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Abstract

Training and development is an important tool for motivating employees and increasing organizational performance. Therefore, we have developed a new model in which we have empirically tested four direct relationships, three mediating relationships, and one moderating effect. We have collected the data from selected SMEs in Karachi. A total of 410 questionnaires were distributed, and 385 valid responses were available. The instrument was adapted from earlier studies. We have used Smart PLS for data analysis. Of the four direct hypotheses, we found support for two of them. Similarly, we only found support for one indirect hypothesis and no support for the moderating relationship. The study found that antecedents “availability of training and managerial support for training” stimulate organizational commitment. However, we did not find any support for the “association between motivation to learn and organizational commitment” in Karachi SMEs. In contrast to earlier literature, we found that “organizational commitment stimulates turnover intentions.” Organizational commitment mediates (1) availability of training and turnover intentions, and (2) managerial support and turnover intentions. However, the study did not support organizational commitment’s mediating role on motivation to learn and turnover intentions. Similarly, constituent attachment did not have a moderating effect in our study.

Keywords: Turnover intentions, organizational commitment, constituent attachment, training and development, SMEs.

1Corresponding Author: Veena Teewari Nandi; Email: veenatewari@yahoo.com
Introduction

Organizational commitment is critical for success and growth, which depends on many factors, including training and development, employee needs, and motivation for training and development (Al-Emadi & Marquardt, 2007). Given its significance, researchers have been examining their association in different domains with a different combination of variables (Dhar, 2015). Past literature has documented that organizations with a well-structured training and development program benefit from organizational performance and sustainable growth (Newman, Thanacoody & Hui, 2011). Organizational success depends immensely on the human resource department. The HR department, besides conventional human resource functions, has to ensure that employees working in an organization are highly skilled and motivated. Thus, they are required to develop training and development programs that match the changing requirements. Such programs have several benefits (Bulut & Culha, 2010). Firms may have a pool of skilled labor, which may give them a competitive edge. It will make the firms attractive to both new employees and potential employees. Due to career development opportunities, the existing employees may have low intentions to switch to other organizations. Their performance and job satisfaction will be high, due to which organizational performance and organizational commitment may also increase significantly. On the other hand, firms may attract new skilled labor, which may help human resource development (Ehrhardt, Miller, Freeman & Horn, 2011; Siegel et al., 1997).

Employees are essential assets of an organization. Thus, firms should ensure that their employees’ motivation and commitment level is high. These aspects are necessary for developing a sustainable relationship between employees and an organization. Monetary benefits motivate employees, but many of them, besides economic rewards, give importance to an organization’s career development opportunities and culture (Bulut & Culha, 2010; Bagher, Yap, Holmes, Hannan & Cukier, 2010). Given this significance, we have developed a new model in which we have examined the effect of “training, motivation to learn, and managerial support on organizational commitment.” Further, the impact of “organizational commitment on turnover intentions” was also assessed. Besides three mediating effects, we have also examined the moderating effect of constituent attachment on turnover intentions.

Literature Review

Organizational Commitment

Firms that have a well-structured training and development program motivates employees to develop a favorable attitude towards work. Consequently, it positively affects job-related outcomes, including motivation, satisfaction, and commitment (Yao,
Qiu & Wei, 2019; Liu, 2019). There is sufficient empirical evidence available, suggesting that training and development programs promote organizational commitment and decrease turnover intentions (Xu & Payne, 2018). Many researchers have validated this association in different domains (such as manufacturing and service industries) and other countries (Jin, McDonald & Park, 2018). Thus, firms who believe that their employees have low satisfaction and low commitment need to counsel them.

Further, firms should develop training programs based on employees’ capabilities and organizational goals (Celis, 2018). Organizational commitment is often a problematic issue, as employees have high self-interest and low loyalty towards their employers (Jehanzeb et al., 2013). Therefore, many researchers recommend that organizations focus on developing and maintaining a culture of internal and external training. Such a culture would decrease turnover intentions and enhance employee attitude and commitment (Ehrhardt, Miller, Freeman & Hom, 2011). Employees’ attitude towards the job depends on their perception of employers. If they believe that their employers are concerned about their career and development, their motivation, satisfaction, and commitment level will increase.

In contrast, if employees have a negative attitude towards their employers, they will perform poorly and start looking for new job opportunities (Chordiya, Sabharwal & Goodman, 2017). Training and development programs in an organization have several positive effects. Employees feel that organizations care for their wellbeing. Newman, Thanacoody, and Hui (2011) suggest that training polishes workers’ skills and knowledge, promoting a positive attitude towards work. Additionally, it supports the social exchange culture, which is beneficial for employers and employees (Chordiya, Sabharwal & Goodman, 2017; Hussain et al., 2020).

**Conceptual Framework**

We have proposed a new model on organizational commitment and turnover intentions in Figure 1. It has four direct hypotheses, three mediating relationships, and one moderating effect.
Hypothesis Development

### Availability of Training and Organizational Commitment

The availability of training programs in an organization is critical for employee motivation and commitment. Dias and Silva (2016) believe that organizations with a well-structured training program for employees benefit immensely, as it enhances their attitude towards work. Consequently, it promotes organizational commitment and a sustainable relationship with employees. Egan, Yang and Bartlett (2004), based on a comparative survey of Malaysian and American responses, concluded that training and development stimulate “affective organizational commitment” but do not promote “continuous organizational commitment” (Alamri & Al-Duhaim, 2017). Thus, organizations that encourage their employees to participate in training programs develop a strong base of committed employees.

Alsamman, Aldulaimi and Alsharedah (2016) argue that employees who voluntarily participate in training programs have a favorable attitude towards work compared to those who do not participate in such programs. Silaban and Syah (2018) contend that the availability of training programs in an organization has a direct association with employee satisfaction and turnover intentions. Abdullahi (2018) conceptualized training as “planned intervention that is designed to enhance job satisfaction.” An effective HR department develops training and development programs by mapping employees’ existing skills with the organization’s future goals (Baird, Tung & Yu, 2019). Thus, employees who have a high orientation towards learning and development
perform better than those who have a low inclination toward learning and development (Witasari & Gustomo, 2020; Albalawi, Naugton, Elayan & Sleimi, 2019).

There are inconsistent results on the association between training programs' availability and its effect on turnover intentions and work attitude (Khan, 2018). For example, Mackay (2018) found that the availability of training programs in an organization stimulates employee motivation, enhances commitment, and reduces turnover intentions. Albalawi, Naugton, Elayan and, Sleimi (2019) argue that there is a strong association between the availability of training programs, employee commitment, and attitude towards work. All employees do not have the same inspiration for career growth and development, which has contributed to inconsistent results on the association between the availability of training programs and organizational commitment (Wang, Jin, Wang, Zhao, Sang & Yuan, 2020).

**H1: The availability of training programs in a firm promotes organizational commitment.**

**Motivation to Learn and Organizational Commitment**

The motivation level is not the same for all employees. It depends on a host of factors, including their attitude towards life and career (Kovach, 2018). Ali, Zhong-Bin, Jian-Ping, Ali, and Sultan (2018) indicate that highly motivated employees have a higher inclination to learn. This attitude translates into organizational commitment. In contrast, employees with low motivation have a short orientation toward learning, progress, and low organizational commitment (Pesce, Shi, Critto, Wang & Marcomini, 2018). Besides, employees with a high motivation level also develop optimistic feelings towards the organization (Arefin & Islam, 2019). Demiral (2017) found that most employees believe that training programs are a critical precursor to organizational commitment regardless of the motivation level.

Unamaheswari and Krishnan (2016) suggests that when participating in a training program, employees often have the intention to enhance their skills and apply them at their job. Many past studies have extended the “Integrative Theory of Training Model” and concluded that employees who are motivated to learn have a positive work attitude (Silaban & Syah, 2018). The literature also suggests that employees who have high motivation to learn to achieve more from training than other employees (Lim, Loo & Lee, 2017). A training program’s success depends on the motivation level of participants. If most participants in training and seminars actively participate, all participants would benefit (Shafique, Kalyar & Ahmad, 2018). Past literature documents a significant association between “motivation to learn and a favorable attitude towards the job. Thus, many researchers believe that besides sending employees for training, firms should also counsel them about the benefits of attending training workshops (Mylona & Mihail,
Counseling can increase employees’ inspiration to learn which is necessary for their development and organizational commitment (Alamri & Al-Duhaim, 2017).

**H2: Employees’ motivation to learn promotes organizational commitment.**

**Manager Support for Training and Organizational Commitment**

Organizations that encourage and support employees to attend training workshops and seminars develop a positive work attitude. Consequently, it enhances organizational commitment and reduces turnover intentions (Dias & Silva, 2016). Employees’ willingness to develop themselves depends on the support they receive from employers and family members. A balance between work and family responsibilities also increases organizational commitment (Hanaysha, 2016). Similarly, Baird, Tung, and Yu (2019) suggest that the organization and senior colleagues’ emotional and social support is necessary for employee development. Well-structured training enhances employee confidence and motivates them to contribute constructively in job assignments (Chen & Chiu, 2018).

Similarly, Kaynak, Toklu, Elci and Toklu (2016) argue that supervisor’s support for employee training and development promotes “affective and continuous commitment.” Employees in an organization appreciate the management and organizational support. Consequently, they develop loyalty and invest in self-development by attending workshops and seminars (Ahmad, Kura, Bibi, Khalid & Rahman-Jaaffar, 2019). Successful firms create a culture where employees take the initiative in self-development by attending training programs. Most such employees apply the newly learned skills in their job assignments (Ekrot, Rank & Gemünden, 2016; Chelliah, Bujang, Lew & Adriel, 2016).

**H3: Managerial support for training in an organization enhances organizational commitment.**

**Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions**

Turnover intentions have negative consequences for employers, as their investment in employee development can get wasted. Organizations invest in hiring and developing a new workforce (Rawashdeh & Tamimi, 2019). Past studies suggest an inconsistent association between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. For example, Rawashdeh and Tamimi (2019) suggest that employees with low organizational commitment do not maintain a sustainable relationship with the employer (Nawaz & Pangil, 2016). Silva and Dias (2016) argue that employees, due to insufficient commitment towards an organization, perform poorly, and have intentions to switch their jobs. Many
studies have documented that an organization with a conducive working environment promotes a favorable work attitude and reduces turnover intentions.

Many researchers think that organizational commitment and turnover intentions have a bi-directional relationship. That is, low commitment promotes high turnover intentions. Further, high turnover intentions stimulate weak organizational commitment (Hitotsuyanagi-Hansel, Froese & Pak, 2016). The literature also suggests that a firm that invests heavily in human resource development increases employee loyalty. Such investments promote a favorable attitude towards work and low turnover intentions (Kim, Song & Lee, 2016).

H4: Organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions are negatively associated.

Mediating Effects
Committed employees in an organization are highly motivated with a positive work attitude and develop a sustainable relationship with the employer (Rawashdeh & Tamimi, 2019). Many researchers believe that organizational commitment, in essence, reflects employees’ psychological behavior. This psychological attitude can promote citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and high job performance. Hitotsuyanagi-Hansel, Froese, and Pak (2016) argue that employee commitment is their psychological status, which governs their relations with an organization. A firm’s core values also promote organizational commitment. A committed employee aligns his/her values with the firm’s core values and thus develops a sustainable relationship with it. A mismatch in core values and inflexibility towards change also promotes employee turnover intentions (Rawashdeh & Tamimi, 2019).

The availability of a training program in an organization indicates a positive development culture. Such programs reflect an organization’s concern about the career development of employees. Therefore, employees reciprocate by taking the training seriously and applying the newly learned skills at work (Egan, Yang & Bartlett, 2004). Such training improves employees’ motivation level and increases their organizational commitment (Dias & Silva, 2016). Social exchange theory (Blau 1964) also postulates that the psychological contract between an employee and employer is an essential precursor of employee behavior. When employees believe that the firm is concerned about their career development, their motivation level increases significantly, and they exhibit exemplary work performance (Abdullahi, 2018). Some employees take the initiative in attending training and development programs while others non-voluntarily attend the training in an organization (Silaban & Syah, 2018). Employees who take the
initiative of attending training programs learn more than others, but their commitment towards the organization is also high. On the contrary, those employees who have a non-serious attitude towards training have a low commitment level towards the organization (Alamri & Al-Duhaim, 2017).

Organizations should also motivate employees to attend training (Hanaysha, 2016). Managerial support for training can be enhanced through financial support, paid leave, and giving weightage to training in the promotion policy (Hanaysha, 2016). Employees appreciate the organizational support and develop a positive attitude towards work (Dias & Silva, 2016). These factors enhance organizational commitment and reduce turnover intentions (Baird, Tung & Yu, 2019). Training and development enhances organizational performance. However, only those employees benefit from training programs that have a high motivation to learn. Thus, firms need to improve the motivation level of employees (Nawaz & Pangil, 2016). For that, firms need to counsel their employees and develop an awareness of the importance of training and development. Training and development in an organization should promote zeal for learning; otherwise, it is a waste of resources (Egan, Yang & Bartlett, 2004). Training also allows employees to learn new skills and use them for increasing work performance. These factors, directly and indirectly, affect employee commitment.

A study on Malaysian and American consumers concluded that training stimulates affective commitment, but does not affect continuous commitment (Ahmad & Bakar, 2003). Thus, firms must do career counseling to enhance their awareness of the importance of training and development (Rawashdeh & Tamimi, 2019).

H5: Organizational commitment mediates the association between the availability of training and turnover intentions.

H6: Organizational commitment mediates the association between managerial support and turnover intentions.

H7: Organizational commitment mediates the association between motivation to learn and turnover intentions.

The Moderating Effects of Constituent Attachment
Employees with a higher constituent attachment maintain a sustainable relationship with the organization. In contrast, employees who have low constituent attachment are not loyal to the organization. Therefore, they have high turnover intentions (Ellingson, Tews & Dachner, 2016). Mathie and Zajac (1990) based on a theoretical model, suggest
that constituent attachment is a precursor of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Past studies have mostly examined the effect of constituent attachment on turnover intentions. Perhaps, few studies have examined the moderating effect of constituent attachment on turnover intentions. The literature suggests that organizational commitment and turnover intentions are negatively associated (Tews, Michel & Allen, 2014). However, we believe that a favorable constituent attachment will reduce the negative association between commitment and turnover intentions. In contrast, an unfavorable constituent attachment will enhance the relationship between commitment and turnover intentions. Thus, we argue that constituent-attachment will significantly moderate the relationship between commitment and turnover intentions.

\[ H8: \text{ Constituent attachment moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions.} \]

**Methodology**

**Population and Sample Size**

The study examines the effect of organizational commitment on turnover intentions. It also looks at the impact of antecedents (i.e., “availability of training, motivation to learn and managerial support,”) on organizational commitment. The research also examines the mediating role of organizational commitment and the moderating role of constituent attachment. The scope of the study was limited to SMEs in Karachi. We had recruited surveyors to collect the data from selected SMEs in Karachi. A total of 410 questionnaires were distributed, and 385 responses were available for analysis.

**Respondents Profile**

The respondents’ profile indicates that about 70% were married individuals, and the remaining 30% were single. In terms of employment, we found that 25% of the respondents had a working experience that ranged up to 5 years; 55% of respondents’ working experience ranged between 5 to 10 years, while the rest had working experience from 10 to 20 years. The salaries of respondents ranged from Rs. 15000-70000. 23% of respondents’ salaries ranged between Rs.15000 to Rs.25,000; 37% respondents salaries ranged from Rs.25,000 to Rs.35,000; 30% respondents salaries ranged from Rs.35,000 to Rs.45,000; while 10% respondents salaries was above Rs.45,000.

**Pilot Testing**

We adapted the instrument from earlier studies. All the constructs used in the study had established reliability values. However, questionnaires adapted from developed countries may have a social desirability issue. Therefore, we asked six BBA students from
a private university to fill out the questionnaire as a pilot test. Subsequently, we took their opinion on the desirability issue. None of the students found the questionnaire to be against the social norms of the country.

**Scales and Measures**

The adapted questionnaire has seven constructs and 32 indicator variables. All the constructs have one factor, except organizational commitment, that has two elements. We measured the respondents’ opinion on the Five-point Likert Scale. “One represents highly disagree, and five represents highly agree.” A summary of constructs containing their sources, items, and reliability values is illustrated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability Values*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Bothma and Roodt (2013)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75 to 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Allen and Meyer et al. (1993)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.78 to 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Training</td>
<td>Newman et al., (2011)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83 to 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Support</td>
<td>Newman et al., (2011)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.77 to 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
<td>Noe and Schmitt (1986)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.77 to 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Attachment</td>
<td>Maertz and Campion (2004)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.74 to 0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

We have used the Smart PLS software for data analyses. The measurement model (presented in Figure 2) and Structural Model (Illustrated in Figure 3) provide the empirical results.

**Results**

Table 1 illustrates the results related to descriptive analyses (i.e., “Cronbach's alpha, mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avail. of Training</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>-0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Support for Training</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
<td>-1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>-1.001</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent attach.</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>-0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>4.101</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that Cronbach's Alpha values range from (α =0.715 to α= 0.896). It is lowest for constituent attachment (α=0.715, Mean=3.76, SD=1.60), and the highest
for the availability of training ($\alpha=0.896$, Mean=3.99, SD=0.89). Given these Cronbach’s Alpha values, we have concluded that the adopted constructs have acceptable internal consistency (Hair et al., 2014). Further, the skewness (SK) values range from -0.800 to 1.116. We found that the highest skewness value is for turnover intentions (SK =1.116, Mean= 4.101, SD= 0.1.67), and the lowest for motivation to learn (SK =-0.800, Mean= 4.15, SD= 1.98). We also found that the Kurtosis values range from -0.993 to 1.876. The highest kurtosis is for managerial support for training (KR = 1.876, Mean= 4.25, SD= 1.37), and the lowest is for constituent attachment (KR = -0.993, Mean= 3.76, SD= 1.60). Given these results, we believe that the constructs are within the prescribed range of univariate normality.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

The study has examined the convergent validity based on “composite reliability and AVE.” Composite validity was assessed through the Fornell & Larcker (1981) criteria. We have summarized the results in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Convergent and Discriminant Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. of Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr. Support for Train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent attach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the highest composite reliability is for managerial support for training (CR=0.917), and the lowest is for turnover intentions (CR=0.867). The highest AVE is for constituent attachment (AVE=0.772), and the lowest is for motivation to learn (AVE=0.623). Given these results, we have inferred that the latent variables meet the requirement of convergent validity. The results also illustrate that the Pearson Correlation values are lesser than the square root of variance extracted, suggesting that the latent variables are “unique and distinct.”

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We have used Confirmatory Factor Analysis (results in Table 4) to “verify the factor structure of a set of the observed variables.”
Table 4: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Training</th>
<th>Constituent Attachment</th>
<th>Manager Support for Training</th>
<th>Motivation to Learn</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT4</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA4</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA5</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML1</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML2</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML4</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC1</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC2</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC3</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC4</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC5</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC6</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC7</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC8</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the factor loadings for all the indicator variables are greater
than 0.60, suggesting that all the indicator variables have a theoretical association with the individual constructs.

**Direct Hypotheses**

We have formulated four direct hypotheses. The summary of direct effects is illustrated in Table 5. The measurement and structural models are depicted in Figure 2 and Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Results of Direct Effects</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T Stat</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability Training. -&gt; Org. Commitment (H1)</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>19.905</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn -&gt; Org. Commitment (H2)</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Support -&gt; Org. Commitment (H3)</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>7.962</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Comm. -&gt; Turnover Int. (H4)</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>5.060</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results suggest that all the direct hypotheses were accepted, except the hypothesis 2, which is the “association between motivation to learn and organizational commitment.”

**Indirect Hypothesis**

We have formulated three mediating hypotheses and one moderating hypothesis. The results are illustrated in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Results of Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T Stat</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Training. -&gt; Org. Com. -&gt; Turn Int. (H5)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>11.9027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Supp. for Train. -&gt; Org. Com. -&gt; Turnover Int. (H6)</td>
<td>0.0688</td>
<td>5.2172</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Learn -&gt; Org. Com. -&gt; Turn. Int. (H7)</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
<td>1.5889</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating Effect of Constituent Attachment (H8)</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the three proposed mediating relationships, our results do not support one hypothesis, i.e., the “mediating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between motivation to learn and turnover intentions.” We also did not find support for the moderating effect of constituent attachment on turnover intentions.
Figure 2: Measurement Model

Figure 3: Structural Model
Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion

Hypothesis 1 states that the “availability of training programs and organizational commitment are positively associated,” supported by the empirical results. Training and development facilities available in a firm motivate employees to develop a positive attitude, enhance organizational commitment, and give them a competitive edge (Dias & Silva, 2016). Researchers believe that firms that invest in employees’ training, development and growth. Such firms are attractive to existing and potential employees (Egan, Yang & Bartlett, 2004). Alamri and Al-Duhaim (2017) argue that it is difficult to measure the causal relationship between training and organizational performance. Blundell et al. (1999) suggest that a “lack of suitable data and methodological difficulties have prevented adequate assessment of the impact of human capital appreciation on firm performance while estimates of the impact of training on productivity are subject to wide margins of uncertainty.” Since HRM practices affect employee attitudes and behavior, therefore, Alsamman, Aldulaimi, and Alsharedah (2016) suggest that firms should examine the effect of training on organizational commitment, which is positively associated with organizational performance.

Hypothesis 2 states that “motivation to learn promotes organizational commitment,” but not supported by the results. Employees concerned about personal growth and career development have a high motivation to learn and are more committed to their jobs (Kovach, 2018). Such employees employ newly acquired skills at the workplace, enhancing their performance (Egan, Yang & Bartlett, 2004). Thus, both firms and their employees benefit. Ahmad and Bakar (2003) suggest that the motivation to learn stimulates affective commitment but has an insignificant association with continuous commitment. Therefore, besides organizing training and developing programs for employees, firms should encourage them to take such programs seriously (Pesc, et al., 2018).

Hypothesis 3 states that managerial support promotes organizational commitment, which our results support. The motivation level is not the same for all employees. It depends on a host of factors, including their attitude towards life and career (Demiral, 2017). Dias and Silva (2016) suggest that highly motivated employees have a favorable attitude towards learning. This attitude translates into organizational commitment. In contrast, employees with low motivation have a low inclination to learn and low organizational commitment (Hanaysha, 2016). Besides, employees with a high level of motivation also develop positive feelings and organizational commitment (Baird, Tung & Yu, 2019). Chen and Chiu (2018) found that regardless of employees’ motivation
level, training programs are a driver of organizational commitment. Ekrot, Rank, and Gemünden (2016) indicate that employees try to apply the newly acquired skills in their job after attending a training program.

Hypothesis 4 states that “organizational commitment has a negative effect on turnover intentions.” Contrarily, our results found a positive association with the association of these variables. Turnover intentions have negative consequences for employers. Employers’ investment in the development of employees goes to waste. They have to invest in hiring and developing a new workforce (Rawashdeh & Tamimi, 2019). Past studies suggest an inconsistent association between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. For example, Silva and Dias (2016) argue that employees with low organizational commitment do not maintain a sustainable relationship with the employer. Similarly, Butali and Njoroge (2017) suggest that employees perform adversely due to low commitment, and their intention to stay with the organization decreases significantly. In contrast, many studies found that an organization with a conducive working environment enhances employee attitude and reduces turnover intentions (Hitotsuyanagi-Hansel, Froese & Pak, 2016; Kim, Song & Lee, 2016).

Conclusion

Based on theoretical support, we have developed a new model with four direct hypotheses, three mediating hypotheses, and one moderating hypothesis. We found that antecedents such as “availability of training and managerial support for training” stimulate organizational commitment. However, we did not find any support for the “association between motivation to learn and organizational commitment” in Karachi SMEs. Contrary to earlier literature, we found that organizational commitment stimulates turnover intentions. Training and development is a critical factor to promote a positive attitude towards work and enhance organizational commitment. Firms that invest in training and development of employees may benefit in several ways. These firms may have a large pool of skilled workers that may stay with them for a longer period. It also gives a competitive edge to such firms. However, just arranging training for employees is not sufficient. Organizations should support and motivate employees to attend trainings. Employees who have a high motivation to learn benefit from training also apply the skills and knowledge at work. Thus, it not only enhances their motivational level but also increases their organizational performance. Our results suggest that employees of SMEs in Karachi have a low motivational level for learning. Therefore, SMEs should encourage and motivate them for training. This is necessary for employee development and the sustainable growth of SMEs.

We also found that organizational commitment mediates (1) availability of training
and turnover intentions, (2) managerial support, and turnover intentions. However, we did not find support on the mediating role of organizational commitment on motivation to learn and turnover intentions. We also found that constituent attachment does not moderate turnover intentions.

Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to SMEs in Karachi. Other researchers can extend research in different sectors and cities. Further, a comparative analysis between two sectors may provide insight into training and organizational commitment issues. While we have focused on a few variables, researchers can include other antecedents, such as “work stress, work-life conflict, and abusive behavior.” The study has examined the mediating role of organizational commitment, future studies can study the mediating impact of citizenship behavior, abusive supervision and employer branding.
## Annexure 1

### Turnover Intentions
- I often think of quitting my present job
- I may leave this company and work for another company in the next year
- I plan to stay in this company to develop my career for a long time
- I may not have a good future if I stay with this organization

### Commitment

#### Affective Commitment
- I really feel that this organization's problems are my own.
- I do not feel like "part of the family" at this organization.
- I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.
- I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization

#### Continuous Commitment
- Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now
- I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this Organization
- One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives
- One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives

### Availability of Training
- My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training
- My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job-specific skills and knowledge
- My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organization which may be of use to me in the future
- My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training programs and seminars outside of the organization

### Managerial Support
- I am comfortable discussing my skill weaknesses with my manager
- My manager shares information (problems, trends) influencing career plans
- My manager supports my participation in training and development programs
- My manager gives me coaching and guidance to help achieve my work objectives
- My manager believes advising and training as one of his/her major job responsibilities
- I do not hesitate to tell my manager of a training need
- My manager makes sure I get the training and development needed for job effectiveness
- My manager provides me with specific feedback on my job performance
Motivation to Learn
I try to learn as much as I can from training programs
I believe I tend to learn more from training programs than others
I am usually motivated to learn skills emphasized in training programs

Constituent Attachment
I want to continue working with my coworkers here
I want to continue to work here because I like my coworkers
I enjoy working at [company name] because of the people I work with
I would lose valuable working relationships with the people here if I quit
I would lose valuable friendships if I quit
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