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Preface

Dr. Esther van Leeuwen was the first who actually made me dwell on the concept of loyalty. After an interesting conversation with van Leeuwen about her inspiring ideas on loyalty and prior research on employer loyalty, I was immediately intrigued by the concept of loyalty.

Loyalty is something that everyone knows, or perhaps: feels. I asked my friends to define loyalty and they all described the concept in different words: ‘honesty, always stay faithfull, supporting someone, pride, integrity, love, strength, familiy, stick to morality…’ Because there was no clear definition I also started to read about loyalty and its relationships with other variables and concepts, to gain extra knowledge as a basis before starting off my research. Interestingly, extensive research had been done around the concept of loyalty, but very little research was conducted on the concept of employer loyalty. Therefore, current research should clarify more about the construct of employer loyalty.

The research was conducted in the 11 Air Mobile Brigade which took me very long to get in. But I was determined to get in. And when I got in, my determination was rewarded by unforgettable memories of attending outdoor trainings, strolling around the barracks and having inspiring conversations with Captain van Kemenade.

Herewith I would like to thank Captain van Kemenade for learning me so much about the organization and taking me everywhere. I would also like to thank the employees of the 11 Air Mobile Brigade for the interesting conversations and helping me conducting my research by completing the questionnaires. Moreover, I would like to thank Esther van Leeuwen for the preservation of the quality of this research and her critical look on my ideas and investigations.

I hope you enjoy reading!
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Abstract

Loyalty from the employer to the employee has been hardly investigated in prior research. Therefore, two studies investigated the phenomenon of employer loyalty by a survey research in which a questionnaire was completed by 260 employees. Current research confirmed a positive effect of employer loyalty on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), commitment, job satisfaction and a negative effect on turnover intention (Hypothesis 1a). Also, the unique contribution of employer loyalty to the prediction of these variables above and beyond the predicting value of perceived organizational support (POS) and procedural fairness was examined but not confirmed (Hypothesis 1b). Furthermore, current research examined whether perceived external threat was related to have been on a mission or not (Hypothesis 2a), whether mission moderates the relationship between employer loyalty and the criterion variables (Hypothesis 2b) and whether threat is a mediator in the moderating effect of mission (2c). Hypotheses 2a/b/c could not be confirmed, although employer loyalty was a predictor of the variables by itself but not above and beyond POS and procedural justice. Furthermore, interesting findings emerged from exploratory analyses which confirm that employer loyalty was a unique predictor of turnover intention above and beyond POS and procedural fairness. Psychological safety was mediating the effect of employer loyalty on commitment and OCB (but not on job satisfaction and turnover intention). Also POS was mediating the relationship between employer loyalty and commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, turnover intention and psychological safety. These results demonstrate the importance of employer loyalty and provide new perspectives for future research.

KEYWORDS: employer loyalty, organizational citizenship behavior, perceived organizational support, procedural fairness, psychological safety.
Employer loyalty and its effects on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention.

“Employee loyalty begins with employer loyalty. Your employees should know that if they do the job they were hired to do with a reasonable amount of competence and efficiency, you will support them.” - Harvey Mackay (2011, p. 4).

Since the downfall of the Lehman Brothers bank in 2008 and the subsequent financial crisis, the world economy collapsed. The Dutch economy was therefore affected to a large extent leading to major consequences for organizations and its employees. The Dutch benefits agency UWV reported that due to the recession 334,000 jobs had been suspended within the past five years (UWV, Duurzame Arbeidsmarktontwikkelingen – II, may 2014). Besides, organizations started to offer temporary contracts which decreased the number of permanent contracts by 97% in 2011 compared to 2010 (UWV, vacatures in Nederland, 2011). It appears that organizations cannot provide certainty in times of crisis, which resembles as a lack of employer loyalty to the employees. In this age of flexible contracts and relaxation of dismissal laws, the impact of employer loyalty is particularly of increasing importance. However, much research has been conducted on loyalty of the employees to the employer (e.g. Hart & Thompson, 2007; Donghong, 2012; Jauch et al., 1978), the reverse – i.e. loyalty from the employer to its employees – has hardly been studied. Current research, provides clarity around the concept of employer loyalty and its effects on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention. Additionally, it was investigated whether employer loyalty has a unique effect on these variables. Therefore, this research examined to what extent employer loyalty differs from the concepts of organizational support and procedural fairness.

Because of the crisis, organizations are having serious trouble to survive. Prof. dr. van Wijnbergen stated in Het Financieele Dagblad that organizations must react quickly on changes and feel the effects much earlier than usual (FD, January 31st 2009, page 7). As organizations
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strive to retain their competitive edge, they are reorganizing, downsizing, and implementing new technology. Therefore, employees today are facing greater changes, at a more rapid pace, than ever before (Wanberg & Banas, 2000). Unfortunately, coping with this change requires flexibility which can be very difficult for employees. Employees experiencing change often feel a loss of territory, are uncertain about what the future holds, and may fear failure as they are faced with new tasks (Coch & French, 1948). Shortly, loyalty seems to recede from many organizations by economic fluctuations, giving priority to the achievement of individual goals and large uncertainties (Gasperz & Ott, 1996). This lack of loyalty in organizations is a topic which is increasingly discussed. Dr. Ligteringen stated in Het Financieele Dagblad (FD, May 8th 2014, page 10) that large numbers of newly graduates in their first job endorsed that their employers “did not keep their part of the bargain.” The ’old psychological contract’ exchanged loyalty to security, but the ‘new contract’ lacks intrinsic equity. He also stated that complete flexibility and freedom of action of the employer creates ongoing uncertainty and this could ultimately not be associated with loyalty. This is disturbing since loyalty is one of the most important variables in a collegiate culture (Clark, 1971). Moreover, Van Leeuwen and Homan (2012) demonstrated that loyal organizations are admired and seen as more supportive, competent and high performing than disloyal organizations. Therefore, loyal organizations are perceived as more attractive which makes employer loyalty an important aspect for organizations to pay attention to.

Nevertheless, most of previous research on loyalty has focused on loyalty from different perspectives, for example consumer’s loyalty to brands (e.g. Ellis, 2000; Gounaris, 2004; Fullerton, 2005), loyalty in romantic relationships (e.g. Fehr, 1993; Fletcher, 1993) and organizational loyalty (e.g. Whiting et al., 2008; Hoffman, 2006). The latter implies loyalty of the employee to the organization, conversely, current research investigates loyalty from the organization to its employees, to which hardly any research has been done before.
Minton (1992) emphasized the variance in the concept of loyalty and appealed for further research to broaden the conceptual map to capture more of the breadth and texture inherent in the idea of loyalty. According to Van Vugt et al. (2004) loyalty is a complex, multifaceted construct, consisting of emotive, cognitive and behavioral elements. Loyalty is manifested through strong, positive emotions, trust and making sacrifices to help others that could even be personally costly (Levine & Moreland, 2002). Loyalty is a feeling or an attitude of devoted attachment and affection between people. This feeling of loyalty tends to imply the obligated feeling of a person to persevere in a relationship (Rundle – Thiele, 2005). There is an emotional component in the concept of loyalty that implies morality and goes beyond mere support (Coughlan, 2005). Perceived employer loyalty is thus manifested in a feeling of assurance that the organization ‘is backing you up’ whatever it takes which implies a feeling of unconditional support.

**Perceived organizational support and procedural fairness**

To investigate whether employer loyalty has a unique effect on employees’ behavior, the effect of employer loyalty was compared to the effects of concepts closely related to employer loyalty. First, the extent to what the effects of employer loyalty on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention are distinct from the effects of organizational support was investigated, as support is a concept that appears to be strongly related to loyalty (Van Vugt et al., 2004; Levine & Moreland, 2002; Rundle – Thiele, 2005). Perceived organizational support is valued as assurance perceived by the employee that aid will be available from the organization when it is needed to carry out one’s job effectively and to deal with stressful situations (George et al., 1993). Organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995) supposes that employees personify the organization, infer the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. According to Rhoades et al. (2002) employees reciprocate such perceived support with increased commitment, performance and loyalty. On the basis of these assumptions, organizational support theory
provides a general approach to the role of reciprocity norms in employee–employer relationships (Rhoades et al., 2002).

Second, as procedural fairness is a particularly important determinant of perceived organizational support (Shore and Shore, 1995; Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Rhoades et al., 2002; Baer, 2003) and since procedural fairness leads to a higher level of commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, Niehoff and Organ, 1993; Schappe, 1998; Masterson et al., 2000; Laschinger, 2004), the effects of procedural fairness were compared to the effects of employer loyalty on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention to investigate whether employer loyalty is distinct from procedural fairness and adds an extra dimension. Procedural fairness is a concept that expresses the perceptions of employees about the extent to which they were treated fairly in organizations (Greenberg, 1996). These perceptions contain evaluations of formal rules and policies related to how decisions are made in the group and how these formal rules and policies influence the treatment of group-members. In addition, procedural fairness contains evaluations of how particular group authorities make decisions and how particular group authorities treat group members (Blader & Tyler, 2003). Prior research indicated that repeated instances of fairness in decisions should have a strong cumulative effect on perceived organizational support by indicating concern for employees’ welfare (Shore and Shore, 1995) – loyalty to employees.

Organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention

Current research investigates the effect of employer loyalty on four variables typically used in organizational research: organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention. Organizational citizenship behavior is behavior of a discretionary nature that is not part of an employee’s formal role requirements. However, this behavior contributes to the effective functioning of an organization (Robbins, 2001; Athanasou and King, 2002). Good organizational citizens enable an organization to allocate scarce resources efficiently by
simplifying maintenance functions and freeing up resources for productivity (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Organizational citizenship behavior is held to be vital to the survival of an organization (Organ, 1988) since organizational citizenship behaviors have been shown to enhance organizational effectiveness and decrease employee turnover (e.g. Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Koys, 2001; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 2000). Organizational commitment refers to an employee’s belief in the goals and values of the organization, desire to remain a member of the organization and faithfulness to the organization (Mowday et al., 1982; Hackett et al., 2001). Organizational commitment is an affective response to the whole organization and the degree of attachment or loyalty employees feel towards the organization (Najafi et al., 2011). Job satisfaction refers to an employee’s affective or emotional response to his or her particular job (Cranny et al., 1992). Job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the valuation of an employee’s work (Locke, 1976). In essence, it is ‘the extent to which people like their jobs’ (Spector, 1996). Turnover is the termination of an individual’s employment with a given company (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Turnover intention was conceived to be a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization. It has been described as the last step in a sequence of withdrawal cognitions, a set to which thinking of quitting and intent to search for alternative employment also belong (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978).

Many studies have shown strong relationships between organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions (e.g. Smith et al., 1983; Gonzalez and Garazo, 2006; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Yang and Chang, 2007; Mowday et al., 1982; Schappe, 1998; Williams and Anderson, 1991; Tett and Meyer, 1993; Lu et al., 2002; Chen, Hui, Sego, 1998). Interestingly, prior research demonstrated that perceived organizational support is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff, 2000; Wayne et al., 1997), commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1997; Eisenberger 2001; Shore &
Wayne, 1993; Rhoades, 2002; Settoon, 1996), job satisfaction (Rhoades, 2002) and negatively related to turnover intention (Rhoades, 2001; 2002). Moreover, procedural fairness is also positively related to organizational citizenship behavior (Podsaskoff, 2000; Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki and Latham, 1997), commitment (Masterson, Lewis, et al., 2000; Folger & Konovsky, 1989), job satisfaction (Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Wesolowski and Mossholder, 1997; Masterson, Lewis, et al., 2000; Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Nadir and Tanova, 2010) and negatively related to turnover intention (Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Nadir and Tanova, 2010). Since procedural fairness and perceived organization support are related to loyalty, current research assumes to find a positive effect of employer loyalty on organizational citizenship behavior, commitment and job satisfaction and a negative effect on turnover intention (Hypothesis 1a). See Figure 1.

Because of the moral component of loyalty, as discussed before, current research assumes to find a unique contribution of employer loyalty to the prediction of the four variables – organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention – above and beyond the predicting value of perceived organizational support and procedural fairness (Hypothesis 1b). See figure 1.

**Employer loyalty in the 11 Air Mobile Brigade**

In present research, the 11 Air Mobile Brigade served as study population. The 11 Air Mobile Brigade is part of the Royal Netherlands Army in the Ministry of Defence and consists of three battalions: 11 Infantry Battalion (Air Assault) *Garde Grenadiers en Jagers*; 12 Infantry Battalion (Air Assault) *Regiment Van Heutsz*; 13 Infantry Battalion (Air Assault) *Regiment Stoottroepen Prins Bernhard*. Each battalion consists of four infantry companies. Current research was conducted at 11 Infantry Battalion (Air Assault) *Garde Grenadiers en Jagers* and its associated companies: *Alfa Koningscompagnie; Bravo Stiercompagnie; Charlie Tijgercompagnie; Delta Wolfcompagnie*. The 11 Air Mobile Brigade is a rapidly deployable light
infantry combat unit, which contributes in the field for freedom, security and prosperity and can be deployed theoretically everywhere in the world within five to twenty days. Under the toughest conditions they carry out combat operations, providing humanitarian assistance and disaster support. *They go on where others stop* (‘11 Infantry Battalion’, 2013). Core values contain: pride, respect, professionalism, courage, discipline, camaraderie, cooperation and loyalty. These values are of great importance in the cooperation among the employees and their immediate superior, since support and blind trust is of vital importance. Loyalty is key in the work of the militaries: “*They have to stand in for each other, whenever, wherever. If necessary a military must be able to kill. Someone is able to kill through the hatred against a different group, but an even bigger factor appears to be the love of one’s own group*” (Captain van Kemenade, personal communication, November 4th 2013). The militaries are the men executing the actual work and the organization depends on them, thus the organization has to take good care of its employees. Loyalty plays a pivotal role in 11 Air Mobile Brigade, since the militaries are the engine of the organization carrying out operations as ‘*comrades, loyal to each other.*’ (‘11 Infantry Battalion’, 2013).

**Perceived external threat and Mission**

Current research investigates which other variables could moderate the effect of employer loyalty on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention. In current organization the extent of perceived external threat is an interesting variable to examine. Threat involves a negative situation in which people have relatively little control and loss is likely (Dutton and Jackson, 1987). This can be encountered in the work activities of the Army. Besides, in the army some men had been on mission, but others had not been on mission. Mission is an interesting factor to investigate as well since the extent of perceived threat could be related to have been on mission or not. Current research examines whether perceived threat was related to mission and expects that when militaries have been on a mission, this will lead to a
higher level of perceived threat (Hypothesis 2a). Besides, it is expected that the effect of employer loyalty on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention will be stronger for employees that have been on mission compared to those who have not been on mission (Hypothesis 2b) and additionally, the moderating effect of mission on the effect of employer loyalty on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention is expected to be mediated by the perception of threat (Hypothesis 2c).

**Psychological safety**

In this research the construct of psychological safety was included to explore the relationship between employer loyalty and psychological safety and the associated effects. Psychological safety describes perceptions of an individual about the consequences of interpersonal risks in their work environment. It consists of taken-for-granted beliefs about how others will respond when someone puts oneself on the line, such as by asking a question, seeking feedback, reporting a mistake, or proposing a new idea (Edmondson, 2003). Kahn (1990) proposed psychological safety is the feeling to be able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status or career. Therefore, a supportive organization climate – where employees feel psychological safety – is related to the feeling of employees to show more initiative which increases the performance of an organization (Baer, 2003). This indicates that when an employee perceives support from the organization in an unconditional way – like in employer loyalty, it feels like negative consequences are unlikely to occur which makes the person feel safe to show extra role behavior – organizational citizenship behavior. Therefore, the construct of psychological safety was included in current research for exploratory purposes to investigate whether perceived psychological safety mediates the relation between employer loyalty and commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention.
Perceived organizational support as a mediator

In prior research Moorman et al. (1998) suggested that perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between procedural fairness and organizational citizenship behavior. Since procedural fairness, perceived organizational support and employer loyalty are related concepts, it is interesting to examine whether perceived organizational support plays a mediating role in the relationship between employer loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior, satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention as well. Therefore, this research exploratory investigates the mediating role of perceived organizational support between employer loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior, satisfaction, commitment and turnover intention.

Study 1

Since employer loyalty has received hardly any attention in the literature, relatively little is known about the construct and what it consists of. Study 1 was conducted to gain more understanding of the construct of employer loyalty. In this study Dutch students were asked to describe what for them personally, makes an employer loyal or disloyal and which behaviors and emotions belong to a loyal or disloyal employer.

Method

Participants were 42 psychology students from the VU University Amsterdam (36 women, 7 men). Their mean age was 19.35 (SD = 1.45). The experiment consisted of an online survey for which students could voluntarily enroll. This was run on computers at the VU University. Firstly, participants was asked to indicate what loyalty from the employer means to them, more specifically, how a loyal employer behaves. Participants could describe 5 behaviors of a loyal employer in the survey. Secondly, participants was asked to indicate what a lack of loyalty of the employer means to them, more specifically, how does a disloyal employer behave? Similarly, participants could describe 5 behaviors of a disloyal employer. After, a list of 60 items describing
behaviors and emotions of an employer within an organization was displayed (e.g. ‘The leader treats all employees equally’; ‘The leader feels committed to its employees’; ‘The leader continues to support the employees for better or worse, despite mistakes that have been made’). Participants had to indicate to what extent this behaviors or emotions, in their sense, were associated with loyalty from the employer to the employees. Upon finishing participants were thanked and debriefed. After their participation, the students received credits.

Results and conclusion

The loyal descriptions (e.g.: ‘A loyal employer is sincere and honest’; A loyal employer stands by its employees, for better or worse’) and disloyal descriptions (e.g.: ‘A disloyal employer leaves the company when times are bad’; ‘A disloyal leader is not emotionally involved with its employees’) were coded into several umbrella terms that are pivotal to employer loyalty (8 terms: Integrity, Trust, Justice, Commitment, Respect, Support, Ethos/Environment and Leadership). After encoding, the umbrella terms were compared with the highest scoring behaviors and emotions (18 items, e.g.: ‘The leader feels committed with its employees’; ‘The leader supports the employees for 100%’; ‘The leader continues to support the employees for better or worse, despite mistakes that have been made’). From this, three underlying dimensions of employer loyalty emerged. First, commitment: the leader is involved with the employees in such a way that borders are blurred and they share the same interests. The leader feels genuine empathy, knows the employees in person and feels committed. Second, support: the leader knows what is daily routine in the workplace and knows what is going on among the employees. The leader is supportive, gives praise when deserved and provides in constructive feedback. The leader supports the employees for better or worse. Third, integrity: the leader is honest and does not talk behind someone’s back. The leader has sense of responsibility and always puts the interest of the organization first.
From study 1, commitment, support and integrity emerged as antecedents of employer loyalty. Descriptions of the participants – e.g.: ‘The leader supports the employees for better or worse’; ‘The leader is honest’; ‘The leader always puts the interest of the organization first’; ‘The leader feels committed with its employees’ – reveal that employer loyalty contains a moral component and the feeling of unconditional support and fairness. This confirms prior research on loyalty mentioned before which explains the construct of loyalty and refers to the emotional component of loyalty (Coughlan, 2005; Rundle – Thiele, 2005; Levine & Moreland, 2002; Van Vugt et al., 2004).

**Study 2**

To apply the findings on the construct of employer loyalty from study 1 in an actual organization where employees of the organization can be interrogated, study 2 was conducted in the Ministry of Defence to further investigate the construct of employer loyalty and its effects.

**Method**

A total of 245 participants of the 11 Air Mobile Brigade (239 men, 1 women, 5 unknown, \(M_{\text{age}} = 25.38, SD = 5.74\)) participated. Most participants were employed at the Ministry of Defence for 0 up to 10 years and most of them were working for 1 up to 1.5 years in their current unit. The research population consisted of 60 participants of the *Alfa Koningscompagnie*; 83 of the *Bravo Stiercompagnie*; 75 of the *Charlie Tijgercompagnie*; 27 of the *Delta Compagnie*. The participants were represented by 173 soldiers, 48 commissioned officers and 20 officers. Of 4 employees the position was unknown. Within the companies 137 participants had not been on a mission, 98 had been on a mission – mostly in Afghanistan – and of 10 participants this is unknown. 33 participants were still in the same unit as during the mission, 65 had changed of unit and of 10 participants this was unknown. During a joint meeting with the companies at the barrack stationed in Schaarsbergen, 300 questionnaires were distributed among the employees. During the meeting the researcher asked the participants to fill in the questionnaires individually and return
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the questionnaires within two weeks in a box that was on a fixed place in the building. Within two weeks 260 questionnaires have been returned. 40 questionnaires which were distributed among the companies did not return because these participants did not hand in their questionnaires in the box. Of the 260 questionnaires that were handed in, 245 were appropriate for use in current research. The remaining 15 were not appropriate for use since they were obviously completed without sincere attention: participants responded with the same answer to all questions, or wrote on top of the questionnaire: ‘the questions were not answered seriously.’

A questionnaire was handed out among the employees to examine the extent to which employees consider their organization as loyal. The first page was informative and contained information about the questionnaire. It indicated the questionnaire was measuring some important aspects in work experience, including job satisfaction and the contact between the employee and the employee’s immediate supervisor. The instruction that they had to think of their personal unit or their personal immediate supervisor when this was stated, was also underlined. Finally, it was emphasized that their participation was anonymous and every honest answer was a right one. Before the distribution of the questionnaires the researcher pointed out the instructions and read it to the entire group, adding the instruction to return the questionnaire within two weeks in a box that was on a fixed place in the building.

**Questionnaire**

**Employer loyalty scale**

Unless otherwise indicated, all answers were assessed on 5-point scales (1 = not at all, 5 = very much), preceded by the question: “to what extent do you agree with the following statement?” Scales were created by averaging the items. Employer loyalty has been examined by a newly developed scale consisting of 23 items. The scale was divided into three distinct subscales: involvement (5 items, e.g. ‘My immediate supervisor feels involved with me’), support (8 items, e.g. ‘I can count on my immediate supervisor’) and integrity (10 items, e.g. ‘My immediate
supervisor stands by me for better or worse’). 5 of the 23 items were negatively worded and reverse scored.

Principal Components Analysis with Oblimin rotation revealed 4 components with eigenvalues above 1. Together, these components explained 62.26% of the total variance. The factor loadings are displayed in Table 1. Considering the highest loadings on each factor, it can be seen that most of the items in the involvement subscale are loading on factor 3 and one item on factor 4. The items of the support scale and the integrity scale are mainly loading on factor 1 and in both subscales (support scale; integrity scale) the items that are negatively worded and reversed scored are loading on factor 2 which provided a separation between negative and positive loaded factors. As can be seen in Table 1 the items of the support and integrity subscales are mostly overlapping and the involvement subscale is not loading discretely onto its respective factor, which means the principal distinction within the loyalty scale is not functionally important. For this reason, the subscales have been considered as one fixed loyalty measure (23 items, M = 3.78, SD = 11.85, α = .93) without subscales.

Remaining scales

Perceived organizational support. In current study the 36-item Survey of Perceived Organizational Support was used (Eisenberger et al., 1986; e.g.: ‘If my job were eliminated, my direct supervisor would prefer to lay me off rather than transfer me to a new job,’ α = .94). Three items in this scale were excluded as they were not applicable in the operating environment of the 11 Air Mobile Brigade (item 2: ‘If my direct supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary he would do so;’ item 28: ‘My direct supervisor cares more about making a profit than about me;’ item 30: 'If my direct supervisor earned a greater profit, he would consider increasing my salary’). 15 items were negatively worded and reverse scored.

Procedural Fairness. To measure the extent of procedural fairness items of Blader & Tyler’s four component model (2003) were used. The scale contains items covering quality of
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decision-making procedures (7 items, e.g.: ‘My supervisors decisions are consistent across people and situations’) and items covering quality of treatment within an organization (25 items, e.g.: ‘My supervisor treats me fairly when decisions are being made’). The scale had an internal consistency of $\alpha = .95$.

Organizational Commitment. The Organizational Commitment Scale of Cook and Wall (OCS; 1980; 9 items, e.g.: ‘I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for’) was used to assess the extent to which the employees feel committed to the organization ($\alpha = .81$). Three items were reverse scored.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The scale measuring organizational citizenship behavior was based on the measure developed by Smith et al. (1983: 16 items, e.g.: ‘I help others who have been absent,’ $\alpha = .77$). Four items were negatively worded and reverse scored.

Turnover intention. The scale measuring turnover intention was based on Hunt (1981) which he utilized assessing the likelihood of leaving the Army or Civil Service employment. The items had an internal consistency of $\alpha = .88$ (7 items, e.g.: ‘I am considering leaving the 11 Air Mobile Brigade in the future’). Five items in this scale had been drawn in the opposite direction and were reverse scored.

Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured by a scale based on the shortened version of Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey (1994; 20 items, e.g.: ‘I am satisfied with my chances for promotion,’ $\alpha = .61$). Nine items in this scale were negatively worded and reverse scored.

Threat. A newly developed scale was conducted for measuring the extent of perceived external threat. This scale was constructed based on interviews and common experiences with employees during an annual four days outdoor training in the field (8 items, e.g., ‘Sometimes I am afraid for my life and the lives of my teammates,’ $\alpha = .74$).

Psychological safety. To measure psychological safety a scale of 8 items was constructed using 6 items adapted from Edmondson’s (2000) psychological safety scale ( e.g., ‘If I make a
mistake in this job, it is often held against me’) and two items referring to the psychological state of safety (‘I feel safe in my unit’ and ‘I can be myself in my unit’). The total scale had an internal consistency of $\alpha = .71$. Three items were negatively worded and reverse scored. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were thanked and debriefed.

Results

Means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities and correlations among scales are displayed in Table 2. Correlation analyses demonstrated that the predictors are significant and strongly correlating. This mutual positive correlations within employer loyalty, perceived organizational support and procedural fairness reveal there is much overlap among the concepts which confirms findings from previously mentioned research (Andrews and Kacmar, 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001, 2002). Moreover, the analysis showed significant intercorrelations among the criterion variables as well. The positive correlations among commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction and the negative correlations of these variables with turnover intention, confirm that these variables are interrelated as referred to in prior research (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Murphy et al., 2002; LePine et al., 2002; Chen et al., 1998).

Furthermore, positive moderate significant correlations among the predictor variables and the criterion variables were demonstrated. The positive correlation between perceived organizational support and commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior and the negative relationship with turnover intention was confirmed by prior research (Podsakoff, 2000; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Eisenberger 2001; McFarlane, 1993; Rhoades, 2001; Rhoades, 2002; Settoon, 1996). Besides, the positive correlation between procedural fairness and commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior and the negative relationship with turnover intention was confirmed by prior research as well (Podsaskoff, 2000; Ball, Trevino, & Sims, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki and Latham, 1997; Masterson, Lewis, et al., 2000;
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Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Mossholder, Bennett, & Martin, 1998; Wesolowski and Mossholder, 1997; Alexander and Ruderman, 1987; Nadiri and Tanova, 2010).

Interestingly, the correlations among employer loyalty and the criterion variables are significant as well. A positive correlation showing a positive relationship between employer loyalty and commitment, satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior has been demonstrated, which means an increase in employer loyalty was positively correlated to an increase in commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Besides, a negative correlation between employer loyalty and turnover intentions was shown which means that an increase in employer loyalty was correlated with a decrease of turnover intention of the employee. These results confirm hypothesis 1a.

Employer loyalty, Perceived Organizational Support and Procedural Fairness

In order to determine whether the presumed unique relationship between the predictors and the criterion variables exists, four regression analyses were conducted with commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intention and job satisfaction as criterion variables in which, unless otherwise indicated, employer loyalty, perceived organizational support and procedural fairness were entered simultaneously as predictors.

Commitment. The conducted regression analysis \( \text{adj. } R^2 = .27, F(3, 241) = 31.30, p < .001 \), demonstrated a significant effect of procedural fairness \( \beta = .29, t = 3.797, p < .001 \) and perceived organizational support \( \beta = .24, t = 2.638, p < .01 \). Employer loyalty was not a significant predictor \( \beta = .06, t = .697, p = .487 \). Both procedural fairness and perceived organizational support were statistically significant predictors for commitment explaining 27% of the variance.

Job satisfaction. The regression analysis demonstrated that procedural fairness \( \beta = .29, t = 3.90, p < .001 \) and perceived organizational support \( \beta = .28, t = 3.06, p < .01 \) were unique predictors of job satisfaction explaining 28% of the variance, \( \text{adj. } R^2 = .28, F(3, 241) = 32.41, p < \)
Employer loyalty was not a unique predictor $\beta = .02, t = .256, p = .798$ above and beyond the other predictors.

Organizational citizenship behavior. The regression analysis demonstrated that both perceived organizational support $\beta = .37, t = 3.9, p < .001$ and procedural fairness $\beta = .21, t = 2.7, p = <.01$ were unique predictors explaining 22% of the variance of organizational citizenship behavior $adj. R^2 = .22, F(3, 241) = 24.25, p < .001$. Employer loyalty did not have a unique effect in the prediction of organizational citizenship behavior $\beta = -.06, t = -.63, p = .532$.

Turnover intention. The regression analysis revealed that procedural fairness was the only predictor having a significant effect on turnover intention $\beta = -.27, t = -3.27, p = .001$ and counted for 12% of the explained variability in turnover intention. Perceived organizational support $\beta = -.18, t = -1.85, p = .07$ and employer loyalty $\beta = .07, t = .682, p = .559$ could not statistically significantly predict turnover intention, $adj. R^2 = .12, F(3, 241) = 12.34, p < .001$.

Results of the regression analyses revealed that hypothesis 1b could not be confirmed considering that employer loyalty could not statistically significantly contribute to the prediction of commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention above and beyond the predictive value of perceived organizational support and procedural fairness. Due to high correlations among the predictors, as can be seen in Table 2, and as the variables overlap with each other to a great extent, the unique effect of employer loyalty pales into insignificance. Employer loyalty by itself was a significant predictor since employer loyalty correlates significantly with all the intended outcome variables as can be seen in Table 2.

Threat and Mission

In order to test whether the perception of threat differs between people that have been on mission and employees that have not been on mission an independent samples t-test was conducted. There was no statistically significant difference in mean score on perceived threat between employees that have been ($M = 2.81, SD = .56$) on a mission and employees that have not
been \((M = 2.83, SD = .56)\) on a mission.02 (95% CI, -.12 to .17), \(t (235) = .326, p = .75\). This result does not support Hypothesis 2a.

**Employer loyalty and Mission I**

A regression analysis was conducted to examine whether mission moderates the effect of employer loyalty on commitment, satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention. An interaction term was computed with the z-scores of employer loyalty and mission. The regression test demonstrated that the interaction term \([\text{employer loyalty} \times \text{mission}]\) was not a significant predictor of commitment (\(\beta = .049, t = .660, p = .510\)), satisfaction (\(\beta = -.007, t = -.099, p = .921\)) and organizational citizenship behavior (\(\beta = .057, t = .768, p = .443\)). However, the interaction term was a significant predictor of turnover intention (\(\beta = -.173, t = -2.24, p < .05\)).

This demonstrates that mission moderates the effect of employer loyalty on turnover intention. A correlation analysis between employer loyalty and turnover intention for the group of participants that have been on a mission and the group of participants that have not been on mission, demonstrated a significant and stronger (negative) correlation for people that have been on a mission \((- .366**)\) than for people that have not been on a mission \((- .122)\). This result reveals that the effect of employer loyalty on turnover intention is stronger (negatively) for people that have been on mission compared to people that have not been on mission. Thus, when employees have been on mission employer loyalty has a stronger (negative) effect on turnover intention, compared to people that have not been on mission. Hypotheses 2b was confirmed for turnover intention, but not for commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Employer loyalty, Threat and Mission**

To examine whether the moderating effect of mission in the effect of employer loyalty on turnover intentions was mediated by perceived threat, a bootstrapping analysis was conducted with PROCESS in SPSS (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). Bootstrapping is a nonparametric resampling procedure which is an additional method advocated
for testing mediation that does not impose the assumption of normality of the sampling
distribution (Preacher, 2008). Following recommendations, the number of resampled bootstraps
was 5,000 times (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2013). The bootstrapping analysis was
conducted with the interaction term [employer loyalty * mission], [z-threat] as a mediator and [z-
loyalty] and [mission] as covariates. Results demonstrated that perceived threat did not
significantly mediate the moderating effect of mission (boot indirect effect = .0001, SE = .0056,
95% CI = -.0114, .0136). This means that perceived threat does not play a mediating role in the
moderating effect of mission. This result does not support Hypothesis 2c.

**Employer loyalty and Mission II**

An additional analysis was conducted in order to determine whether there is a difference in
perceived employer loyalty between employees that have been on a mission and employees that
have not been on a mission. An independent samples t-test demonstrated that there was a
statistically significant difference in mean score on employer loyalty between employees that have
been on a mission and employees that have not been on a mission, with employees that have been
(M = 3.88, SD = .45) on a mission scoring higher than employees that have not been (M = 3.71,
SD = .53) on a mission .17 (95% CI, -.30 to -.05), t (235) = -2.71, p = .007. This demonstrates
that employees that have been on a mission perceive more employer loyalty than employees that
have not been on a mission.

**Employer Loyalty and Psychological Safety**

According to Baer (2003) employees working in an organization that provides a personally
non-threatening and supportive climate should be more likely to take risks of proposing a new
idea or take initiatives than in an environment where proposing a new idea will lead to an attack,
to him or her being censored, ridiculed or penalized…’ (West, 1990, p. 312). This shows a
relation between perceived organizational support from the organization and the feeling of
psychological safety exists, which leads to initiatives – organizational citizenship behavior.
Therefore, current research included psychological safety to explore the relationship between employer loyalty and psychological safety.

To test whether employer loyalty had a unique effect in the prediction of psychological safety above and beyond perceived organizational support and procedural fairness a regression analysis was conducted with psychological safety as a criterion variable and the predicting variables employer loyalty, perceived organizational support and procedural fairness $adj. R^2 = .58$, $F(3, 241) = 112.16, p < .001$. The analysis demonstrated that procedural fairness $\beta = .12, t = 2.02, p < .05$ and perceived organizational support $\beta = .37, t = 5.3, p < .001$ as well as employer loyalty $\beta = .35, t = 5.1, p < .001$ provided a unique statistically significant contribution in the prediction of psychological safety explaining 58% of the variance. Interestingly, employer loyalty appears to have a unique effect in addition to perceived organizational support and procedural fairness. This shows that employer loyalty contributes a significant part in the prediction of psychological safety above and beyond perceived organizational support and procedural fairness.

In order to examine whether psychological safety plays a mediating role in the effect of employer loyalty on the criterion variables, a mediation analysis was conducted with the Bootstrapping method in PROCESS. Results demonstrated that psychological safety did not significantly mediate the effect of employer loyalty on satisfaction (boot indirect effect = .09, $SE = .05$, 95% CI = .0000, .1922) and turnover intention (boot indirect effect = -.19, $SE = .11$, 95% CI = -.3952, .0278). However, the effect of employer loyalty on commitment (boot indirect effect $= .1912, SE = .0706$, 95% CI = .0600, .3369) and organizational citizenship behavior (boot indirect effect $= .17, SE = .05$, 95% CI = .0762, .2854) was significantly mediated by psychological safety. This demonstrates that the positive effect of employer loyalty on commitment and organizational citizenship behavior can be explained by psychological safety.

To investigate whether mission and/or threat moderate the effect of employer loyalty on psychological safety a regression analysis was conducted with both interaction terms.
[loyalty*mission] as well as [loyalty*threat]. The regression analysis revealed that the interaction terms were not significant predictors of psychological safety (respectively $\beta = .027, t = .462, p = .645; \beta = .056, t = 1.220, p = .224$). This shows that neither mission or threat moderate the effect of employer loyalty on psychological safety.

**Employer Loyalty and Perceived Organizational Support**

As discussed before, research of Moorman et al. (1998) demonstrated that perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between procedural fairness and organizational citizenship behaviors. In Moorman’s research a high significant correlation among the concepts of procedural justice and perceived organizational support ($r = .69^{**}$) was demonstrated. Since the high correlation ($r = .78^{**}$) among employer loyalty and perceived organizational support demonstrates much overlap in between these concepts as well, it is interesting for exploratory purposes to test whether perceived organizational support has a mediating effect in the relation between employer loyalty and commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intention, job satisfaction and psychological safety as well. Results of a Bootstrapping analysis demonstrated that perceived organizational support significantly mediated the effect of employer loyalty on commitment (boot indirect effect = .31, $SE = .09, 95\% CI = .1419, .4732$), satisfaction (boot indirect effect = .23, $SE = .06, 95\% CI = .1140, .3538$), organizational citizenship behavior (boot indirect effect = .29, $SE = .07, 95\% CI = .1528, .4286$), turnover intention (boot indirect effect = -.37, $SE = .13, 95\% CI = -.6265, -.1056$) and psychological safety (boot indirect effect = .31, $SE = .07, 95\% CI = .1889, .4463$). The results are displayed in Figures 2a through 2e and demonstrate that perceived organizational support mediates the effect of employer loyalty on commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, turnover intention and psychological safety.

**General discussion**

Many previous researchers have studied loyalty in organizations from the perspective of
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the employee to its employer or organization (e.g. Whiting et al., 2008; Hoffman, 2006; Hart & Thompson, 2007; Donghong, 2012; Jauch et al., 1978). The present research focused on the barely investigated phenomenon employer loyalty – loyalty from the employer to its employees and demonstrates the relevance of employer loyalty in organizations.

The results of study 1 provided more clarity around the construct of employer loyalty and demonstrated that the construct of employer loyalty consisted of 3 components: commitment, integrity and support. This demonstrated that the construct of loyalty contains more than mere support and that employer loyalty consists of a moral component. This moral component in the construct of loyalty was confirmed by prior research (Van Vugt et al., 2004; Levine and Moreland, 2002; Rundle – Thiele, 2005; Coughlan, 2005).

The results of study 2 demonstrated that, as predicted, the increase of commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior was related to the increase of employer loyalty and that the decrease of turnover intention was related to the increase of employer loyalty as well (Hypothesis 1a). The presence and increase of employer loyalty appeared to have a positive impact on commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and the likelihood to leave the organization. In addition, contrary to expectations it was demonstrated that employer loyalty could not predict commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention above and beyond the predicting values of organizational support and procedural fairness (Hypothesis 1b). Interestingly, employer loyalty by itself was a unique predictor of commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention, but due to overlap within constructs of employer loyalty, perceived organizational support and procedural fairness the unique effect of employer loyalty falls by the wayside.

The present research also revealed that in contrast to expectations, perceived external threat could not be attributed to have been on a mission or not (Hypothesis 2a). Besides, employer loyalty had a stronger (negative) effect on turnover intention (but not on commitment, job
satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior) when employees had been on a mission compared to people that had not been on a mission (Hypothesis 2b). Thus, employer loyalty was a better predictor of turnover intention when employees had been on mission than when employees had not been on mission. Contrary to expectations, this moderating effect of mission in the effect of employer loyalty on turnover intention could not be explained by perceived threat (Hypothesis 2c). Interestingly, a higher level of employer loyalty could be attributed to have been on a mission. These results might be related to the fact that militaries prefer going on a mission above not going on a mission. Going on mission is an honor and militaries indicated that going on a mission is the purpose of their job for which they train. When employees have been on a mission they might see the organization as loyal to them. This might be an explanation of the higher level of employer loyalty of employees that have been on a mission and the strong (negative) effect of employer loyalty on turnover intentions when employees have been on a mission.

From the exploratory analysis concerning psychological safety and employer loyalty the remarkable finding emerged that employer loyalty made a unique contribution to the prediction of psychological safety above and beyond organizational support and procedural fairness. This finding confirms the prediction that employer loyalty adds extra value in the prediction of psychological safety above and beyond organizational support and procedural fairness. In addition, the effect of employer loyalty on commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (but not on job satisfaction and turnover intention) could be explained by employees’ feeling of psychological safety, which indicates that employer loyalty is an antecedent to psychological safety. When people perceive loyalty from their employer, this positively influences their feeling of psychological safety which means they feel save to show one’s self without being criticized. In turn this will reciprocate the feeling of commitment to the organization and increase initiatives of organizational citizenship behaviors. This finding was confirmed from prior research by Baer (2003) as well.
Furthermore, exploratory analysis on perceived organizational support and employer loyalty showed that the effect of employer loyalty on commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, turnover intention and psychological safety could be explained by perceived organizational support. This mediating role of perceived organizational support was supported by prior research of Moorman et al. (1998) and suggests that employer loyalty is an antecedent to perceived organizational support which in turn mediates its relationship to commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, turnover intention and psychological safety.

Implications

Despite the fact that prior research acknowledged loyalty as the bedrock of relationships between consumers and organizations or brands, people in romantic relationships or employees to its organization, surprisingly hardly any literature has focused on employer loyalty. Current research demonstrated that employer loyalty is an important phenomenon for the organization as a whole since employer loyalty is a predictor of employees’ attitudes and behaviors towards the organization. Employer loyalty by itself is a predictor of commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention and therefore of great relevance for organizations, since for example, organizational citizenship behavior have been shown to enhance the effectiveness of an organization (e.g. Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Koys, 2001; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 2000). Moreover, employer loyalty has a unique contribution to the prediction of psychological safety above and beyond perceived organizational support and procedural fairness. Psychological safety is related to the feeling of employees to show more initiative which in turn is positively related to the performance of an organization according to Baer (2003). Although organizations are already being supportive and fair to their employees, being loyal to employees increases the feeling of psychological safety which thus in turn could increase the performance of the organization.
Importantly, employer loyalty positively influences perceived organizational support, which in turn positively influences commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, turnover intention and the feeling of psychological safety. This could positively influence the performance of the employees and the organization according to Baer (2003) and since procedural fairness and perceived organizational support are strongly correlating to employer loyalty, the added value of employer loyalty to organizations may be emphasized.

Furthermore, for the organization of the 11 Airmobile Brigade especially, it is interesting to be aware that employer loyalty more strongly affects the turnover intentions of employees that have been on a mission compared to the others who have not been. This shows that with employees that have been on a mission, the perception of employer loyalty more strongly (negatively) affects the likeliness to leave the organization than with employees who have not been on a mission. Thus, employees who have been on a mission want to stay more with the organization when they perceive employer loyalty than employees that have not been.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The present study does have a number of limitations that should be noted as well. First, the sample of employees from a military organization. This setting may be too unique and therefore limit the external generalizability to other organizations. Second, when the questionnaire was distributed the employees completed the questionnaire individually, but the employees could decide personally in which environment. So there was no control on the setting in which de questionnaires were completed. Third, the reason for not returning the questionnaires was not known. It could be that some employees did not want to complete the questionnaires because they were afraid of expressing their opinion and true feelings about their supervisor. The employees had to answer the demographic questions in the end of the questionnaire from which could be retrieved who exactly completed the questionnaire (e.g. ‘Which unit do you belong to? Define your company, peloton and group’; ‘Are you an officer, petty officer or soldier?’; ‘What is your
position?; ‘What is your supervisor’s position?’). For future research it would be very important to maintain complete anonymity of the questionnaire.

For further research, the employer loyalty scale could be redefined with questions that are even more specifically focused on employer loyalty. Current scale was divided into four distinct factors instead of three as intended and the constructs overlapping. Also the relevance of the items in the subscales was taken into account, but a lack of relevance may still exist. For future research it would be interesting to develop distinct relevant subscales contributing to the construct of employer loyalty. Moreover, it would be more appropriate to utilize a shortened version of current questionnaire, since this version was very long, which could have been disturbing for the concentration of the participant. Furthermore, the scale of perceived external threat could be redefined as well. The questions were written in present tense asking whether militaries perceived threat at this moment or else often perceived threat. I would have been more appropriate if the questions were focused on specific situations for which the militaries could use imagination or when the questions were stated more specifically or from a personal perspective.

Future research might also focus on the expansion of the number of constructs that ‘touch side’ with employer loyalty like procedural fairness and perceived organizational support. Prior research shows that for example, empowerment leads to a higher level of commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (Faulkner and Laschinger, 2008; Bogler and Somech, 2004; Bhatnagar and Sandhu, 2005), therefore empowerment could perhaps be utilized as a predictor in future research on employer loyalty.

Moreover, it would be interesting for future research to investigate whether there are other factors that influence perceived employer loyalty. In particular the behavior of the supervisor would be interesting to investigate. Prior research demonstrated that the characteristics of a leader which are most valued by followers are honesty, integrity and trustfulness (Kouzes and Posner, 1987) and when followers feel trust and respect toward the leader, than they are motivated to do
more than they are expected to do – organizational citizenship behaviors (Yukl, 1989). Also results from Study 1 confirm the findings that integrity, honesty and trustful behaviors belong to behaviors of a loyal leader. Konovsky and Pugh (1994) found that the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior was fully mediated by employees' trust in their supervisors. Thus, for further research it would be interesting to investigate which behaviors make employees trust their leader and which behaviors make a leader a loyal one.

Another interesting perspective for further research would be whether the attachment of a person determines whether someone perceives employer loyalty. Prior research stated that the strongest predictor of a loyalty conflict – not knowing who you should be loyal to – is natural family attachment (Poulin, 1986). Someone that has attached well during childhood could be less vulnerable for employer loyalty than someone that has not attached well in childhood. This would be interesting to test in future research since this could provide more clarity around the emotional or moral component of employer loyalty.
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## Appendix

**Table 1.**
Factor loadings and communalities based on principal components analysis with oblimin rotation for 23 items from the employer loyalty scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader feels committed</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader says good things about me</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is proud of me</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is personally involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader has nothing to do with me</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is there when I need him</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader does a lot to help</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can count on my leader</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader will support me whatever</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader never does anything for me</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader supports me unconditionally</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader will go through fire</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even with bad performance</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is loyal</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is honest</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader shows respect</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders backs me up</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader through thick and thin</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader puts hand in fire</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader treats me unfair</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader exploits me</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader betrays me</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader gives me safe feeling</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Direction</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>,330***</td>
<td>,365**</td>
<td>,357**</td>
<td>,381**</td>
<td>,340**</td>
<td>,416**</td>
<td>,322**</td>
<td>,324**</td>
<td>-173**</td>
<td>,298**</td>
<td>,332**</td>
<td>,290**</td>
<td>-174**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Threat</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-188**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>159*</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.155*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.129*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Loyalty</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>,775**</td>
<td>,655**</td>
<td>,713**</td>
<td>,344**</td>
<td>,437**</td>
<td>,363**</td>
<td>,430**</td>
<td>-252**</td>
<td>,580**</td>
<td>,434**</td>
<td>,645**</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 POS</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>,649**</td>
<td>,716**</td>
<td>,372**</td>
<td>,475**</td>
<td>,457**</td>
<td>,485**</td>
<td>-307**</td>
<td>,556**</td>
<td>,456**</td>
<td>,669**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fairness</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>,586**</td>
<td>,485**</td>
<td>,484**</td>
<td>,410**</td>
<td>,488**</td>
<td>-346**</td>
<td>,568**</td>
<td>,502**</td>
<td>,703**</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Safety</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>,335**</td>
<td>,426**</td>
<td>,400**</td>
<td>,388**</td>
<td>-256**</td>
<td>,437**</td>
<td>,323**</td>
<td>,519**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Competitiveness</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>,511**</td>
<td>,357**</td>
<td>,414**</td>
<td>,270**</td>
<td>,373**</td>
<td>,436**</td>
<td>,393**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Commitment</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td>,510**</td>
<td>,563**</td>
<td>-563**</td>
<td>,406**</td>
<td>,397**</td>
<td>,386**</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 OCB</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>,214**</td>
<td>-363**</td>
<td>,267**</td>
<td>,417**</td>
<td>,279**</td>
<td>-201**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>(.61)</td>
<td>,321**</td>
<td>,383**</td>
<td>,282**</td>
<td>,428**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Turnover</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>-236**</td>
<td>-163**</td>
<td>-237**</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Admiration</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td>,477**</td>
<td>,634**</td>
<td>0.061</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>13 Interest</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>,515**</td>
<td>-0.08</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>14 Leader</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</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>15 FatherSon Item</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.11</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>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01. *p < .05. Internal reliabilities (coefficient alphas) are given in parentheses along the diagonal.
**Figure 1.** Interrelated variables and mediators of employer loyalty.

*Figure 2a.** The unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and commitment mediated by perceived organizational support. In parentheses the unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and the dependent variable controlled by perceived organizational support (= the direct effect). *p < .001.
**Figure 2b.** The unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and satisfaction mediated by perceived organizational support. In parentheses the unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and the dependent variable controlled by perceived organizational support (= the direct effect). *p < .001.

**Figure 2c.** The unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior mediated by perceived organizational support. In parentheses the unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and the dependent variable controlled by perceived organizational support (= the direct effect). *p < .001.

**Figure 2d.** The unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and turnover intention mediated by perceived organizational support. In parentheses the unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and the dependent variable controlled by perceived organizational support (= the direct effect). *p < .001.
Figure 2e. The unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and psychological safety mediated by perceived organizational support. In parentheses the unstandardized coefficients between employer loyalty and the dependent variable controlled by perceived organizational support (= the direct effect). *p <.001.