS.
5.14.6. The mediation effect of organisational justice on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI):

**Hypothesis 2e:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between the quality of LMX and turnover intentions.

In order to test the hypotheses, two mediation analyses were conducted. The next section will explain the steps of the analysis carried out for procedural justice followed by distributive justice.

a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and TOI (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 4.8% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=.048$). The relationship was negative and significant (Beta=-.220, p<.001), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on PJ. The regression revealed that LMX explained 53.5% of the variance in PJ ($R^2=.535$). The relationship is significant (Beta =.731, p<0.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
Step1: PJ was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that PJ explains 4.8% of the variance in TOI \((R^2=0.048)\). The relationship is significant \((\text{Beta} = -0.220, \ p<0.001)\), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

Step2: LMX was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of PJ. The analysis revealed that the two variables together exert 5.6% of the variance in TOI \((R^2=0.056)\). The relationship between LMX and TOI is no longer significant \((\text{Beta} = -0.126, \ \text{Sig}= 0.108)\), after controlling for the effect of PJ. Based on that, PJ has a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and TOI. (Table 5.36 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

| Table 5.36: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI) |
|-----------------|-----|-----|---------|--------|------|
| Analysis 1      | R   | R²  | R² Change | Beta   | T    | Sig.  |
| LMX on TOI      | .220| .048| .048      | -.220  | -4.099| .000  |
| Analysis 2      | R   | R²  | R² Change | Beta   | T    | Sig.  |
| LMX on PJ       | .731| .535| .535      | .731   | 19.500| .000  |
| Analysis 3      | R   | R²  | R² Change | Beta   | T    | Sig.  |
| Step 1: PJ on TOI | .220| .048| .048      | -.220  | -4.107| .000  |
| Step 2: LMX on TOI (controlling for PJ) | .236| .056| .007      | -.126  | -1.611| .108  |

b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and TOI (DV).

Analysis 1:
LMX was regressed on TOI. The regression revealed that LMX explained 4.8% of TOI ($R^2=.048$), showing a negative significant relationship between LMX and TOI (Beta=$-220$, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**

DJ was regressed on LMX. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 17.5% variance in DJ ($R^2=.175$). The relationship is significant (Beta =.418, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** DJ was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that DJ explained only 3.3% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=.033$). The relationship is negative and significant (Beta=$-182$, sig=.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of DJ. The two variables together exert 5.8% in the variance of TOI ($R^2=.58$). The relationship between LMX and TOI became no longer significant, after controlling for the effect of PJ (Beta=$-182$, sig=.003), which shows a full mediation role for DJ in the relationship between LMX and TOI (Table 5.37 explains the analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.37: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on TOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H2e suggests a mediation role for organisational justice in the relationship between LMX and TOI. The results fully supported the hypothesis; both procedural and distributive justice mediate the relationship between LMX and TOI.

5.15. The relationship between LMX and organisational politics:

Hypothesis 3a:
The quality of LMX is negatively related to organisational politics.

The factor analysis conducted earlier revealed two factors for the organisational politics scale use in this study; (1) general political behaviour (GPB) and (2) get along to get ahead (GATGA). Two sets of regression analysis were conducted for the relationship between LMX and each factor. The results confirmed the significant negative correlation between LMX and GPB ($Beta=-.249$, $t=-4.669$, $F=21.796$). LMX is also responsible for 6.2% of the variance in GPB ($R^2=.062$). Regarding the relationship between LMX and GATGA, the analysis showed a moderate negative prediction power of LMX in GATGA ($Beta=-.466$, $t=-9.575$, $F=91.675$). This is also higher than the prediction of LMX in GPB. LMX is responsible for 21.7% of the variance in the GATGA ($R^2=.217$), which is also higher than the impact of LMX on GPB. All together, the findings support the hypothesis (Table 5.38-5.40 explains the steps of the regression analysis and the descriptive statistics).
Table 5.38: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standardized Coefficients) for the relationship between LMX and the two dimensions of organisational politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPB</th>
<th>GATGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>18.843</td>
<td>-9.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.796</td>
<td>91.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F sig.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.39: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and GPB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPB</td>
<td>1.4040</td>
<td>.42445</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>1.5282</td>
<td>.36140</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.40. Descriptive statistics for the relationship between LMX and GATGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GATGA</td>
<td>1.4093</td>
<td>.39498</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>1.5282</td>
<td>.36140</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.16. The mediation effect of organisational politics on the relationship between LMX and organizational commitment:

**Hypothesis 3b:**

Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and organisational commitment.

As mentioned earlier, the factor analysis revealed two dimensions of organisational politics; general political behaviour (GPB) and get along to get a head (GATGA). The following section will explain the steps of the regression analysis carried out for GPB followed by GATGA.

a. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC):
The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on OC. The regression revealed that LMX explained 19.4% of OC (R²=.194). The relationship was significant (Beta=.440, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on GPB. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 6.2% (R²=.062) variance in GPB. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.249, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GPB was regressed on OC. The analysis showed that GPB explains 2.3% (R²=.023) of the variance in OC. The relationship is not significant (Beta=-152, p<.005), which does not satisfies the third mediation condition. Based on that no further analysis is needed; GPB has no mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC. (Table 5.41 explains the analysis steps).

| Table 5.41: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of general political behaviour (GPB) on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC). |
|-----------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|-------|
| Analysis 1      | R       | R²      | R² Change | Beta   | t       | Sig   |
| LMX on OC       | .440    | .194    | .194     | .440   | 8.923   | .000  |
| Analysis 2      | R       | R²      | R² Change | Beta   | t       | Sig   |
| LMX on GPB      | .249    | .062    | .062     | -.249  | -4.669  | .000  |
| Analysis 3      | R       | R²      | R² Change | Beta   | t       | Sig   |
| Step 1: GPB on OC | .152   | .023    | .023     | -.152  | -2.803  | .005  |
| Step 2: LMX on OC (controlling for GPB) | .443 | .196 | .173 | .429 | 8.418 | .000 |
b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on OC. The regression revealed that LMX explained 19.4% of OC ($R^2=.194$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.440, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on get along to get ahead (GATGA). The regression revealed that LMX explained 21.7% ($R^2=.217$) variance in GATGA. The analysis also showed a negative significant relationship (Beta=-.466, $p<0.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** GATGA was regressed on OC. The analysis revealed that GATGA explained 18.8% ($R^2=.188$) of the variance in OC, showing a significant relationship (Beta=-.434, $p<0.001$), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on OC, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The analysis showed that the two variables together explains 26.1% ($R^2=.261$) of the variance in OC. The relationship between LMX and OC remained significant after controlling for the effect of GATGA (Beta=.304, sig=$<.001$), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. However, as the first three mediation
conditions were met, then GATGA had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC. (Table 5.42 explains the steps of the regression analysis)

**Table 5.42**: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment (OC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>8.923</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>-9.575</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on GATGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>-8.760</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GATGA on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on OC (controlling for GATGA)</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>5.690</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3b suggests a mediation role for organisational politics on the relationship between LMX and OC. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had no mediation effect, while GATGA had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC.

5.17. The mediation effect of organizational politics on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS):

**Hypothesis 3c:**

Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the quality of LMX and job satisfaction.

To test the hypotheses two mediation analysis were carried out. The next section will explain the steps of the analysis carried out for the general political behaviour (GPB) followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).
a. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between LMX and JS:

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

LMX was regressed on JS. The regression revealed that LMX explained 12.2% ($R^2=.122$) of JS, the relationship was significant (Beta=.350, p<001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**

LMX was regressed on GPB. The analysis revealed that LMX explained .6.2% ($R^2=.062$) variance in GPB. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.418, p<001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GPB was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that GPB explains 13.1% ($R^2=.031$) of the variance in JS. The relationship is not significant (Beta=.177, sig=.001), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that, GPB has no mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS (Table 5.43 explains the analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.43: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1 LMX on JS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2 LMX on GPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3 Step 1: GPB on JS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3 Step 2: LMX on JS (controlling for GPB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on JS. The regression revealed that LMX explained 12.2% of JS ($R^2=.122$) and the relationship was significant (Beta=.350, p<001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on GATGA. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 21.7% ($R^2=.217$) variance in GATGA. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.466, p<001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GATGA was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that GATGA explains 16.2% ($R^2=.162$) of the variance in JS. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.390, sig=.000), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on JS, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The analysis showed that the two variables together explain 18.8% of the variance in JS ($R^2=.188$). The relationship between LMX and JS remained significant after controlling for the effect of GATGA (Beta=.215, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. As the first three conditions were met, then...
GATGA has a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS.

(Table 5.44 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.44: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3c suggests a mediation role for organisational politics on the relationship between LMX and JS. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had no mediation effect, while GATGA had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS.

b. The mediation effect of organizational politics on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS):

**Hypothesis 3d:** Organisational politics mediate the relationship between LMX and career success.

To test the hypotheses, two mediation analysis were conducted. The next section explains the steps of the analysis carried out for the general political behaviour (GPB), followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).
5.18. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on CS. The regression revealed that LMX explained 9.2% of CS ($R^2=0.092$). The relationship was significant (Beta=0.304, $p<0.01$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on GPB. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 6.2% ($R^2=0.062$) of the variance in GPB. The analysis also showed that relationship is significant (Beta=-0.249, $p<0.01$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** GPB was regressed on CS. The analysis revealed that GPB explains 23% ($R^2=0.023$) of the variance in CS. The relationship is significant (Beta=-0.150, sig=$<.001$), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that no further analysis was needed. GPB had no mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS. (Table 5.45 explains the steps of the analysis).
Table 5.45: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>5.801</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2:</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-4.669</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on GPB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3:</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-2.765</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GPB on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on CS (controlling for GPB)</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>5.263</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

LMX was regressed on CS. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 9.2% of the variance in CS (R²=.092). The relationship was significant (Beta=.304, p<001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**

LMX was regressed on GATGA. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 21.7% (R²=.217) of the variance in GATGA. The relationship is also significant (Beta=-.466, p<001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GATGA was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that GATGA explains 12.4% of the variance in CS (R²=.124). The relationship is negative and significant (Beta=-.352, sig=.000), which satisfies the third mediation condition.
Step 2: LMX was regressed on CS, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The analysis revealed that the two variables explain 14.9% of the variance in CS ($R^2=.149$). The relationship between LMX and CS became no longer significant after controlling for the effect of GATGA (Beta=.179, sig=>.001), which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. Based on that GATGA had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS. (Table 5.46 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>5.801</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>-9.575</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX on GATGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>-6.841</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GATGA on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on CS (controlling for GATGA)</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3d suggests a mediation role for organisational politics in the relationship between LMX and CS. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had no mediation effect, while GATGA had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS.

5.19. The mediation effect of OP on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI):

Hypothesis 3e:
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions.
To test the hypothesis each dimension of organisational politics was assessed separately. The first section shows the analysis carried out for the mediation effect of general political behaviour (GPB), followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).

a. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between LMX (IV) and TOI (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
LMX was regressed on TOI. The regression analysis revealed that LMX explained 4.8% of TOI ($R^2=.048$). The relationship was significant (Beta=-.220, $p<0.01$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on the GPB. The regression revealed that LMX explained 6.2% ($R^2=.062$) variance in GPB. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.249, $p<0.01$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** GPB was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that GPB explains 7% ($R^2=.070$) of the variance in TOI. The relationship is significant (Beta=.264, sig=<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.
**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of GPB. The analysis revealed that the relationship between LMX and TOI remained significant after controlling for the effect of GPB (Beta=.264, sig=<.001), which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. Based on that, GPB had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and TOI. (Table 5.47 explains the analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX on TOI</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-4.099</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 2</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX on GPB</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-4.669</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 3</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GPB on TOI</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>4.986</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: LMX on TOI (controlling for GPB)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>-3.038</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI):**

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between LMX (DV) and TOI (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

LMX was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 4.8% of TOI (R²=.048). The relationship was significant (Beta=-.220, p<001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
LMX was regressed on the GATGA. The analysis revealed that LMX explained 21.7% ($R^2=.217$) variance in GATGA. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.466, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GATGA was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that GATGA explained only 4.7% ($R^2=.047$) of the variance in TOI. The relationship was significant (Beta=.216, sig=.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** LMX was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The analysis showed that the two variables together explain 6.5% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=.065$). The analysis revealed that the relationship between LMX and TOI was no longer significant (Beta=-.152, sig=.012) after controlling for the effect of GATGA, which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. As mentioned earlier, according to Baron and Kenny (1986), if the impact of the IV on DV drops statistically after controlling for the effect of the mediating variable, then a full mediating effect exists for MV between the IV and DV, if not then the mediation does not exist. In this case GATGA had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and TOI. (Table 5.48 explains the analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.48: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions (TOI).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1 LMX on TOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2 LMX on GATGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3 Step 1: GATGA on TOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: LMX on TOI (controlling for GATGA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H3e suggests a mediation role for organisational politics in the relationship between LMX and TOI. The results fully support the hypothesis; both GPB and GATGA had full mediation effects on the relationship between LMX and TOI.

5.20. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and work outcomes:

**Hypothesis 4a:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 4b:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4c:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is positively related to career success.

**Hypothesis 4d:**
The corporate succession planning and career development is negatively related to turnover intentions.

The regression analysis was conducted to assess the direction of the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and work outcomes. The analysis showed that SPCD had significant moderate positive relationships with CS (Beta=.540, t=11.678, F=136.387), JS (Beta=.537, t=11.567, F=133.799) and OC (Beta=.486, t=10.104, F=102.083). The analysis also revealed a weak negative relationship between SPCD and TOI (Beta=-.268, t=-5.052, F=25.522). SPCD explains 28.8% of the variance in JS (R²=.288), 29.2% of the variance in CS (R²=.292), 23.6% of the variance in OC.
(R²=.236), and a low prediction power in TOI (R²=.072) which is 7.2%. Looking at the other parts of the table, the p-value of F=zero and t-value of 2 or higher indicate that the model is statistically significant. The analysis showed that the highest impact of SPCD was on CS and the lowest was on TOI. These results put emphasize on the strong link between the employees' involvement in and benefit from the continuous corporate SPCD programs, and the level of their satisfaction towards their jobs and careers. (Tables 5.49 – 5.53, show the results of the regression analysis and descriptive statistics).

| Table 5.49: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standardized Coefficients) for the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| OC | TOI | CS | JS |
| Beta | .486 | -.268 | .540 | .537 |
| R² | .236 | .072 | .292 | .288 |
| Adjusted R-square | .233 | .069 | .290 | .286 |
| T | 10.104 | -5.052 | 11.678 | 11.567 |
| F | 102.083 | 25.522 | 136.387 | 133.799 |
| F sig.000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |

| Table 5.50: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC) |
|---|---|---|
| OC | Std. Deviation | N |
| Mean | 1.6387 | .29610 |
| SPCD | 1.0966 | .49753 |

| Table 5.51: Descriptive Statistics for the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI) |
|---|---|---|
| TOI | Std. Deviation | N |
| Mean | .8627 | .65266 |
| SPCD | 1.0966 | .49753 |

| Table 5.52: Descriptive Statistics for the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS) |
|---|---|---|
| CS | Std. Deviation | N |
| Mean | 1.4219 | .47772 |
| SPCD | 1.0966 | .49753 |
Table 5.53: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>1.5086</td>
<td>.46258</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
<td>1.0966</td>
<td>.49753</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.21. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), and organisational justice:

Hypothesis 4e:
The corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) is positively related to organisational justice.

H4e suggests a positive relationship between SPCD and organisational justice. As mentioned earlier, the factor analysis conducted earlier revealed two factors for organisational justice i.e. distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ). The first hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to assess the direction of the relationship and the prediction power of SPCD in DJ. The analysis revealed a positive moderate effect of SPCD on perceived DJ (Beta=.481, t=9.991, F=99.824). The analysis also revealed that SPCD predicts 23.2% of the variance in DJ (R²=.232).

The second analysis tests the prediction power of SPCD in PJ. The analysis revealed a high significant positive relationship between the two variables (Beta=.621, t=14.412, F=207.705). SPCD is responsible for 38.6% of the variance in PJ (R²=.386). The results show that both forms of organisational justice are positively and significantly related to SPCD, which gives full support to the
hypothesis. (Tables 5.54-5.56 show the findings of the regression analysis and descriptive statistics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.54: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standardized Coefficients) for the relationship between SPCD and organisational justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F sig.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.55: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between SPCD and distributive justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.56: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between SPCD and procedural justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.22. The mediation effect of organisational justice on the relationships between SPCD, and organizational commitment (OC):

Hypothesis 5a:
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment.

To test the hypotheses each dimension of organisational justice was tested separately. The first section shows the mediation analysis for procedural justice followed by distributive justice.
a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
SPCD was regressed on OC. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.6% of the variance in OC ($R^2=.236$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.486, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on PJ. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 38.6% ($R^2=.386$) of the variance in PJ. The relationship was significant (Beta=.621, $p<0.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** PJ was regressed on the OC. The analysis showed that PJ explains 27.3% of the variance in OC ($R^2=.20.5$). The relationship was significant (B=.453, $p<0.001$), which satisfied the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on OC, controlling for the effect of PJ. The two variables together explain 27.3% of the variance in OC ($R^2=273$). The relationship between SPCD and OC remained significant after controlling for PJ (Beta=.332, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. Based on that, PJ had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and OC. (Table 5.57 explains the steps of the regression analysis).
Table 5.57: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of procedural justice on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>10.104</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>14.412</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on PJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step1: PJ on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step2: SPCD on OC (controlling for PJ)</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

SPCD was regressed on OC. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 23.6% of the variance in OC (R²=.236). The relationship was significant (Beta=.486, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on DJ. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.2% of the variance in DJ (R²=.232). The relationship was significant (Beta=.481, p<0.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** DJ was regressed on OC. The analysis showed that DJ explains 23.2% of the variance in OC (R²=.232). The relationship is significant (Beta=.481, p<0.001), which satisfies the third mediation analysis.
**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on OC, controlling for the effect of DJ. The analysis revealed that the two variables together exert 24.5% of the variance in OC ($R^2=.245$). The analysis revealed that the relationship between SPCD and OC remained significant after controlling for DJ (Beta=.432, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. However as the first three conditions were met, then DJ will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and OC. (Table 5.58 shows the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>10.104</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>9.991</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>6.112</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: DJ on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on OC</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>7.924</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(controlling for DJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H5a suggests a mediation role for organisational justice in the relationship between SPCD and OC. The results partially supported the hypothesis; both PJ and DJ had partial mediation effects on the relationship between SPCD and OC.

5.23. The mediation effect of organizational justice on the relationship between LMX and job satisfaction (JS):

*Hypothesis 5b:*

Organisational justices mediates the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction.
To test the hypotheses each dimension of organisational justice will be tested separately. The first section will test the mediation effect of procedural justice followed by distributive justice.

a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (DV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

SPCD was regressed on JS. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 28.8% of the variance in JS ($R^2=0.288$). The relationship was significant (Beta=0.537, $p<0.001$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on PJ. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 38.6% of the variance in PJ ($R^2=0.386$). The relationship was significant (Beta=0.621, $p<0.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** PJ was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that PJ explained 21% of the variance in JS. The analysis showed a significant relationship (Beta=0.458, sig=$<0.001$), which satisfied the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on JS, controlling for the effect of PJ. The analysis showed that the two variables explain 31.3% ($R^2=0.313$) of the variance in JS. The
relationship between SPCD and JS remained significant after controlling for the effect of PJ (Beta=-.410, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. As the first three conditions were met, then procedural justice has a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and JS. (Table 5.59 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis LMX on JS</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>11.567</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2 SPCD on PJ</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>14.412</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on JS (controlling for PJ)</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>7.049</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

SPCD was regressed on JS. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 28.8% of the variance in JS (R²=.288). The relationship was significant (Beta=.537, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on distributive justice (DJ). The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.2% of the variance in DJ ($R^2=.232$). The relationship is significant (Beta=.481, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** DJ was regressed on JS. The analysis revealed that DJ explains 16.5% of the variance in JS ($R^2=.165$). The relationship is significant (Beta=.406, sig=$<.001$), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on JS, controlling for the effect of DJ. The analysis revealed that the two variables exert 31.6% ($R^2=.316$) of the variance in JS. The relationship between SPCD and JS remained significant after controlling for the effect of DJ (Beta=-.444, sig=$<.001$), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. However, as the three mediation conditions were met, then DJ will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and OC. (Table 5.60 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

| Table 5.60: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS). |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Analysis 1                      | R   | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta | t    | Sig |
| SPCD on JS                      | .537| .288 | .288         | .537 | 11.567 | .000 |
| Analysis 2                      | R   | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta | t    | Sig |
| SPCD on DJ                      | .481| .232 | .232         | .481 | 9.991 | .000 |
| Analysis 3                      | R   | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta | t    | Sig |
| Step 1: DJ on JS                | .406| .165 | .165         | .406 | 8.081 | .000 |
| Step 2: SPCD on JS (controlling for DJ) | .562| .316 | .151         | .444 | 8.550 | .000 |

H5b suggests a mediation effect for organisational justice on the relationship between SPCD and JS. The results partially supported the hypothesis; both PJ and DJ had partial mediation effects on the relationship between SPCD and JS.
5.24. The mediation effect of organizational justice on the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS):

**Hypothesis 5c:**
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between SPCD and career success.

To test the hypotheses each dimension of organisational justice were tested separately. The first section shows the mediation effect of procedural justice followed by distributive justice.

**a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS):**

Following are the steps of the regression analysis carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
SPCD was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 28.8% of the variance in CS ($R^2=.28.8$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.537, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on PJ. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 38.6% of the variance in PJ ($R^2=.386$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.621, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second condition of the mediation.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** PJ was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that PJ explained 21% of the variance in CS (R²=.210). The relationship was significant (Beta=.458, sig=<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on CS, controlling for the effect of PJ. The analysis showed that the two variables together explain 31.3% (R²=.133) of the variance in CS. The relationship between SPCD and CS remained significant after controlling for the effect of PJ (Beta=.410, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. However, as the first three conditions were met, then PJ will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and CS. (Table 5.61 explains the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.61: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of procedural justice on the relationship between SPCD and career success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on CS (controlling for PJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS):**

Following are the steps of the regression analysis carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
SPCD was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that LMX explained 29.2% of the variance in CS ($R^2=.292$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.540, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on DJ. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.2% of the variance in DJ ($R^2=.232$). The relationship was significant (Beta=.481, $p<.001$), which satisfies the second condition of the mediation.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1**: DJ was regressed on CS. The analysis revealed that DJ explains 11.9% of the variance in CS ($R^2=.119$). The relationship is significant (Beta=.345, sig=<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2**: SPCD was regressed on CS, controlling for the effect of DJ. The analysis revealed that the two variable explain 30.1% of the variance in CS ($R^2=301$). The relationship between SPCD and CS remained significant after controlling for DJ (Beta=.487, sig=<.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. However as the first three conditions were met, then DJ has a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and CS. (Table 5.62 explains the steps of the regression analysis).
Table 5.62: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice on the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on CS</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>11.687</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>9.991</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>6.697</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:DJ on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:SPCD on CS (controlling for DJ)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>9.271</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H5c suggests a mediation role for organisational justice in the relationship between SPCD and CS. The results partially supported the hypothesis; both PJ and DJ had partial mediation effects on the relationship between SPCD and CS.

5.25. The mediation effect of organisational justice on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions:

Hypothesis 5d:
Organisational justice mediates the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions.

To test the hypotheses each dimension of organisational justice were tested separately. The first section tests the mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) followed by distributive justice (DJ).

a. The mediation effect of procedural justice (PJ) on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of PJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and TOI (DV).

Analysis 1:
SPCD was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 7.2% of TOI ($R^2=.072$). The relationship is negative and significant (Beta=-.268, p<.001), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on PJ. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 38.6% ($R^2=.386$) variance in PJ, and the relationship is significant (Beta =.621, p<0.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** PJ was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that PJ explains 4.8% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=.048$), showing a significant negative relationship (Beta=-.220, sig =<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of PJ. The analysis revealed that the two variables explain 7.6% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=0.076$). The relationship between SPCD and TOI became no longer significant, after controlling for the effect of PJ (Beta=-.213, sig=.002). Based on that, PJ will have a full mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI. (Table 5.63 explains the analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on TOI</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-5.052</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on PJ</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>14.412</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: PJ on TOI</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-4.107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on TOI (controlling for PJ)</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>-3.155</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The mediation effect of distributive justice (DJ) on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of DJ (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and TOI (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

SPCD was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 7.2% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=.072$). The relationship is negative (Beta=$-.268$, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on DJ. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.2% ($R^2=.232$) of the variance in DJ. The relationship was significant (Beta =.481, $p<0.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** DJ was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that DJ explained 3.3% of the variance in TOI ($R^2=.033$), showing a non-significant relationship (Beta=$-.183$, sig. =.001), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that no further analysis is needed. DJ does not mediate the relationship between SPCD and TOI. (Table 5.64 explains the analysis steps).
Table 5.64: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of distributive justice on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on TOI</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-5.052</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on DJ</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>9.991</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: DJ on TOI</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-3.363</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on TOI (controlling for DJ)</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-3.363</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H5d suggests a mediation role for organisational justice in the relationship between SPCD and TOI. The results partially supported the hypothesis; PJ had a partial mediation effect, while DJ had no mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI.

5.26. The relationship between SPCD and organisational politics (OP):

*Hypothesis 5e:*

The corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) is negatively related to organisational politics.

The hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to test the prediction power of SPCD in organisational politics. The first analysis was conducted to test the prediction power of SPCD in the general political behaviour (GPB). The analysis revealed a moderate negative relationship between the two variables (Beta=-.362, t=-7.061, F=49.851). SPCD explains 13.1% of the variance in GPB.

Regarding the relationship between the second dimension of OP, *go along to get ahead* (GATGA) and SPCD, the regression analysis confirmed the high negative correlation between the two variables (Beta=-.615, t=-14.186, F=201.233), and also showed that SPCD explains 41.6% of the variance in GATGA (R²=.378).
Comparing between the two dimensions of POP, the analysis showed that GATGA is more correlated with SPCD than GPB, which gives an indication that the individuals’ compliance with actions taken by others is more affected by the corporate SPCD than the overt, self-serving political behaviours they practice in order to ensure advancement of their personal gains. (Tables 5.65 - 5.67 show the regression analysis and the descriptive statistics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.65: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standardized Coefficients) for the relationship between SPCD and the two dimensions of organisational politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GPB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F sig.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.66: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between SPCD and GPB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.67: Descriptive statistics for the relationship between SPCD and GATGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.27. The mediation effects of organisational politics on the relationship between SPCD and organizational commitment:

_Hypothesis 6a:
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and organisational commitment._
Similar to the previous sections, to test the hypothesis each dimension of organisational politics was tested separately. The first section shows the test of the mediation effect of general political behaviour (GPB), followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).

a. The mediation effect of general political behaviour (GPB) on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
SPCD was regressed on OC. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.6% of the variance in OC (R²=.236). The relationship was significant (Beta=.486, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on GPB. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 13.1% (R²=.131) of the variance in GPB. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.362, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** GPB was regressed on OC. The analysis revealed that GPB explains 2.3% of the variance in OC (R²=.023). The relationship is negative and not significant (Beta=-.152, p.005), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that, no further analysis will be needed. GPB has no mediation effect on the
relationship between SPCD and OC. (Table 5.68 shows the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.68: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on OC (controlling for GPB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and OC (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
SPCD was regressed on OC. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 23.6% of OC (R²=.236). The relationship was significant (Beta=.486, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on GATGA. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 37.8% (R²=.378) of the variance in GATGA. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.615, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
**Step 1:** GATGA was regressed on the OC. The analysis showed that GATGA explains 18.8% of the variance in OC. The relationship is significant (Beta = -.434, p<0.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on OC, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The two variables together exert 26.5% of the variance in OC (R² = .265). The relationship between SPCD and OC remained significant after controlling for GATGA (Beta = -.352, sig = <.001), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. However as the first three steps were met, GATGA will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and OC. (Table 5.69 explains the steps of the analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>10.104</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>-.615</td>
<td>-14.186</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on GATGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>-8.760</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GATGA on OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on OC (controlling for GATGA)</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>5.878</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H6a suggests a mediation role for organisational politics in the relationship between SPCD and OC. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had no mediation effect, while GATGA had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and OC.
5.28. The mediation effects of organisational politics on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction:

_Hypothesis 6b:_
*Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and job satisfaction.*

Similar to the previous sections, to test the hypotheses each dimension of organisational politics will be tested separately. The first section will test the mediation effect of general political behaviour (GPB), followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).

**a. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS):**

Following are the steps of the regression analysis carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and JS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
The SPCD was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that LMX explained 53.7% of the variance in JS (R²=.537). The relationship is significant (Beta=.537, p<.001), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on PJ. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 13.1% (R²=.131) of the variance in GPB. The relationship is negative and significant (Beta=-.362, p<.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**
Step 1: GPB was regressed on JS. The two variables together exert 3.1% of the variance in JS (R²=.031). The relationship is negative and non-significant (Beta=-.177, sig=.001), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that no further analysis will be needed. GPB does not mediate the relationship between SPCD and JS. (Table 5.70 explains the mediation analysis steps).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.70: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on JS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on GPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GPB on JS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on JS (controlling for GPB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and JS (DV).

Analysis 1:

SPCD was regressed on JS. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 28.8% of the variance in JS (R²=.288). The relationship was significant (Beta=.537, p<.001), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

Analysis 2:
SPCD was regressed on GATGA. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 37.8% ($R^2=.378$) of the variance in GATGA. The relationship is negative and significant ($\beta=-.615, p<001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

Step 1: GATGA was regressed on JS. The analysis showed that GATGA explains 15.2% of the variance in JS ($R^2=.152$). The relationship is negative and significant ($\beta=-.390, sig=<.001$), which satisfies the third mediation conditions.

Step 2: SPCD was regressed on JS, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The analysis revealed that the two variables exert 29.4% ($R^2=.294$) of the variance in JS. The relationship between SPCD and JS remained significant after controlling for the effect of GATGA ($\beta=+.477, sig=<.001$), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. However, as the first three mediation conditions are met, then GATGA will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and JS. (Table 5.71 explains the steps of the analysis).

| Table 5.71: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS). |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Analysis 1      | R   | $R^2$| $R^2$ Change | Beta | t    | Sig |
| SPCD on JS      | .537| .288| .288         | .537 | 11.567| .000|
| Analysis 2      | R   | $R^2$| $R^2$ Change | Beta | t    | Sig |
| SPCD on GATGA   | .615| .378| .378         | -.615| -14.186| .000|
| Analysis 3      | R   | $R^2$| $R^2$ Change | Beta | t    | Sig |
| Step 1: GATGA on JS | .390| .152| .165         | -.390| -7.700| .000|
| Step 2: SPCD on JS (controlling for GATGA) | .542| .294| .142         | .477 | 8.136| .000|

H6b suggests a mediation role for organisational politics in the relationship between SPCD and JS. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had
no mediation effect on the relationship, while GATGA had a partial mediation effect in the relationship between SPCD and JS.

5.28. The mediation effects of organisational politics on the relationship between SPCD and career success:

**Hypothesis 6c:**  
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and career success.

To test the hypothesis, each dimension of organisational politics was tested separately. The first section shows the steps of the analysis for the general political behaviour (GPB), followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).

a. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**  
SPCD was regressed on CS. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 29.2% of the variance in CS ($R^2= .29.2$). The relationship was significant ($\text{Beta} = .540$, $p<.001$), which satisfies the first condition of the mediation relationship.

**Analysis 2:**
SPCD was regressed on the GPB. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 13.1% ($R^2 = .131$) of the variance in GPB. The relationship is significant (Beta=-.362, p<001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

Step 1: GPB was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that GPB explained 2.3% of the variance in CS ($R^2 = .023$). The relationship is negative and non-significant (Beta=-.150, sig=.006), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that no further analysis was needed; GPB had no mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and CS. (Table 5.72 shows the steps of the mediation analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.72: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of 'general political behaviour' (GPB) on the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction (JS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on GPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GPB on CS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between LMX and career success (CS):**

Following are the steps of the regression analysis carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and CS (DV).

**Analysis 1:**
SPCD was regressed on CS. The analysis showed that LMX explained 29.2% of the variance in CS (R²=.292). The relationship is significant (Beta=.540, p<.001) which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on GATGA. The analysis showed that SPCD explained 37.8% variance in GATGA (R²=.378). The relationship was significant (Beta=-.615, p<.001), which satisfies the second condition of the mediation.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GATGA was regressed on the CS. The analysis showed that GATGA explains 12.4% of the variance in CS (R²=.124). The relationship is significant (Beta=-.352, sig=<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on CS, after controlling for the effect of GATGA. The two variables exert 29.2% (R²=.292) of the variance in CS. The analysis revealed that the relationship between SPCD and CS remained significant, after controlling for the effect of GATGA (Beta=.521, sig=<.000), which does not satisfy the fourth mediation condition. However, as the first three conditions were met, then GATGA will have a partial mediation effect on the relationship between CS and SPCD. (Table 5.73 explains the steps of the analysis).
Table 5.73: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of ‘get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) on the relationship between SPCD and career success (CS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>11.678</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>-.615</td>
<td>-14.186</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on GATGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>-6.841</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GATGA on CS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on CS</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>8.867</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(controlling for GATGA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H6c suggests a mediation role for POP on the relationship between SPCD and CS. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had no mediation effect, while GATGA had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and CS.

5.29. The mediation effects of organisational politics on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions:

Hypothesis 6d:
Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and turnover intentions.

To test the hypothesis, each dimension of organisational politics was tested separately. The first section shows the test of the mediation effect of the general political behaviour (GPB), followed by get along to get ahead (GATGA).

a. The mediation effect of GPB on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI):
The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GPB (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and TOI (DV).

**Analysis 1:**

SPCD was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 7.2% of TOI ($R^2 = .072$). The relationship is negative and significant ($\beta = -.268$, $p < .001$), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

**Analysis 2:**

SPCD was regressed on GPB. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 13.1% ($R^2 = .131$) variance in GPB. The relationship is negative and significant ($\beta = -.362$, $p < 0.001$), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

**Analysis 3:**

**Step 1:** GPB was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that GPB explains 7% of the variance in TOI ($R^2 = .070$). The relationship is significant ($\beta = 264$, sig. $= < .001$), which satisfies the third mediation condition.

**Step 2:** SPCD was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of GPB. The two variables exert 32.2% of the variance in TOI ($R^2 = .322$). The relationship between SPCD and TOI remained significant after controlling for GPB ($\beta = -.196$, sig=$<.001$), which does not satisfy the third mediation condition. Based on that, no further analysis was needed. GPB had no mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI. (Table 5.74 explains the steps of the analysis).
Table 5.74: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-5.052</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on TOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 2</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>-7.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD on GPB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 3</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>4.986</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: GPB on TOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: SPCD on TOI (controlling for GPB)</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-3.539</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The mediation effect of GATGA on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI):

The following regression analysis steps were carried out for the mediation effect of GATGA (MV) on the relationship between SPCD (IV) and TOI (DV).

Analysis 1:

SPCD was regressed on TOI. The analysis revealed that SPCD explained 7.2% of TOI (R²=.072). The relationship is negative and significant (Beta=-.268, p<.001), which satisfies the first mediation condition.

Analysis 2:

SPCD was regressed on GATGA. The regression revealed that SPCD explained 37.8% (R²=.378) variance in GATGA. The relationship is negative and significant (Beta =-.615, p<0.001), which satisfies the second mediation condition.

Analysis 3:

Step 1: GATGA was regressed on TOI. The analysis showed that GATGA explains 4.7% of the variance in TOI (R²=.047). The relationship is negative and significant (Beta=-.216, sig =<.001), which satisfies the third mediation condition.
Step 2: SPCD was regressed on TOI, controlling for the effect of GATGA. The analysis showed that the two variables together exert 7.6% of the variance in TOI (R²=.076). The relationship between SPCD and TOI became no longer significant after controlling for GATGA (Beta=-217, sig=.001), which satisfies the fourth mediation condition. GATGA has a full mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI. (Table 5.75 explains the steps of the analysis).

| Table 5.75: The regression analysis for the mediation effect of “get along to get ahead” (GATGA) on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions (TOI). |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Analysis 1      | R      | R²     | R² Change | Beta   | t      | Sig    |
| SPCD on TOI     | .268   | .072   | .072     | -.268  | -5.052 | .000   |
| Analysis 2      | R      | R²     | R² Change | Beta   | t      | Sig    |
| SPCD on GATGA   | .615   | .378   | .378     | -.615  | -14.186| .000   |
| Analysis 3      | R      | R²     | R² Change | Beta   | t      | Sig    |
| Step 1: GATGA on TOI | .216   | .047   | .048     | -.216  | -4.023 | .000   |
| Step 2: SPCD on TOI (controlling for GATGA) | .275   | .076   | .029     | -.217  | -3.230 | .001   |

H6d suggests a mediation role for POP in the relationship between SPCD and TOI. The results partially supported the hypothesis; GPB had no mediation effect, while GATGA had a full mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and TOI.

5.33. Prediction of work outcomes:

Four hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to assess the prediction of the four outcome variable; organisational commitment (OC), job satisfaction (JS), career success (CS) and turnover intentions (TOI). Each independent
variable was entered in the first step, followed by the perception variables, while in the third step the outcomes were added.

**a. The prediction of organizational commitment:**

The first regression analysis was conducted to assess the prediction of OC. In the first step, LMX and SPCD were interred. SPCD had a higher impact (Beta=.361, *p*>.001) than the quality of LMX (Beta=.284, *p*>.001). Collectively both were responsible for 28.7% of the variance in OC (R² Change=.287). In the second step, the four perception variables were interred. Among them, GATGA had the highest negative impact (Beta=-.134, *p*>.001). Collectively the four variables were responsible for 1% variance in OC (R² Change=.016) which is lower than the impact of the two predictors. (Table 5.76 shows the steps of the regression analysis).

<p>| Table 5.76: findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standard Coefficients) for the effect of LMX, SPCD, organisational justice and politics on OC. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Model 1 (Independent variables) LMX – SPCD</th>
<th>Model 2 Mediating variables (Perceptions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
<td>19.887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>69.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The prediction of job satisfaction:

The second regression was conducted to test the prediction of job satisfaction (JS). Similar to the previous model, in the first step LMX and SPCD were interred. SPCD had a higher impact (Beta=.485, \( p>0.001 \)) LMX (Beta=.118, \( p>0.001 \)). Collectively both were responsible for 28.7\% of the variance in JS (\( R^2 \) Change=.287). In the second step, the four perceptions variables were interred. The impact of DJ was (Beta=.004, \( p>0.001 \)), PJ was (Beta=.016, \( p>0.001 \)), GPB (Beta=.102, \( p>0.001 \)) and GATGA was (Beta=-.134, \( p>0.001 \)). Among the four variables, GPB had the highest impact on JS and DJ had the lowest. Collectively, the four variables were responsible for 2.7\% variance in JS (\( R^2 \) Change=.027) which is weaker than the impact of LMX and SPCD collectively. (Table 5.77 shows the steps of the regression analysis).

| Table 5.77: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standard Coefficients) for the effect of LMX, SPCD, organisational justice and politics on job satisfaction. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Independent variables | Model 1 (Independent variables) LMX – SPCD | | Model 2 Mediating variables (Perceptions) | |
| | | B | Beta | Sig | B | Beta | Sig |
| Constant | .367 | .212 | .008 | .981 | |
| **Step 1** | | | | | |
| LMX | .151 | .118 | .022 | .031 | .024 | .716 |
| SPCD | .451 | .485 | .000 | .406 | .437 | .000 |
| **Step 3** | | | | | |
| DJ | .152 | .134 | .016 | |
| PJ | .141 | .140 | .087 | |
| GPB | .118 | .108 | .036 | |
| GATGA | .044 | .038 | .554 | |
| Model F | 21.326 | 15.763 | |
| \( R^2 \) | .345 | .372 | |
| \( R^2 \) Change | .287 | .027 | |
| F Change | 71.034 | 3.383 | |
c. The prediction of career success:

The next regression analysis was conducted to test the prediction of career success (CS). In the first step, LMX and SPCD were interred. SPCD had a much higher impact (Beta=.523, \( p>0.001 \)) than LMX (Beta=.073, \( p>0.001 \)). Collectively both were responsible for 30% of the variance in CS (\( R^2 \) Change=.300). In the second step, the four perceptions variables were interred. Among them, DJ had the highest impact (Beta=.094, \( p>0.001 \)), followed by GPB (Beta=.091, \( p=>0.001 \)), PJ (Beta=.055, \( p=>0.001 \)), and the lowest power was for GATGA (Beta=.047, \( p=>0.001 \)). Collectively, the four variables were responsible for only 1.3% variance in JS (\( R^2 \) Change=.013) which is lower than the impact of LMX and SPCD collectively. (Table 5.78 shows the steps of the regression analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.78: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standard Coefficients) for the effect of LMX, SPCD, organisational justice and politics on career success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. The prediction of turnover intentions:

The next regression analysis was conducted to test the prediction of turnover intentions (TOI). In the first step LMX and SPCD were interred. Both variables had a negative impact on TOI. SPCD had a slightly higher impact (Beta=-.273, p>0.001), than LMX (Beta=-.269, p>0.001). Collectively both were responsible for 8% of the variance in TOI (R² Change=.089). In the second step, the four perceptions variables were interred. Among them GPB had the highest, though low impact (Beta=.208, p>0.001), followed by PJ (Beta=.101, p>0.001), DJ (Beta=-.031, p>0.001) and GATGA (Beta=.027, p>0.001). Collectively, the four perceptions variables were responsible for only 3% of the variance in TOI (R² Change=.035), which is lower than the impact of LMX and SPCD collectively. (Table 5.79 shows the steps of the analysis).

| Table 5.79: Findings of Multiple Regression Analysis (Standard Coefficients) for the effect of LMX, SPCD, organisational justice and politics on turnover intentions |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Independent variables           | Model 1 (Independent variables) LMX – SPCD | Model 2 Mediating variables (Perceptions) |                                |                                |                                |
|                                 | B | Beta | Sig | B | Beta | Sig |                                |                                |                                |
| Constant                        | 1.631 | .001 | .001 | 1.055 | .066 | .001 |                                |                                |                                |
| Step 1                          |                                |                                |                                |                                |                                |
| LMX                             | -.269 | -.149 | .013 | -.322 | -.178 | .021 |                                |                                |                                |
| SPCD                            | -.273 | -.208 | .001 | -.209 | -.159 | .030 |                                |                                |                                |
| Step 2                          |                                |                                |                                |                                |                                |
| DJ                              |                               | -.050 | -.031 | .628 |                                |                                |                                |
| PJ                              |                               | .144 | .101 | .287 |                                |                                |                                |
| GPB                             |                               | .320 | .208 | .001 |                                |                                |                                |
| GATGA                           |                               | .045 | .027 | .716 |                                |                                |                                |
| Model F                         | 4.908 |                                | 4.452 |                                |                                |                                |
| R²                              | .108 |                                | .143 |                                |                                |                                |
| R² Change                       | .089 |                                | .035 |                                |                                |                                |
| F Change                        | 16.079 |                                | 3.266 |                                |                                |                                |
5.34. Summary of results:

Six hypotheses were made for the relationships between the constructs of the study. However, most of the hypotheses were not supported. Significant positive correlations were found between the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and organisational justice. Also a moderate negative significant relationship was found between LMX and perceptions of organisational politics (POP). The results also revealed that the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) had a positive correlation with organisational justice, and a negative relationships POP.

Both LMX and SPCD were found to be positively related to organisational commitment (OC), job satisfaction (JS) and career success (CS), and negatively related to turnover intentions (TOI). Among the four outcomes, LMX and SPCD had the least impact on TOI. The two forms of organisational justice and the two forms of organisational politics were found to have different degrees of mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and work outcomes and the relationships between SPCD and work outcomes. Table (5.80) shows the summary of hypotheses and the results of the study.
Table 5.80: Summary of results for hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1a</strong> The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1b</strong> The quality of LMX is positively related to job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1c</strong> The quality of LMX is positively related to career success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1d</strong> The quality of LMX is negatively related to turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2a</strong> The quality of LMX is positively related to organisational justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2b</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and organisational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2c</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2d</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and career success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2e</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3a</strong> The quality of LMX is negatively related to organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3b</strong> Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and organisational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3c</strong> Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3d</strong> Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and career success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3e</strong> Organisational politics mediate the relationship between the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of LMX and turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4a</strong> SPCD is positively related to organisational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4b</strong> SPCD is positively related to job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4c</strong> SPCD is positively related to career success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4d</strong> SPCD is negatively related to turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5a</strong> SPCD is positively related to organisational justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5b</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between SPCD and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5c</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between SPCD and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5d</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between SPCD and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5e</strong> Organisational justice mediate the relationship between SPCD,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and turnover intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6a</strong> SPCD is negatively related to organisational politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6b</strong> Organisational politics mediate the relationship between SPCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially supported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and career success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6c</td>
<td>Organisational politics mediate the relationship between SPCD and job satisfaction.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6d</td>
<td>Organisational politics mediate the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6e</td>
<td>Organisational politics mediate the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.16. Chapter summary:

This chapter discussed the conceptual model based on the theoretical framework and the research hypotheses. The chapter presented the results of the correlation and regression analyses conducted to assess the relationships between the variables. The results of the analysis provided some support to the hypotheses.
Figure 5.2: The study model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>The quality of Leader-Member Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCD</td>
<td>Succession planning &amp; career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>Perceptions of Organisational Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Career Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOI</td>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1. Introduction:

The main objective of this study is to investigate the extent to which leadership and organisational career management practices predict career-related attitudes and behaviours. To achieve that, the study assessed the prediction effects of the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) and the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD) on the employees’ perceptions about justice and politics, and four work outcomes including organisational commitment, job satisfaction, career success and turnover intentions.

This chapter discusses the main findings, research contributions, managerial implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

6.2. The main findings:

The study found support for most of the hypotheses. The results were presented in Chapter 5 and the following sections will discuss the main findings.

6.2.1. The relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes:
The relationships between the quality of LMX and work outcomes were in the expected direction and in line with the results of previous research (e.g., Gerstner and Day, 1997; Schriesheim, Neider, Scandura and Tepper, 1992; Seers and Graen, 1984; Vecchio, Griffeth and Hom, 1986, 2001; Volmer et al., 2011); a high correlation was found between LMX and job satisfaction. Another positive correlation was also found between LMX and career success giving support to the results of Erdogan, Kramer and Liden (2004), Park, Kang and Lee (2013) and Langford (2000). The results also revealed a negative relationship between the quality of LMX and turnover intentions, in consistence with previous studies (e.g., Graen, Liden and Hoel, 1982; Vecchio and Gobdel, 1984; Ferris, 1989; Erdogan, Liden and Wayne, 2006).

6.2.2. The relationship between the quality of LMX and perceptions of organisational justice:

The results showed significant positive correlations between the quality of LMX and both distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ). Supervisors are often seen as the organisation's agents in implementing career related policies; their favourable or unfavourable treatment would impact the subordinates’ perceptions of justice to a great extent. The employees’ perceptions of fairness are enhanced when they feel that they are valued members of the group (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975; Podsakoff et al., 1990). The study revealed that among the two dimensions of justice, the impact of LMX was greater on PJ than DJ. The
reason could be that in-group members would possibly receive more justifications, as well as larger amounts of resources due to the relative benefits of the high quality interactions and close relationship with the supervisor/manager. Subordinates in high-quality LMX receive more rewards, better performance ratings, challenging assignments, participation in decision making, leader support and attention, empowerment, salary/pay and career progress, than their peers in low-quality LMX (Lee, 2001).

Arab culture was described as collectivistic (Hofetede, 1980; 2001) and diffuse (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). In such cultures there is less of a distinction between work and personal relationships; they might overlap. Friendships and personal relationships may be instrumental as they enable individuals to accomplish their goals, which positively impacts their justice perceptions.

6.2.3. Organisational justice as a mediator for the relationship between the quality of LMX and work outcomes:

The study found full mediation effects for procedural justice (PJ) on the relationships between LMX and organisational commitment, and LMX and job satisfaction. Distributive justice (DJ) had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment, and LMX and job satisfaction. Both DJ and PJ had full mediation effects on the relationship between LMX and career success. Also both PJ and DJ had full mediation effects on the
relationship between LMX and turnover intentions. The results of this study also support the results of Hassan and Chandaran (2995) who reported a mediation role of both PJ and DJ on the relationship between LMX with job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

6.2.4. The relationship between the quality of LMX and perceptions of organisational politics:

The results confirm the findings of Hochwarter (2003) related to the negative relationship between the quality of LMX and perceptions of organisational politics (POP). Among the two dimensions of politics, the impact of the quality of LMX was greater on ‘get away to get ahead’ (GATGA) factor that reflects the covert political behaviour in which individuals show silence and act passively for their own benefit than the ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) that refers to the individual’s overt self serving behaviour to gain preferred outcomes. This finding could be true in an Arab high context culture (Hall, 1977). In such cultures what is unsaid but understood carries more weight than what is actually written down or said (Muna and Khoury, 2012).

The findings of this study validate previous arguments made by LMX theorists which emphasize that research needs to move beyond investigating LMX relationships in isolation of the surrounding social context (e.g., Gerstner and Day, 1997; Graen and Scandura, 1987; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995; Kinicki and Vecchio, 1994; Lien et al., 1997; Sparrowe and Liden, 1997). Yousif (2000)
found that UAE (which shares the same cultural values with Bahrain) is relatively high in terms of internal locus of control. Such cultures are described as high in organisational politics. Managers in organisations with high locus of control are more likely to play politics than those with a low level of external locus of control (Wendy and Morrison, 2001).

6.2.5. Organisational politics as a mediator for the relationship between LMX and work outcomes:

The results revealed that both dimensions of organisational politics i.e. GPB and GATGA had full mediation effects on the relationship between LMX and turnover intentions. GPB had no mediation effects on the relationships between LMX and organisational commitment, LMX and job satisfaction, and LMX and career success. GATGA had a full mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and career success, while it had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between LMX and organisational commitment, and LMX and job satisfaction.

6.2.6. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and work outcomes:

The results showed significant positive relationships between SPCD and organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and career success, while showing a negative relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions. Among the four outcomes, SPCD had the highest impact on job satisfaction.
Regarding the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment (OC), the findings are generally consistent with those of earlier research (Folger and Konovosky 1989; Greenberg 1990; McFarlin and Sweeney 1992; Sweeney and McFarlin 1993; Tyler 1991) conducted in the framework of organisational justice which emphasizes that fairness perceptions of HRM practices act as a significant predictor of OC. Lind and Tyler (1988) found that people care a great deal about the fairness of procedures (procedural justice). Furthermore, the fairness of HRM practices may indicate the nature of the relationship that employees can expect from their organisation. Newman, Thanacoody and Hui (2011) highlighted the importance of training to enhance OC and reduce turnover among employees. Ababneh (2013) found a significant positive impact of career development on organisational commitment and a negative impact on turnover intentions. Balfour and Wechsler (1996) also stated that the clarity of career development has positive influence on OC that is based on social relationships in the organisation. Wayne, Shore, and Liden (1997) suggested that HRM practices that signaled the organisation's intentions to invest in employees (such as developmental experiences and training) produced higher levels of organisational commitment.

Regarding the relationship between SPCD and career success, the results of this study are consistent with previous studies that found positive relationships between various forms of HR practices and career success. For example, Seibert, Krainer and Liden (2001) found that establishing a social network was related to
6.2.7. The relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) and organisational justice:

The results of the study found evidence for a positive correlation between the SPCD and both distributive (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ). Among the two dimensions, SPCD had a higher impact on PJ than PJ. Past research has emphasized that the fair distribution of career development opportunities and the use of fair decision making procedures will be reciprocated by positive attitudes and behaviours (Wooten and Cobb, 1999; Aryee and Chen, 2004; Crawshaw, 2006). Research examining the structure of the organisation promotion systems suggests that the employees’ perceptions of fairness are influenced by the type of criteria used to make promotion decisions (Kaplan and Ferris, 2001; Peare, Branyiczki and Bakacsi, 1994). McEnrue (1989) found that the promotion criteria
and paths were significantly related to the perceived fairness of the promotion decisions. Lemons and Jones (2001) found that the employees were likely to have positive perceptions of organisational justice when they receive rewards, such as promotions. Scadura (1997) found a significant positive relationship between career development and both DJ and PJ. The more people perceive that the organisational resources and outcomes such as pay and promotions are fairly distributed, the more they are satisfied with their careers. Also Bagdadli and Paoletti, (2000) and Crawshaw, (2005) reported significant associations between DJ and intrinsic career satisfaction (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001).

6.2.8. The mediation role of organisational justice in the relationship between the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD), and work outcomes:

The results showed that both procedural justice (PJ) and distributive justice (DJ) had partial mediation effects on the relationship between SPCD and organisational commitment, SPCD and job satisfaction, and SPCD and career success. PJ had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and turnover intentions, while DJ had no mediation effect on the relationship between the two variables.

6.2.9. The relationship between succession planning and career development (SPCD) and organisational politics:
The results of the study showed negative correlations between SPCD and the two dimensions of organisational politics. The relationship was stronger with ‘get away to get ahead’ (GATGA) than the ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB). The results extend on the results of previous research which found a correlation between organisational politics and a variety of HR practices. Employees working in politically charged working environments with unfair practices and systems accompanied by favoritism, scarce career and promotional opportunities, poor training and reward systems (Karatepe and Uludag, 2008a; Kusluvan et al., 2010) may escalate their tendencies to engage in organisational politics. Favoritism leads to inefficient conclusions and the loss of organisational harmony and prosperity which have high negative impact on an Arab Muslim society like Bahrain where harmony and good relationships between individuals are part of their collectivistic culture characteristics. A number of authors have also pointed out that organisational promotion systems are often political in nature (Ferris and Buckley, 1990; Ferris, Russ, and Fandt, 1989; Markham et al., 1989; Riley, 1983). Ferris and Judge (1991) identified a substantial body of research addressing how influence behaviours affect selections, performance evaluations, compensation decisions and the organisational promotion systems that are often seen as political in nature and primary mechanisms through which individuals achieve career success (e.g., Feldman and Klich, 1991; Ferris et al., 1989; Heisler and Gemmill, 1978). Ferris and Kacmar (1992, study 1 and 2) also found a correlations between the opportunity for promotion and perceptions of organisational politics. The self-
interest actions by political people may cause threat to the expected resources (Harris and Harris, 2007) of the other employees, especially in relation to promotion opportunities and recognition. Limited organisational resources create a very competitive working environment such that some employees might well perceive their lack of opportunity for promotion and career advancement within the organisation is because of not playing organisational politics games (Ferris and Buckley, 1990; Gandz and Murray, 1980). Thus, as positions are at risk and career promotion chances become limited, individuals may participate in more political behaviors. Some researchers (Daskin and Arasli, 2011; Poon, 2003) have emphasized that when employees are faced with limited resources they will tend to display more political behaviors than those without such concerns. A possible explanation is that political actions do not reflect fairness or justice in the eyes of many employees.

6.2.10. The mediation role of organisational politics in the relationship between SPCD and work outcomes:

The results showed that ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) had no mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and the four work outcomes including organisational commitment, job satisfaction, career success and turnover intentions. ‘Get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) had a partial mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and OC, SPCD and CS and SPCD and TOI, while it had a full mediation effect on the relationship between SPCD and JS.
6.2.11. Additional analysis:

1. The relationship between organisational politics and work outcomes:

The results of the correlation and regression analysis revealed that perceptions of organisational politics (POP) negatively related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment and career success, and positively related to turnover intentions. The results support the suggestions of Mowday, Steers and porter (1979) regarding considering organisational politics as the fundamental variable in determining job attitudes. The results of this study revealed that both dimensions of organisational politics, namely ‘get along to get ahead’ (GATGA) and ‘general political behaviour’ (GPB) had negative effects on organisational commitment, job satisfaction and career success, while they had high positive effects on turnover intentions. The highest negative impact of GPB was on career success; while the highest negative impact of GATGA was on job satisfaction. Considering the description of each dimension, it could be noted that the employees’ actions to gain advantages are more related to tangible benefits whereas the general and covert self serving behaviours are more related to career success. Kodisinghe (2010) found a reciprocal relationship between organisational politics and job satisfaction. Other studies found a significant relationship between POP and job satisfaction (e.g., Cropanzano et al., 1997; Randall et al., 1999), whereas many studies revealed negative relationships (e.g. Ferris et al., 1996; Kacmar et al., 1999; Vale and Perrewe, 2000; Witt et al., 2000; Vigoda, 2000) between the two variables. Consistent with these studies, this study found a
significant negative relationship between POP and job satisfaction. Some individuals may prefer highly political work environments because they are predisposed to thrive in political climates. However, most individuals may be less satisfied with their jobs in such situations. It may be difficult to be satisfied with a job when promotions, awards, and/or pay raises are based on political, rather than merit considerations, or when there are cliques closely tied to organisation leaders that typically get their way even at the cost of productivity (Witt, 1992).

This study also found negative significant relationships between POP and organisational commitment. These results confirm the results of previous studies (e.g. Drory, 1993; Maslyn and Fedor, 1998; Nye and Witt, 1993; Witt, 1998). However other researchers found positive relationships (e.g. Cropanzano et al., 1997, study 1), and some studies did not find significant relationships between the two variables (e.g. Cropanzano et al., 1997, study 2; Randall et al., 1999).

Results from past research has shown mixed results regarding the relationship between organizational politics and turnover intentions. Larwood et al., (1998) found negative relationships, other studies such as Harrel-Cook et al., (1999); Hochwarter, Perrewe et al., study 1; Randall et al., (1999); Chang et al., (2009) found no relationships, while the majority of the studies found positive relationships between them (e.g., Cropanzano et al., 1997, both studies; Kacmar et al., 1999; Maslyn and Fedor, 1998; Randall et al., 1999; Vigoda, 2000). The present study found a positive relationship between the two variables; thus, supporting the original organisational politics model of Ferris et al., (1989).
The study also extends the results of previous research (e.g. Judge and Bretz, 1992) that found negative relationships between organisational politics and career success. Pfeffer (1989) has argued that the political perspective allows more accurate description of how career success is determined in many organisations. However in reviewing the literature, Ferris and Judge, (1999) noted that none of the published work on politics and career success contained actual empirical data regarding the effect of political influence behaviour on career success and called for more research linking influence behaviour to career success. In congruence with Ferris and judge, 1991, some researchers such as Kipnis and Schmidt, (1988) and Hwa, Ansari and Jantan (2005) found that rational tactics (as a form of organisational politics) positively predicted salary progression, career satisfaction and promotability. Similarly, Hochwarter et al, (2006) found a positive relationship between these variables, while Randall et al., (1999) found no significant relationship.

Comparing between the impact of LMX and SPCD on employees’ perceptions and work outcomes, the results showed that LMX had less impact on employees' perceptions of justice and politics as well as the resulting work outcomes than SPCD. This indicates that employees rate their career concerns higher than their relationship with their supervisor, in spite of the Arab collectivistic culture that puts more emphasize on connections, networking and relationships. This might indicate a cultural change from a highly collectivistic towards a more individualistic culture.
The analysis also covered demographic variables as predictors including six demographic variables comprising age, gender, nationality, education, work experience and organisational tenure. These variables were tested in previous studies and were found to have different levels of relationships with organisational variables. The data analysis revealed a variance in their impact on the other variables in the study. For example, age had a higher correlation with LMX than SPCD suggesting that the quality of LMX is higher for older employees than their younger counterparts. However LMX had a negative correlation with nationality, indicating that the relationship between the two individuals is not affected by their nationality or cultural backgrounds.

Another important finding was related to the very high correlation between SPCD and education, which might indicate that more educated employees perceive a high level of SPCD and are more involved in the corporate efforts related to it. Probably because they are involved in those programs and benefit from them more than their less educated colleagues. This finding takes us back to the importance of the organisation's contribution in the development of their employees and its impact on how they view the corporate human resources practices.

Inverse relationship was found in previous literature between organisational commitment and the level of education. However, the results are not consistent (Luthans et al., 1987; Mowday et al., 1982). The higher level of education is correlated with lower levels of organizational commitment (Luthans et al., 1987;
Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982). The negative relationship may have resulted from the possibility that highly qualified employees have higher expectations that the organisation may not be able to fulfill. However the level of education does not seem to be consistently related to the level of OC (Meyer and Allen, 1997). More educated individuals may also be more committed to other facets of their life such as their career, profession or family. For example, Billingsley and Cross (1992) failed to find support for a relationship between education and commitment.

Managers/leaders play major roles in the decisions related to the employees' multiple career transitions across the organisational boundaries (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Greenhaus, 2003; Hall, 1996a) and the allocation of important outcomes such as rewards, promotions, training and career development opportunities. Within the framework of the exchange relationship, employees in high LMX quality receive greater growth opportunities, attention, nurturing and support than their low quality LMX counterparts (Graen and Scandura, 1987). Scaduto, Lindsay and Chiaburu (2008) found a positive correlation between LMX and training effectiveness. Bezuijen, Dam, Berg and Thierry (2010) found a positive impact of LMX on the employees’ engagement in learning activities. Also, Hung et al., (2004) found a direct impact of the employees’ perceptions about training and development, and the quality of LMX. Chen, Lamb and Zhong, (2007) found that in-group followers had higher performance ratings, which will impact their status within the organisational SPCD programs.
Furthermore, the results of the study support the cultural perspective. Middle Eastern societies were described as high in in-group collectivism (House et al., 1999), middle in institutional collectivism (Kabasakal and Bodur, 2002) and high in power distance (Hofstede, 2005; House et al., 1999). In such cultures, the decisions of promotions and career development are taken by the management of the organisation (House et al., 1999), which gives high importance of the quality of the individual’s relationship with the supervisor for his/her career growth opportunities. The decisions of the allocation of successors and the individuals' career development are most of the time based on social connections rather than qualifications or skills. In a relatively similar cultural context, Al-Gahtani, Hubona, and Wang (2007) stated that Saudi Arabia was described as a collectivist society that values interpersonal and social relationships where relationships play a major role in the individual's career advancement and progression (Hofstede, 2005). The preferential treatment is a typical social exchange and consistent with the LMX theory, which emphasizes that insiders with a high quality exchange relationship obtain more official and non-official rewards (Dienesch and Liden, 1986). Breland et al., (2007) found that individuals in low quality LMX experienced higher perceptions of subjective career success when they possess high levels of political skills.

2. The relationship between organisational justice and work outcomes:
When employees perceive unfairness, they may reciprocate by a host of outcomes (Colquitt, Wesson, Porter and Ng, 2001). Previous research found both distributive justice (DJ) and procedural justice (PJ) to be important predictors of workplace attitudes (Martin and Bennett, 1996; McFarlin and Sweeny, 1992). The study strongly supports earlier research (e.g., Hassan, 2002; Lawler, 1977; Martin and Bennet, 1996) indicating a positive contribution of DJ and PJ in job satisfaction (JS), organisational commitment (OC), and career success (CS) and a negative impact on turnover intentions (TOI).

In an Arab context, Ibrahim and Perez (2014) and Al-Zu’bi (2010) found significant positive relationships between both forms of organisational justice and JS which supports the results of this study. However, many studies found DJ to predict JS more strongly than PJ. For example, Cohen-Charash et al., (2001) Meta-analysis revealed that JS was related to DJ more than PJ. Ohana and Meyer (2010) found no relation between DJ and JS. Lambert et al., (2007) found a significant impact of PJ on JS. Also Tang and Sarsfield-Badwin (1996) found a relationship between PJ and different facets of JS. These results are consistent with the results of the meta-analysis by Colquitt et al., (2001), Cohen-Charash et al., (2001), and Aryee et al., (2002).

If employees perceive that justice is present in their workplace, they tend to be more committed. Comparing between the two forms of justice, this study showed that DJ is a stronger predictor of OC than PJ. This finding is consistent with other studies (e.g. Aryee et al., 2002; Lowe and Vodanovich, 1995;
Greenberg, 1994) which revealed a higher correlation DJ with OC than PJ. Lind and Tyler (1988) concluded that PJ may not be important to all individuals. However, some studies showed that PJ explains the major share of the variance in OC than DJ (e.g. Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Lambert et al., 2007; Konovsky, Folger and Cropanzano, 1987; 1991; Masterson et al., 2000). Other studies (e.g., Ibrahim and Perez, 2014) did not find significant direct effects of organisational justice on OC. Also Ohana and Meyer (2010) found that DJ was not linked to OC.

The present study found a significant negative relationship between organisational justice and TOI. The result is in line with the findings of two meta-analysis studies by Coloquitt et al., (2001) and Cohen-Charash et al., (2001).

6.3. Research Contributions:

The study makes several important contributions to the leadership and management research within the Arab context and specifically in the Arabian Gulf region. First, it investigates the quality of LMX and the organisational succession planning and career development (SPCD) as predictors of organisational justice and politics, and work outcomes. The quality of LMX represents the leadership model adopted in the organisation, while the SPCD represents the organisational career management practices. The study is unique in integrating both perspectives which makes it possible to make comparisons between their effects in a relationship-oriented society such as Bahrain.
Second, the study extends the results reached by international researchers and contributes into the empirical research taking place in the Arabian Gulf region through considering the political perspective as an important player in the human resources management research. Through this perspective, the study contributes to the organisational behavior theory by extending knowledge on the harmful consequences of organisational politics on employees’ attitudes and behaviours.

Third, in this study procedural justice was found to be a strong predictor of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, career success and turnover intentions. The study responds to the need for further studies to determine if the leader’s differential treatment affects perceptions of fairness and organisational outcomes (Cobb and Frey, 1991; Forret and Turban, 1994).

Fourth, the study contributes to the validation of the research instruments in an Arab context. The instruments used in the study were created and tested mainly in Western countries that have different cultural characteristics than Arab culture. Recently, they were also tested in some Arab countries. However, more empirical research is still needed to identify the impact of culture on those scales and the correlations among them.

Fifth, the four outcomes were found to be affected by the predictors and the resulting perceptions at different levels. For example, turnover intention was examined as an outcome variable by several researchers such as Ferries et al., (1989). However it was rarely examined as an outcome of the quality of LMX and the organisational career management practices. This study contributes to the
management research by exploring those relationships. Turnover intentions can be influenced by the quality of the employee's relationship with his/her supervisor which could be related to the impact of the Arab collectivistic culture, where the in-group membership matters to the individual.

Sixth, both organisational justice and politics were found to have different degrees of mediation effects on the relationships between the quality of LMX and SPCD and work outcomes.

6.4. Managerial implications:

The results of the study offer several implications for organisations and practicing managers. A primary finding is related to the importance of the quality of the relationships between managers and their subordinates. Employees are more likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction, career success, and organisational commitment and lower levels of turnover intentions when they enjoy high quality relationships with their managers. Based on that, managers need to be attentive to their relationship with their subordinates and take a proactive role in maintaining good relationships with them. The Arab culture is described as high context (Hall, 1976) and collectivistic (Hofsted, 1980) in which relationships play a major role in the individuals’ work experience.

Second, the results of the study provide a strong justification for managers and organisations to identify the individuals who take political views and actions in their organisations. They need to identify superfluous influence attempts and
avoid bias in the decisions related to the organizations’ succession planning and career development. The strong relationship between the quality of LMX and perceptions of organisational politics indicates that organisations need to take proactive measures to reduce the negative effects of organisational politics.

Third, organisational justice is a basic requirement for the effective functioning of every organisation. Thus, the results of the study might help managers to maintain the positive effects and reduce the negative effects of organisational justice. In highly power distance organisations, managers are responsible for ensuring that the employees take positive views about fairness in their organisations.

Fourth, the results of the study indicated a high correlation between the organisational succession planning and career development, and work outcomes. Organisations must strive to increase organisational commitment, job satisfaction and career success among their employees, and reduce their turnover intentions. To achieve that, they need to continue their traditional role of putting in place organisational career management strategies that consider the organizations’ needs as well as the individuals’ career aspirations.

6.5. Limitations of the study:

The study has certain limitations that need to be noted. The first limitation is the potential for common method variance (CMV). The primary method of data collection was self-reported questionnaires. Work behaviours and attitudes subject
to self-rating are often over inflated and have low correlations with actual behaviours (Dunning, Health and Suls, 2004; Xie, Roy and Chen, 2006). Apart from that, research based on questionnaires depends on the voluntary cooperation of the participants, which might impact the response rate and eventually the generalisability of the results.

Second, the questionnaires were distributed through supervisors and some of them were returned through supervisors, as well. Considering that this study evaluates the quality of LMX and organisational politics, this might have affected the responses and gave unrealistic results. Providing an alternative venue for data distribution and collection would improve the response rate.

The third limitation is related to culture. All the instruments used in this study were developed in Western countries; it is possible that these instruments include or exclude variables that are culture specific. A multicultural database could provide more reliable information about the differences in the quality of LMX between cultures, especially in relation to the individualistic-collectivist and power distance features.

The fourth limitation is related to the location of the study. It was conducted in one company only. Testing the correlation between the variables in different industries, public and private sectors and a variety of work environments will have a great contribution to the organisational research. Apart from that, as the study is limited to the employees working in one organisation only. Their views might not reflect the views of the employees in other organisations. Also
comparing the differences between domestic, regional and international settings will be an interesting topic to be studied. More theoretical analysis and empirical studies are needed to examine the nature of the relevant dimensions.

The fifth limitation is related to the analysis of the study that was performed based on the individual as a unit of analysis. Another way to analyse the data is to consider the company as a unit of analysis among several units. It would be interesting to compare between different organisations and test how different or similar the results would be.

The sixth limitation is related to the research design. The current study is based on the quantitative data collection which does not provide indications for a longitudinal analysis to find out if the results will be different at different times and whether the same results would be found if the study is conducted after some time. Thus, it is important to pursue longitudinal studies to confirm the findings of this research. Such studies will provide empirical basis to draw causal inferences and enable researchers to examine actual turnover and retirement decisions.

The seventh limitation is related to the possible generalisability of the results. The subjects of this study were the employees working in one company. Based on that, the sample cannot be considered as a representative of the overall occupational population. A larger proportion of the final sample could include different professional and managerial occupations. Apart from that, the vast majority of the respondents were male. Consequently caution should be taken in generalising the results to a larger population of female representation. It is
unclear whether the results of the current study could be the same if the female population was larger. Also, the average respondents' age was 42.2 which also makes it difficult to generalise the results for different age groups if the average is less or higher. Other researchers have noted that job attitudes are likely to be more stable among older workers than younger workers (Gerhart, 1987), which cannot be confirmed in this study because of the fairly high age among the respondents.

Despite those limitations, this study contributes to the organisational research in an Arab context by showing that culture could be a relevant contextual variable in determining the importance of justice and political perceptions to the relationship between leaders and their subordinates.

6.6. Further research:

In view of the previous limitations, there are several directions for future research. First, future research investigating the potential predictors and outcomes of employees' perceptions about justice and politics at the individual and organisational level in another Arab country could contribute much needed knowledge regarding their effects on the organisations and employees' work outcomes.

Second, future research needs to be based on data gathered from multiple sources and extend the focus to longitudinal effects. Future longitudinal studies will provide some resolution to the self report data collection problems by (a) providing an empirical basis to draw causal inferences and by (b) enabling
researchers to examine actual turnover and early retirement decisions, which will mitigate some of the problems associated with the common rating source.

Third, in order to increase the generalizability of the results, more data collection from various locations is recommended with more varied demographic and occupational backgrounds.

Fourth, in the current study, the selection of outcomes was based on their previously substantiated relationships with perceptions of politics (Kacmar & Baron, 1999) and organisational justice. Including other work outcomes such as extra-role and citizenship behaviours (Lynch et al., 1999), other forms of withdrawal behaviours (Eisenberger et al., 2001) and supervisor rated performance will represent logical extensions of the results reported in this study.

Fifth, in the present study, perceptions of organisational justice and politics were conceptualized as an intermediate linkage between the quality of LMX and the corporate SPCD and work outcomes. Having the perceptions as predictors will definitely enrich the research in this area.

Sixth, the current study represents the first attempt to examine the corporate succession planning and career development (SPCD) as a factor capable of predicting a set of perceptions and work outcomes through which several managerial implications could take place. Future research can examine and revalidate the SPCD scale used and also add the research needed to complete the model introduced in this study. Apart from that, this study took one scale to measure the organisational succession planning and career development, a future
study that separates the two variables and compare between them would be very interesting.

Seventh, future research could also investigate the role of demographic diversity in the relationship between the study variables. For example, leaders may be inclined to develop high quality LMX relationships only with employees who possess certain demographic characteristics. Thus, if the work team was demographically diverse, the LMX relationships would also be diverse indicating high LMX variability within the work unit. Combining the results of this research with previous research indicating a relationship between demographic diversity and team conflict (e.g., Jehn et al., 1999; Pelled, Eisenhardt and Xin, 1999) would add another dimension to the research in this area.

Eighth, this study clearly shows that the effects of political perceptions extend beyond those provided in the Ferris et al., (1989) model to other important organisational variables. The conceptual integration of the perception of organisational politics with other areas of organisational research could enhance our understanding of the impact of organisational politics on other attitudinal and behavioural variables.
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Appendix
Dear participant,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This questionnaire is part of a PhD study in Human Resources Management and it has no relationship with your performance or assessment at work. I assure you that your answers will remain strictly confidential. The information will be analyzed and reported as a group data without any reference to the identity of the respondents.

Please read carefully the directions given at the beginning of each question and answer as frankly and accurately as possible. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers; I am interested in your personal views and opinions about the statements provided.

Once you completed your answers, please put the questionnaire back in the envelope, seal it and send it to me.

Best regards

Khatoon Al Ansari
Tel: 39682233
Section 1: (Personal Information):

A: General Information:

1. Gender (tick the box): Male: ☐ Female: ☐
2. Age: ______________
3. Highest level of education: (tick one only):
   - ☐ Less than high school/Towjeeheya
   - ☐ High school/Towjeeheya
   - ☐ Diploma
   - ☐ Bachelor Degree
   - ☐ Masters Degree
   - ☐ PhD
4. Nationality (tick one box): Bahraini: ☐ Non-Bahraini ☐
5. Total number of years of work experience in general: ______________

B: Work Related information:

6. Job title (you may tick more than one)
   - ☐ Manager
   - ☐ Superintendent
   - ☐ Supervisor
   - ☐ Engineer
   - ☐ Technician
   - ☐ Accountant
   - ☐ IT specialist
   - ☐ Instructor
   - ☐ Salesperson/representative
   - ☐ Administrative assistant
   - ☐ Secretary
   - ☐ Others (Please specify)……………………
7. Total number of years in this company:______________________________
8. Number of years in current position: ______________________________
9. If the CEO is level 1, what is the level of your position? (Please tick one box)

2 3 4 5 6 7 8

10. What was the level of your first post in this company? (Please tick one box)

2 3 4 5 6 7 8

11. If develop yourself according to your plans within company, what do you think will be the final level which you will reach? (Please tick one box)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I know that salary information is very sensitive, but for this confidential study, please indicate the range of your monthly salary in Bahraini Dinars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500-1000</th>
<th>1001-1500</th>
<th>Above 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section 2: Immediate boss**

Please **circle** one number per statement using the scale (1 – 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I usually know how satisfied my boss is with what I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss understands my job problems and needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss recognizes my potential.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss would use his/her power to help me solve problems in my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss would bail me out at his/her expense.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would defend and justify my supervisor's decision if he/she were not present to do so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an effective working relationship with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3: Workplace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my work schedule is fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my level of pay is fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my workload to be quite fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the rewards I receive here are quite fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my job responsibilities are fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job decisions are made by my boss in an unbiased manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My boss makes sure that all employees' concerns are heard before job decisions are made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My boss clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the manager.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss treats me with kindness and consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss treats me with respect and dignity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss is sensitive to my personal needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss deals with me in a truthful manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>When decisions are made about my job, my boss shows concern for my rights as an employee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Concerning decisions about my job, my boss discusses the implications of the decisions with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>My boss offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>When making decisions about my job, my boss offers explanations that make sense to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>My boss explains very clearly any decision made about my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Favoritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>There is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with superiors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well established ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>There has always been an influential group in this department that no one ever crosses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>People here usually don’t speak up for fear of retaliation by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Rewards come only to those who work hard in this organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Promotions in this department generally go to the top performers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>People in this organisation attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I have seen changes made in policies here that only serve the purposes of a few individuals, not the work unit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>There is a group of people in my department who always get things their way because no one wants to challenge them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The management strives to provide me with verified job assignments and career development opportunities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I am confident that I have the skills necessary to be promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Managers encourage me to participate in formal internal or external programs to further expand my leadership knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>My promotion from one grade to the next has been timely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The managers' assessments of my job performance and competencies are fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I have made maximum use of job and educational opportunities by consistently participating in conferences and training workshops.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I believe that all the promotions in this company are based on good assessments of individual's leadership, planning and decision making abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The succession program in this organisation includes all the employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the mentoring program in this company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I know everything about the succession planning program in the company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I am expecting to get a promotion within the next few years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this company be successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>I talk up this company as a great company to work for.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>I find that my values and the company's values are very similar.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>This company really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I am extremely glad that I chose this company to work for over others I considered at the time I joined.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organisation's policies on important matters relating to its employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I really care about the fate of this company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I would like to leave my current employer within the next year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I frequently think of quitting my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I have searched for a job with another company during the past year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>If another employer offered me a similar job I would leave.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>I enjoy my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of questionnaire

Thank you for your time and support