**Section 1**

Q1.1

1. A small sample size: A study with a small sample size may lack adequate power to detect meaningful differences between groups, in this case, the two sites.

2. Lack of randomization: The subjects of the study were not selected randomly. The subjects may be different in some way that could affect the results.

Q1.2

A multiple linear regression analysis was carried out to examine the relationship between site, tenure and intention to quit. The results indicated that site (β =.362, *p*=.041) was a significant predictor of a worker’s intention to quit, while tenure was not a significant predictor ((β =. -018, *p*=.105). The regression equation for prediction intention to quit was:

*QUIT = 3.977 – 0.18\*TENURE + .362\* SITE*

The overall model was significant, *F* (2, 97) = 5.19, *p* = .007, and accounted for 9.7% (R2= .097) of the variance in worker’s intention to quit. The coefficient for SITE in the regression equation indicates that, controlling for tenure, workers in the new site have a 0.362 higher intention to quit score than those in the old site on average.

Q1.3

A multiple linear regression analysis was performed to investigate the relationship between site, tenure and perceived colleague support. The results indicated that site (β =-.011, *p*=.265) and tenure (β =-.134, *p*=.379) were not significant predictors of perceived colleague support. The overall model was also not significant, *F* (2, 97) = 1.515, *p* = .225.

Another multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between site, tenure and perceived company support for workers. The results showed that that site (β =-404, *p*=.028) had a significant effect on perceived company support for workers, but tenure did not (β =-.006, *p*=.593). The equation for predicting perceived company support for workers was:

*CPSUPP = 2.872 – 0.006\*TENURE - .404\* SITE*

The overall model was significant, *F* (2, 97) = 3.416, *p* = .037 and explained 6.6% (*R2* = .066) of variation in perceived company support for workers. Controlling for tenure, workers in the new site had a 0.404 lower perceived company support for workers than those in the old site.

Q1.4

The results of the multiple regression analysis show that perceived company support for workers (β =-.508, *p*<.001) and perceived colleague support (β =-.202, *p*<.048) were significant predictors of a worker’s intention to quit while controlling for tenure. On the other hand, site (β =.130, *p*=.366) was not a significant predictor. The overall model was significant, *F* (4, 95) = 18.468, *p* < .001, and accounted for 43.7% of variation (*R2* = .37) in a worker’s intention to quit.

In order to test the intermediary role of perceived company support for workers and perceived colleague support in the relationship between site and a worker’s intention to quit, the Bootstrap method was used to sample 1000 times and build a 95% unbiased correction confidence interval. The results demonstrated the total direct effect of site on intention to quit was significant (β =.362, *p*=.041) but the direct effect of site on intention to quit was not significant (β =.13, *p*=.366). The indirect effect of site on intention to quit through perceived company support for workers was statistically significant, with a bootstrapped confidence interval that did not include zero (β =.206, 95% CI= .140 – 2.476). The indirect effect of site on intention to quit through perceived colleague support was not significant, with a bootstrapped confidence interval that included zero, (β =.027, 95% CI= -.019 – 129).
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Q1.5

The moderating role of perceived colleague support in the relationship between perceived work demands and intention to quit while controlling for a worker’s tenure was examined using two models. The model with perceived colleague support and work demands as predictors and tenure as the control variable explained 42.1% (*R2*=.421) of variation in the intention to quit. The value of *R2* change when the interaction variable was added was .460 and that change was significant, *F* (1, 95) = 6.86, *p* = .010. The significant interaction implies that perceived colleague support did indeed moderate the effects of work demands on intention to quit while controlling for a worker’s tenure.
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Centering of WKSUPP could have aided interpretation of the results before carrying out this particular analysis.

Q1.6

The perceived colleague support is based on three levels: low (one-standard deviation below the mean), medium (mean) and high (one-standard deviation above the mean).

The model of interest is

*QUIT = 3.652 -.005\*TENURE + 1.105\*WKDEM + 0.345\*WKSUPP -.298\*WKDxSUPP*

We substitute WKSUPP with the appropriate value associated with a particular level of colleague support.

At low level of colleague support:

*QUIT=3.652 – 0.005 \* TENURE + 1.105\*WKDEM + 0.345 (1.79) – (2.98 \*1.79) \* WKDEM*

*QUIT=4.27 – 0.005\*TENURE – 4.229\*WKDEM*

At medium level of colleague support:

*QUIT=3.652 – 0.005 \* TENURE + 1.105\*WKDEM + 0.345 (2.79) – (2.98 \*2.79) \*WKDEM*

*QUIT=4.615-0.005\*TENURE -7.209\*WKDEM*

At high level of colleague support:

*QUIT=3.652 – 0.005 \* TENURE + 1.105\*WKDEM + 0.345 (3.79) – (2.98 \*3.79) \*WKDEM*

*QUIT=4.96 – 0.005\*TENURE -10.189\*WKDEM*

Q1.7

The differential impact of perceived colleague support can be visualized by plotting lines using the following equations:

Low: *QUIT=4.27 – 0.005\*TENURE – 4.229\*WKDEM*

Medium: *QUIT=4.615-0.005\*TENURE -7.209\*WKDEM*

High: *QUIT=4.96 – 0.005\*TENURE -10.189\*WKDEM*

**Section 2**

Q2.1

A principal component analysis was conducted on 30 items to identify underlying dimensions in the data. An initial analysis was performed to obtain eigenvalues for each component in the data. Five components had eigenvalues over Kasier’s criterion of 1 and in combination accounted for 59.1% of variance in the data. Factor 1 explained a majority of the variance (30.9%) in the items while Factor 5 accounted for the least (5.3%).

The extracted factors were subjected to Varimax rotation method, which generated the loadings of each item on the factors. Factor 1 was characterized by high loadings (>0.4) on items related to innovation and flexibility. These items include Q1, Q5, Q11, Q12, Q27 and Q27. The second factor was marked by high loadings on items related to employee autonomy. These items include Q2, Q10, Q17, Q18, Q24 and Q25. The third factor was composed of high loadings on items related to employee skills and training. The specific items include Q13, Q15, Q22, Q26 and Q28. Factor 4 was defined by items pertaining to resources. The items include Q3, Q7, Q14, Q20, Q21 and Q30. The fifth factor was characterized by high loadings on items related to communication. The items include Q8, Q9, Q16, Q19 and Q23.

Q 2.2

There are a number of potential adjustments that can be made. One of the adjustments relates to the extraction method. There are several methods for extracting factors including principal component analysis, common factor analysis and maximum likelihood factor analysis. There are pros and cons to each of these methods, and the appropriate technique depends on the research question and nature of the data. Secondly, the appropriate number of factors to be extracted is another adjustment that can be made. The researcher may decide to specify the exact number of factors to be extracted a priori, or may elect to determine the number using eigenvalues or scree plot. The third potential adjustment relates to the rotation method used following the extraction of factors. There are several rotation methods available including varimax, Quartimax and oblimin.

Q2.3

* Discriminant validity: Discriminant validity is confirmed when there is zero or little correlation between one factor and another.
* Reliability to examine the degree to which items on a factor are internally consistent. The Cronbach alpha test would be used to investigate the reliability of the items.