CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will further elaborate the findings of the study which the data were collected through a self-administrated questionnaire as discussed in the Chapter 3. Generally, the chapter was separated into two distinct parts : (i) Descriptive analysis which demonstrating the key characteristic of the respondents, and (ii) Statistical techniques (Correlation and Multiple regression analysis) to explore the relationship(s) among the variable(s) as well as to test on the hypothesis(s) being proposed in this study. This chapter will start with explaining on some of the preliminary information i.e. the response rate of the respondents, followed by the descriptive analysis on the key demographic characteristics and profile of the respondents. Later, the discussion will provide a concrete and intensive review on the scale reliability and normality assessment. The final section of the chapter will mainly focus on the discussion of the correlation analysis to explore the relationship between the variable(s) as well as to present the analytical findings for all the hypothesis being proposed.

4.2 RESPONSE RATE

A total of 250 set of hardcopy questionnaires were distributed by hand to the interested population and targeted respondents and 200 sets of questionnaires

were then collected back; accounted for a response rate of 80%. All the questionnaire data were being screened, checked and cleaned. With this, a total of 189 sets of questionnaire was defined as useable, however, the remaining 11 set was declared and classified as unusable, mainly, due to reasons of incomplete and invalid responses.

4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Descriptive analysis is aimed to provide an overview of the population where the data was collected. With all these secondary data, a descriptive analysis was conducted through SPSS Version 16. The output for the respondents' key demographic characteristic such as gender, age, ethnic, marital status, education background, monthly income etc was presented at Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents (N=198)

Item	Characteristic	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender	Female	126	66.7
	Male	63	33.3
Age	Age 18 - 25	59	31.2
	Age 26 - 35	97	51.3
	Age 36 - 45	32	16.9
	Age 46 - 55	1	0.5
Ethnic	Malay	94	49.7
	Chinese	76	40.2
	India	13	6.9
	Others	6	3.2
Marital Status	Single	115	60.8
	Married	73	38.6
	Divorced/Separated	1	0.5

(Table 4.1 continued)

Number of dependent child	None	116	61.4
	1-2	60	31.7
	3 - 4	11	5.8
	Above 4	2	1.1
Education background	Primary Education	0	0
	Secondary Education	1	0.5
	Certificate or Diploma	21	11.1
	First Degree	147	77.8
	Postgraduate Degree	19	10.1
	Professional Qualification	1	0.5
Monthly Income	RM2000	26	13.8
	RM2001 - RM4000	122	64.6
	RM4001 - RM6000	29	15.3
	RM6001 - RM8000	6	3.2
	RM8001 - RM10,000	2	1.1
	Above RM10,000	4	2.1

Based on the data, out of the total of 189 sample size (N = 189), female respondents has represented the majority, accounted for 66.70% and the balance 33.30% were male respondents.

In terms of the distribution of the respondents' ethnic, majority of them come from Malay and Chinese population; where 49.70% are Malay and 40.20% are Chinese. Where else, the balance of 6.90% are Indian with the remaining 3.20% are from others minority group. The distribution of the sample size is relatively reflected a general Malaysian population (unless slightly lower for Indian and

minority groups) and with this we hope it may indirectly contributed towards a more generalize perspective from a divergent social background especially in terms of their perceived value of FWA benefits being provided at their workplace.

With regards to the respondent's age, 31.20% were ranged between 18 – 25, 51.30% at age 26 – 35, whereas, 16.90 % from the age group of 36 – 45 with only 1 % from age group of 46 - 55. With this, we may conclude that the majority of the respondents are considered come from a very young age group.

The respondents' age groups above has also reasonably reflected through their marital status as shown from the data. In terms of marital status, majority of them (60.80%) are still single and with only 38.60% are married. In fact, this figure were also consistently reflected to the respondents' life cycle by which 61.40% of them are yet to commit on any burden of taking care for any dependent child / family members required under special care (eg : elders parents etc). Under the same category of analysis, out of the total 189 respondents, 37.10% of them having 1 – 2 dependent child or sibling members under care, 5.8% having 2 – 4 and remaining 1.1% have above 4 dependent child / family members under care.

Nearly majority of the respondents are well educated, among those, 77.80% of them has obtained their first degree, 10.10% with postgraduate degree, followed by 11.10% with certificate and diploma as their education level. Hence, the majority respondents may likely believed to represent within the knowledge labor

group in the Malaysia labor force market.

For the monthly income level, 64.60% of respondents earned within the range of RM2001 - RM4000 per month, followed by 15.30% for RM4001 - RM6000, 13.80% at RM2000, 3.20% at RM6001 - RM8000, 2.10% earned above RM10,000, and lastly 1.10% respondents earned within RM8001 - RM10,000 per month.

In summary, majority of the respondents come from a younger and knowledge labor group (generally within the generation of Gen Y and Millennial and nearly a quarter portion of respondents come from Gen X, based on the age calculation). The data are reasonably consistent with the sample flame which the majority of respondents are currently employed with the business entities such as : IT, Telecommunication and networking, and minority from servicing and academic industries.

4.4 RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT

The most common used of measuring the internal consistency is Cronbach's coefficient alpha which assessed the degree to which the construct items that make up the scale are all measuring the same underlying attribute. Suggested by Nunnally (1978) & DeVellis (2003), an ideally minimum level of .70 Cronbach alpha values are acceptable, depend on the number of items in the scale. With a short items scale, the Cronbach alpha values can be quite sensitive and may

reported as low as .05; which, in this case reporting on the mean inter-item correlation for the items are more appropriate way to measure on the scale reliability. With this, Briggs and Cheek (1986) recommended that an optimal range for the inter-item correlation of .02 to .04 is considered acceptable.

The details results of the reliability assessment for the variables were shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Cronbach's Alpha Scores of the Variables

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Item	Cronbach's Alpha (Previous Study)
Perceived Organization Support	**0.892**	**10**	0.89 (Haar & Spell, 2004)
Affective Commitment	**0.855**	**8**	0.87 (Allen & Meyer, 1990)
Continue Commitment	**0.842**	**8**	0.75 (Allen & Meyer, 1990)
Normative Commitment	**0.863**	**8**	0.79 (Allen & Meyer, 1990)
Total Organizational Commitment (Affective, Continue, & Normative)	**0.741**	**24**	-
Turnover Intention	**0.875**	**3**	0.80 (McNall et al, 2010)
Perceived Value of Benefits (FWA)	**0.898**	**4**	-
Benefit Used (FWA)		**1**	-

Generally, the alpha values for all the constructs are more or less the same with those values indicate in the previous studies as per summarized in the Table 4.2 above. For example, the Perceived Organizational Support (POS) scale deployed and modified from Eisenberger et al (1986) scale, Haar & Spell (2004) reported a reliability of $\alpha = .89$ for the ten-item shortened scale used in their study. Whereas, Muse et al (2008) reported $\alpha = 0.93$ for the eight-item shortened version of the POS developed by Eisenberger et al (1986). In the current study,

the scale reliability for Perceived Organizational Support (POS) reported a Cronbach alpha values α = .892. For other variable(s), the Cronbach alpha values are reported as following: Affective Commitment (0.855), Continue Commitment (0.842), Normative Commitment (0.863), Total Organizational Commitment (0.741), Perceived Turnover Intention (0.875), and Perceived value of FWA benefits (0.898).

Reliability test is not needed for “Benefits Used” as only one item was asked to respondents. Respondent are required only to answer dichotomously if they have either “have use” or “have not use” the FWA (Flexitime and Flexplace) facilitated at their workplace as one of the work-life benefits. In addition, in lieu of accessing to the usage frequency of FWAs at the respondents’ workplace, as well as taking it as an additional reference, a single item 5-point response scale (anchored from 1 = “Never” to 5 = “Many times”) was also asked to the respondent to account for the degree of use of the benefits offered at their workplace by which this scale had been replicated from Muse et al (2008)

In this study, the reliability assessment has been performed for all the construct and the overall alpha value were ranged within 0.741 to 0.898. As mentioned earlier, per recommended by Nunnally (1978) & DeVellis (2003), an ideally minimum level of .70 Cronbach alpha values are acceptable**.** Hence, all the scale being adopted in this study has sufficiently evidenced a satisfactory internal consistency.

4.5 NORMALITY ASSESSMENT

An assessment of the normality of data is a prerequisite for many statistical tests as normal data is an underlying assumption in parametric testing. Normality can be assessed to some extent by obtaining the skewness and kurtosis values. Kurtosis is a numerical value used to give information about the dispersion or variability of data obtained from samples whether it is platykurtosed or leptokurtosed. On the other hand, Skewness is a numerical value used to give information about the distribution of data obtained from samples whether it is normal, positively skewed (skewed to the right) or negatively skewed (skewed to the left). (Lay & Khoo, 2009) The kurtosis and Skewness of normal distribution is zero, however, if the kurtosis and Skewness for data distribution is within the range of -1 to + 1, the data distribution is considered to be normal (Hair, Anderson, Thatham, & Black, 1998).

Table 4.3 Normality Assessment of the Variables

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis	Mean	Standard Deviation
Perceived Organization Support	0.072	-0.070	3.5291	4.99627
Total Organizational Commitment	-0.189	-0.371	3.3633	3.52365
Affective Commitment	-0.173	0.447	3.3492	4.08354
Continue Commitment	-0.930	-0.334	3.3671	4.45500
Normative Commitment	-0.040	-0.043	3.3737	4.47569
Turnover Intention	0.053	-0.491	2.4621	2.57319
Perceived Value of Benefits (FWA)	-0.612	0.338	4.0423	3.01995

(Table 4.3 continued)

Benefit Used (FWA)	-0.440	-0.594	1.3492	0.54485
N = 189				

Refer to the above summary, as all the reported value of skewness and kurtosis were ranged in between -1 to + 1, hence, the normality of data was evidenced obtained.

4.6 CORRELATION ANALYSIS BETWEEN VARIABLES

Pearson Correlation Analysis is usually being conducted to explore the strength of the linear relationships between two variables. The Pearson correlation coefficients (r) which are likely ranged from – 1 to 1 represent the strength of the relationship of the two variables. As recommended by Cohen (1998), r value = .10 to .29 represent a weak correlation; r = 0.30 to .49 represent a moderate correlation; and r = 0.50 to 1.0 represent a strong correlation. On the other hand the negative or positive sign in front of the r value indicate the direction of the relationship. (Pallent, J., 2007).

In this study, Pearson correlation analysis was performed to investigate the proposed relationships between Perceived value of benefits, used of benefits Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Commitment as well as between Organizational Commitment with employee Turnover Intention **(H1 – H4)** . The results of the Pearson correlation for the independent and dependent variables were exhibited in Table 4.4

Table 4.4 Correlation between Variables

Correlations									
Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.Perceived Value of Benefits	4.04	3.02							
2. Used of Benefits	1.00	0.20	.178*						
3.Perceived Organizational Support (POS)	3.53	5.00	.283**	0.018					
4.Affective Commitment (AC)	3.35	4.08	.239**	0.047	.574**				
5.Continue Commitment (CC)	3.37	4.46	.181*	.204**	.351**	.483**			
6.Normative Commitment (NC)	3.37	4.48	0.100	.176*	.528**	.552**	.438**		
7.Total Organizational Commitment (TOC)	3.36	3.52	.211**	.179*	.593**	.823**	.793**	.821**	
8.Turnover Intention (TI)	2.46	2.57	0.011	0.062	-.372**	-.381**	-.261**	-.436**	-.441**

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

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

N = 189

Based on the data reported on the Table 4.4, the elaboration for each of the variable(s) relationship and hypothesis tested were explained at the below section.

H1 : Used of benefits (UsedFWA) will have a direct positive relationship with the employee's Organizational Commitment (OC)

The Benefits Used of FWA (Flexitime & Flexplace) had reported a significant relationship with the total organizational commitment ($r = 0.179$, $p < 0.05$). The positive Pearson correlation value of 0.179 had displayed a positive correlation between the used of benefits with the employee overall organizational commitment. Although, the correlation strength is quite weak with $r = 0.179$ (as r value = .10 to .29 represent a weak correlation recommended by Cohen (1998)), however**, the result was generally supported the H1.**

To further access into the 3 theme of commitment based on thee-component model of organizational commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1990), it was quite surprisingly to find that there are a direct positive relationship between the used of benefits with continue commitment ($r = .204$, $p < 0.01$) and normative commitment ($r = .176$ $p < 0.05$) but not on the Affective Commitment. ($r = 0.047$)

We try to explain this phenomenon from a culture perspective. In an Asian culture, we believed employees are easier to have a stronger sense of reciprocity towards the well treatment they had received from their employer especially in term of a sentiment called “obligation” (normative commitment). We believed it is very much influence by the norm and value system that inherent in the Asian employees. This kind of “internal obligation” to repay the organizational due to the well treatment they received directly from their employer will possible come from the antecedents of their early upbringing (childhood education) and culture-driven socialization (Yao & Wang, 2006).

Whereas, to explain on the direct relationship of “Benefits used” towards the “continue commitment”, it is fairly laid on a mathematically “costs and benefits” premise. As mentioned, “continue commitment” is refers to an employee’s perception that there are costs associated with leaving the organization. Hence, the employee’s that had used and directly experiencing the advantages that they gained from the “benefits” (such as “flexhours” and “flexplace” at their workplace) may not be able to enjoy a similar benefits (eg : flexibility) from others workplace.

This is especially carried some weight to the FWA users employees when FWA is yet to be commonly adoptable and well established at others workplace in Malaysia. Another possible antecedents contributed to this could be also raised from the rapid change of social landscape in Malaysia that has make the "flexibility" on work schedule become increasingly important to the employees in achieving a balance work-life objective. Therefore, the employees may choose to continue their "continue commitment" with the organizational as they have no others better choice at the time being.

Further explanation of why benefits used will predict to have a direct positive relationship with organizational commitment instead of through POS. Consistent with the cited by the previous researchers, the "Benefit Used" and "Perceived Value of Benefits" were found to have differential paths to employee's organizational commitment. (Muse et al, 2008). The "Benefits used" is seems to have a direct relationship with employee organizational commitment instead of mediating through the POS as compared to Perceived value of benefits. Based on the comments from Muse et al (2008) in explaining on above panorama, "Benefits used" were having a direct relationship with the employee organizational commitment (Muse are measured on affective commitment) and this relationship was not mediated with POS. The reason behind was likely due to employees are receiving something in tangible resulting from their use of benefits, therefore, they are intend to directly reciprocate and granting their commitment to the organization. However, on the other hand, "Perceived value

of benefits" is something that are intangible and therefore it required a border judgments of POS to transform the reciprocity relationship in order for the employees to grant their commitments to the organizational.

H2: Perceived Value of Benefits (PVOB) will positively relate to Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Total perceived value of benefits (FWA) has a positive correlation with Perceived Organizational Support whereby the $r = .283$ ($p<0.01$) show a moderate correlation within Perceived value of benefits with the POS. Although the result was only shown a moderate relationship between these two variables, we believe it can be reasonably explained. According to Weathington and Tetrick (2000), the benefit importance (the value of the benefits) will have an indirect rather than a direct relationship with the output variables (i.e. organizational commitment, etc). This was further supported by Muse et al (2008) : "..It is logical to expect benefit value to symbolically reinforce general assessments of POS… we expect these POS sentiments to translate into reciprocal employee affective commitment…. " (p176). **Hence, the H2 was supported.**

H3: Perceived Organizational Support (POS) will positively relate to the employee's Organizational Commitment (OC)

On the other hand, per expected, POS is have a strong positive relationship with the employee's overall organizational commitment (as well as for every single

theme of thee-component of organizational commitment including : affective, continue and normative commitment). POS has recorded a strong positive relationship with Total organizational Commitment of $r = .593$; $p < 0.01$, Affective commitment $r = .574$, $p<0.01$, and Normative commitment $r = .528$; $p < 0.01$ as well as moderate positive relationship with Continue Commitment $r = .351$; $p < 0.01$. **Hence, the H3 was supported.**

H4 : Organizational Commitment (OC) will have a significant inverse relationship with employee's Turnover Intention (TI)

Lastly, the employee's Perceived turnover intention (TI) recorded a moderate negative relationship with all dimension of organizational commitment. The result shown that Organizational commitment have recorded strong negatively relationship with the employee overall organizational commitment with $r = -.441$ $p<0.01$, followed by the three major theme of commitment components, namely, Normative commitment $r = -.436$ $p<0.01$; Affective commitment $r = -.381$ $p<0.01$) and Continue commitment $r = -.261$ $p<0.01$ respectively. Hence, **H4 was therefore supported.**

One important aspect to highlight from the findings was between the three theme of three-component model of commitment by Allen & Meyer (1990), Normative commitment has recorded the strongest negative relationship with the employee's perceived turnover intention ($r = -.436$) compared to the other 2 theme of commitment, namely, affective commitment $r = -.381$ and continue commitment $r = -.261$). Based on Yao & Wang (2006) findings on their study with

the sample taken from China companies had revealed that the normative commitment is having a unique contribution in predicting employees' turnover (frequency & behavior), especially grounded on a collectivistic cultural and value in Asian countries. This seems to be consistent to what has happened in our study grounded on a similar Asian culture.

4.7 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ASSESMENT

Multiple regression is among one of the widely used statistical techniques. We have used the multiple regression analysis to test the mediator **(H5)** for this study, **Hypotheses testing for Perceived Organizational Support (POS) mediate the relationship between Perceived value of benefits (PVOB) and Total Organizational Commitment (TOC)**

In this study, Perceived Organizational Support (POS) has played as a mediating variable in the relationship between the independent variable (Perceived value of benefits) and the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment). The hypothesis proposed are as below.

H5 : Perceived Organizational Support (POS) will fully mediates the relationship between employee's perceived value of benefits and organizational commitment

In order to test the mediator variable, as recommended by Baron and Kenny's

(1986), the following guidelines were applied and all the step(s) were followed :

(a) That the independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable;

(b) That the independent variables significantly influence the mediator;

(c) That the mediator significantly influences dependent variable (with the predictor accounted for); and

(d) Lastly, verification is done to check the direct effect of independent variables and dependent variable in step (a) and step (c). For complete mediation, the Beta at step (c) must be 0 or insignificant effect of independent variables on dependent variable. For partial mediation, the Beta at step (c) must be less than step (a).

(Baron and Kenny, 1986; MacKinnon, et al., 2002; G. Pierce, 2003; Grayson N. Holmbeck, 2006; David Howell, 2006)

Per recommended, there are 3 steps to satisfied on testing the mediating variable under Baron & Kenny's (1986) method. The below presented the step-to-step testing result.

Step 1 : The independent variables (Perceived value of Benefits) is significantly influence the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment)

Table 4.5
Multiple Regression Analysis: = Perceived Value of Benefits (FWA) to Organizational Commitment

Model Summaryь									
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Change Statistics**				
					R Square Change	**F Change**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig. F Change**
1	.211 ª	0.044	0.039	10.36071	0.044	8.708	1	187	**.004**
a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Perceived Value of Benefits b. Dependent Variable: Total Organizational Commitment									

ANOVAь						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	934.74	1	934.74	8.708	**.004** ª
	Residual	20073.397	187	107.344		
	Total	21008.138	188			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Perceived Value of Benefits b. Dependent Variable: Total Organizational Commitment						

Coefficients ª						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		Beta	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	68.781	4.115		16.713	**.000**
	Total Perceived Value of Benefits	0.738	0.25	0.211	2.951	**.004**

a. Dependent Variable: Total Organizational Commitment

Significant effect on dep. variable

Referring to the result shown in Table 4.5, independent variable (Total Perceived value of benefits) gave 3.90% (F = 8.708, p = 0.004 < 0.01) of the variance in Organizational Commitment which evidenced as significant predictors. The regression coefficients of the independent variable also shown that it have a significant effect (p < 0.01) on the prediction of Organization Commitment**. The step 1 has been fulfilled**.

Step 2 : The independent variable (Perceived value of Benefits) is significantly influence the mediator (Perceived Organizational Support)

Table 4.6
Multiple Regression Analysis: = Perceived Value of Benefits (FWA) to Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Model Summaryb									
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Change Statistics**				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.283 [a]	0.08	0.075	4.80434	0.08	16.321	1	187	**.000**
a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Perceived Value of Benefits									
b. Dependent Variable: Total Perceived Organizational Support									

ANOVAb						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	376.718	1	376.718	16.321	**.000** [a]
	Residual	4316.277	187	23.082		
	Total	4692.995	188			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Perceived Value of Benefits						
b. Dependent Variable: Total Perceived Organizational Support						

Coefficients [a]						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	27.712	1.908		14.522	**.000**
	Total Perceived Value of Benefits	0.469	0.116	0.283	4.04	**.000**
a. Dependent Variable: Total Perceived Organizational Support						

Significant effect on mediator

Referring to the result shown in Table 4.6, independent variable (Total Perceived value of benefits) gave 7.50 % (F = 16.321, p = 0.000 < 0.01) of the variance in Perceived Organizational Support (POS) which evidenced as significant predictors. The regression coefficients of the independent variable also shown that it have a significant effect (p < 0.01) on the prediction of Organization Commitment**. The step 2 has been fulfilled**.

Step 3 :

(a) The mediator (POS) is associated with dependent variable (OC) (with the predictor accounted for)

(b) The addition of the mediator (POS) to the full model reduces the relation between the independent variable (PVOB) and dependent variable (OC)

Table 4.7
Multiple Regression Analysis: = Perceived Value of Benefits (FWA), Perceived Organizational Support to Organizational Commitment

Model Summaryb									
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Change Statistics**				
					R Square Change	**F Change**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig. F Change**
1	.595 ª	0.354	0.347	8.54391	0.354	50.894	2	186	**.000**
a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Perceived Organizational Support, Total Perceived Value of Benefits									
b. Dependent Variable: Total Organizational Commitment									

(Table 4.7 continued)

ANOVAb						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	7430.427	2	3715.214	50.894	**.000 [a]**
	Residual	13577.71	186	72.998		
	Total	21008.138	188			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Perceived Organizational Support, Total Perceived Value of Benefits

b. Dependent Variable: Total Organizational Commitment

Coefficients [a]						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		Beta	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	34.785	4.95		7.027	**.000**
	Total Perceived Value of Benefits	0.163	0.215	0.047	0.759	**0.449**
	Total Perceived Organizational Support	1.227	0.13	0.58	9.433	**.000**

a. Dependent Variable: Total Organizational Commitment

Insignificant effect of indep. variable on dep variable

Significant effect of mediator on dep. variable

To evidence a mediator role of a variable, the Step 3(a) and 3(b) must be fulfilled. Based on the reported result showing in the Table 4.7, both perquisite conditions has been satisfied. (i) The regression coefficients of the independent variable (Perceived value of benefits) had an insignificant effect on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment); where, the Sig. 0449 (P > 0.01). . (ii) The

regression coefficients of the mediator (Perceived Organizational Support) had a significant effect on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment); where, the Sig. 000 ($P < 0.01$). Meanwhile, per explained earlier, it is confident that there is a full or complete mediation achieved. In other words, Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is fully mediating / mediated the relationship of Perceived value of Benefits (FWA) and Organizational Commitment**. Hence, the step 3 has been fulfilled and H5 was fully supported.**