The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support and Safety Climate on Voluntary Turnover in the Transportation Industry

J. Kirk Ring   Kirk.Ring@wichita.edu
Department of Management
Wichita State University
Wichita, KS 67260, USA

Abstract

A model investigating the relationship between safety climate, perceived organizational support, and voluntary turnover is developed and tested with data collected from the trucking industry. Perceived organizational support is shown to mediate the relationship between safety climate and voluntary turnover, but this effect occurs only with tenured employees who are not at the beginning or end of their careers. This implicates a curvilinear relationship of the variables and offers statistical support for a temporal nature of perceived organizational support which has not been found in previous studies.

Keywords: Perceived Organizational Support, Turnover, Safety Climate, Empirical

1. INTRODUCTION

From its inception, perceived organizational support has received justified attention and continues to be a promising theoretical contribution to issues of social exchange. By looking at the pieces of this powerful theory, the current study attempts to build upon its depth by including yet another variable to the growing list of variables used to assess how individuals perceive support from their organizations. Interestingly, perceived organizational support literature has yet to include variables pertaining to safety and risk in the work environment. The only study to date that included a factor of work environment used the term job conditions which was considered to be an assessment of whether or not employees enjoyed their daily job activities and whether or not they had control over these tasks [15].

Organizations face substantial costs when accidents and injuries occur in the workplace. Among a multitude of others, these costs may include monetary awards granted for worker compensation, insurance and medical costs, and a loss of human capital. According to the National Safety Council's Injury Facts [1] report, the workplace accidents of 2003 in the United States alone attributed to 3,400,000 disabling injuries and 4,500 deaths which led to a staggering total cost of $156 billion, the majority of which was due to lost wages and productivity. These enormous expenses have catapulted the control of safety issues to the forefront of many organizations' objectives.

Organizations with long track records for keeping employees safe and for promoting safe actions through communication, training, and incentive programs build a good reputation [5] and organizational safety climate which may lead to a reduction accidents, claims filed, and as shown later in this article, voluntary turnover. Organizations and researchers alike understand turnover negatively affects organizational performance [17], [27], [28] due to the costs associated with searching, hiring, and training new employees, and the decreased efficiency related to new employee inexperience. Perceived organizational support has also been considered as an important factor when investigating the causes of turnover [3], [19], [29]. When considering turnover, perceived organizational support has shown that the reciprocal actions taken by

individuals toward the organization generate organizational commitment and a reduction in voluntary turnover.

The similarities of safety climate and perceived organizational support and their effects on individuals within the organization need further investigation. Therefore, the purpose of this manuscript is to present arguments, supported by empirical research, to further explain the relationship between safety climate, perceived organizational support, and voluntary turnover. The manuscript differentiates between voluntary and involuntary turnover because this offers a more complete description of how organizations can proactively reduce the amount of turnover present [17], [27], [28].

The paper is organized as follows. Relevant literature regarding perceived organizational support, followed by safety issues and safety climate, is discussed. Next, a brief review of the types, causes, and effects of turnover in an organization is presented. These analyses set the stage for hypotheses brought forth to explain the relationships between perceived organizational support, safety climate, and voluntary turnover. Data was collected in the U.S. trucking industry to test these hypotheses. The trucking industry offered an environment that fosters a need for safety and thus was deemed appropriate for our study. Analysis of the data is presented after a brief introduction of the methods used for collection. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications these theoretical arguments have on human resource management practices and issues for the direction of future research.

2. BACKGROUND AND THEORY
2.1 Perceived Organizational Support and Safety Climate
Perceived organizational support, developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa [14], suggests that employees develop perceptions regarding the degree to which their organization values their contributions and the amount of concern exhibited towards their well-being. The underpinnings of perceived organizational support are derived from social exchange theory which was developed to explain interpersonal relationship maintenance in the context of the work environment. Once an individual has assessed the organizational support they receive, they act in accordance with a norm of reciprocity [18]. Thus, when individuals are dealt with in a fair and just way, they will be obligated to react in a positive manner toward those who initiate the treatment.

When an individual perceives the organization to be supporting them by valuing their contribution to the organization and by indicating concern for their well-being, the individual will then feel obligated to be committed to the organization and will show this commitment through increased work efforts [13], [14], reduced absenteeism [13], [14], and reduced turnover intention [19]. Also, several studies have indicated specific job conditions that contribute to perceived organizational support. For example, Wayne et al. [29] found that promotions and adequate training were positively related to perceived organizational support. Alternatively, when the organization repeatedly indicates that the contribution and well being of individuals is not highly valued, then employees will lose their commitment to the organization and will in turn decrease their performance on the job [12]. According to Eisenberger et al. [12], the decreased commitment and performance of employees leads to an increased level of intention to quit the organization.

An important distinction of social exchange theorists comes from discretionary versus mandatory actions taken by the organization. Voluntary aid given by the organization leads employee to believe they are genuinely respected and valued in the organization, while mandatory or required actions do not have any affect on their beliefs of the organization [10], [12], [18]. The ability of the organization to exert discretionary actions will vary across the organization, as will the perceptions employees have concerning these actions. The organization will be constrained by a variety of factors throughout its divisions and therefore freedom to act in a discretionary manner will be limited [12].

Safety climate has been defined as "the manifestation of the underlying safety culture in safety-related behaviors of employees and in employees' expressed attitudes" [24]. In other words, safety climate represents the attitudes of the employees toward safety which can affect the actual safety level that the organization reaches. Safety climate has been operationalized through the distribution of survey questionnaires to employees and these studies, similar to perceived organizational support, have persistently shown management commitment and employee training as contributing factors [16]. Safety preparation or training is an important factor of a safety climate [20]. Job training programs reveal the intentions and commitment of the organization by showing employees that they are valued [31]. The actions taken by the organization to keep employees safe will lead to positive employee attitudes toward safety and will have significant effect on the safety climate. It is important to indicate that employees must feel that this is a genuine interest in their welfare [5].

Barling and Hutchinson [5] commented that scholars have dealt with the issues of safety through two different approaches: control-based orientation or commitment-based orientation. The control-based orientation creates a managerial method that stresses rule enforcement, develops occupational goals, and creates reward and punishment structures. This orientation fits well with other control-based initiatives outlined by human resource managers in an attempt to reduce costs and realize enhanced efficiency [4]. The commitment-based orientation crafts a managerial method which infuses trust and organizational commitment by allowing employees to participate in the decision processes, offering better training, and paying higher wages. The main idea behind commitment-based orientation is that it will facilitate a more effective way to prolong an organization's competitive advantage.

The commitment-based approach is more effective in sustaining a competitive advantage than the control-based approach because trust in management and organizational commitment are positively related [23]. Barling and Hutchinson [5] believe that the managerial staff's exhibition of legitimate interest in the welfare of employees infuses commitment to the organization better than simply acting in accordance with administrative and government safety regulations. Employees create their assessment of the safety climate by observing the actions, actual or spoken, of management and then deciding if management is truly committed to their safety. This portrayed legitimate interest then alters the safety climate of the organization.

As in perceived organizational support literature, the management of a firm must use discretionary or voluntary actions above and beyond that which is required to elicit commitment from its employees. Individuals who think the organization enacts safety measures to comply with regulatory agencies will likely not exhibit reciprocal behaviors and will not feel positive effects towards the safety climate. Also similar to perceived organizational support, safety climate will take on a favorable or unfavorable nature based on the perceptions of management's actions and indication of employee value.

Recent research of safety has detailed the different roles organizational support plays in worker safety behaviors [9], the development of favorable safety climates [24], safety climate moderation of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship [21], and safety related behavior when related to social exchange [20]. Thus, similar to perceived organizational support, the literature regarding safety climate has begun to acknowledge a relationship with social exchange. Another important study described the relationship between safety communication and that of perceived organizational support [20]. It demonstrated that perceived organizational support was positively related to safety communication. This stems from the idea that employees are more willing to make suggestions with the intent of helping the organization when they perceive the organization to support them. This offers another example of the similarity of safety climate and perceived organizational support because safety communication is one of the major factors in creating a favorable safety climate [20]. As can be seen above, safety climate and perceived organizational support both rely on discretionary management actions, adequate training of employees, and legitimate concern for the value and

well-being of employees. Also, each has been shown to lead to reciprocal behaviors such as organizational commitment and more effective work habits. Thus,

>Hypothesis 1: Perceived organizational support is positively related to favorable safety climates.

2.2 Turnover

Knowing turnover's effects is important for organizations, but first it is important to adequately understand the processes of turnover by demarcating it into two distinct groups: voluntary and involuntary turnover. Voluntary turnover occurs when an individual purposefully decides to leave a job for reasons other than retirement or similar life circumstances. Voluntary turnover generally occurs when an individual foresees comparable work alternatives available or when the current job is no longer attractive [22]. Involuntary turnover occurs when organizational actions are taken to relieve an individual from their position. The importance of this distinction comes from the fundamental differences regarding reasons why the two types occur [27]. Individuals who leave a job may be unsatisfied with the organization or may have better prospects elsewhere while involuntary turnover could stem from market forces or from bad hiring procedures at the human recourses level. Combining the two types of turnover leads to incorrect descriptions of what may actually be occurring within an organization.

The turnover literature developed over the last three decades has focused primarily on turnover determinants and has used turnover, or the intent to quit, as the dependent variable in empirical studies [17]. The basic premise that scholars have taken while conducting their research has been that increased amounts of voluntary or involuntary turnover will have ill effects on the performance of the organization [25], [28]. In a recent study, Shaw et al. [28] countered this belief by showing that the relationship may more complex than a standard linear model. They posit that the relationship takes a curvilinear shape due to the fact that as turnover increases organizational performance decreases only to a particular level and then begins to level out. The diminishing effect of turnover established in their study has implications for Abelson and Baysinger's [2] optimal turnover model.

Abelson and Baysinger [2] previously created a similar figure in their study to that of Shaw et al. [28] by looking at the degree of performance and turnover through a relational diagram. Both studies clearly show that an optimal turnover rate can be reached and that this rate is "the rate that minimizes the sum of the costs of turnover plus the costs associated with reducing it" [2]. Organizations should not consider this optimal rate to be the same for all because differing environments will dictate various rates for each company [7]. Turnover research has been conducted predominantly from the individual level but some studies have also dealt with turnover from the organizational and industry levels [27]. According to Shaw et al. [27], the organizational level aspect of turnover research has been neglected but does offer considerable insight as to how the two types of turnover transpire. Arthur [4] chose human resource activities to operationalize the organizational level aspect of turnover and found that turnover and performance relationships are dependent on these activities of the organization.

Arthur's [4] findings have particular implications for the current study. Specifically, the actions of human resources, which are basically a portion of the actions of management, can be seen throughout the variables that describe perceived organizational support and safety climates. For example, both have shown adequate training will lead to favorable perceptions from employees. Also, both theories claim that the perception of management's commitment to employees is important for positive development and that management's commitment is indicated through its actions. Thus, due to the similar affects on perceived organizational support and safety climate from managerial actions and the multiple studies showing a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and voluntary turnover, favorable safety climate may also have a negative relationship with voluntary turnover. Thus:

Hypothesis 2: Perceived organizational support is negatively related to voluntary turnover.

Hypothesis 3: Favorable safety climates are negatively related to voluntary turnover.

Mediation of the relationship between safety climate and voluntary turnover may exist. Several perceived organizational support studies included job conditions as antecedents of perceived organizational support [3], [11], [26], [29]. Since the safety climate is contingent on several factors that may be seen as job conditions, it too may be mediated by perceived organizational support. The nature of the mediation is contingent upon the results of the three previous hypotheses. Thus,

Hypothesis 4: The negative relationship between safety climate and voluntary turnover is mediated by perceived organizational support.

3. METHODS
3.1 Sample
The data for this study were obtained from a trucking company in the United States that is composed of team, single, and local drivers. Surveys were distributed throughout the drivers and all replies were kept confidential. Data were sought regarding intent to quit, safety procedures, safety perceptions, and support from management and its policies. Though not used for this specific research project, questions regarding dispatch, pay satisfaction and accuracy, and load levels were also acquired. To ensure that no other relationships affected the dependent variable, these items were used within a subsequent regression analysis and provided no significant relationship with any of the variables. Responses were received from 113 company drivers. After reviewing the data and ridding it of non-responses, 103 usable responses remained.
Measures

3.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis
To assess the extent to which the scales created held together, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. This analysis included the items for perceived organizational support, safety climate and voluntary turnover. The turnover items were excluded from this analysis since they pertained to factual information that was not predicted to be internally consistent. The results of the principle components analysis with varimax rotation are shown in Table 1.

3.3 Independent Variables
Perceived organizational support was calculated by creating a 5-item scale similar to the Eisenberger et al. [12] perceived organizational support scale. This scale assesses the degree to which an individual perceives their organization values their contributions and the amount of concern exhibited towards their well-being. It was created for this specific study and used five-point Likert-type scales for responses that ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." An example item is, "Top management realizes how important company drivers are to success." Confirmatory factor analysis was used and showed that all items loaded onto one factor. The alpha coefficient for this scale was .86.

Safety Climate was calculated by creating a 3-item scale for this specific study. This scale also used five-point Likert-type scales for responses that ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." The safety climate scale represents the attitudes of the employees toward safety which are derived from the actions of management. An example item is, "We hear more about the need to increase productivity than about the need to be safe," (reverse coded). Confirmatory factor analysis was used and showed that all items loaded onto one factor. The alpha coefficient for this scale was .68.

3.4. Dependent Variable.
Intent to quit was used as the dependent variable in this study. As stated previously, this follows

Scale and Item	Factor Loading[a]		
	1	2	3
POS			
Top management realizes how important company drivers are to Miller's success	*0.71*	0.28	0.33
Miller makes sure new drivers understand exactly what the job is like	*0.44*	0.27	0.33
I left orientation felling that this company really cares about us	*0.61*	0.16	0.25
Top management will act on the results of this survey	*0.60*	0.15	0.31
Company drivers are often treated like second-class citizens at Miller	*0.62*	0.19	0.39
Intent to Quit			
I see myself working at miller for a long time[b]	-0.13	*-0.91*	-0.25
I don't plan to drive for Miller much longer	-0.27	*-0.55*	-0.09
I've found a home at Miller[b]	-0.30	*-0.80*	-0.16
Safety			
Miller emphasizes safety	0.16	0.26	*0.61*
Management is always talking about how important safety is	0.30	0.08	*0.57*
We hear more about the need to increase productivity than about the need to be safe[b]	0.27	0.06	*0.73*
Eigenvalue[c]	3.77	2.77	2.74
Percentage of variance explained[c]	23.59	17.32	17.15
Alpha	0.83	0.83	0.68

[a]Factor Loadings for the correct scale are shown in italics type.

[b] Indicates items reverse coded.

[c]Derived from rotation sum of squared loadings

TABLE 1: Factor Analysis Results for Multi-Item Subjective Scales

many authors' operationalizations of voluntary turnover. A three-item scale was specifically created for this study but resembles the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire's items. This scale also used five-point Likert-type scales for responses that ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." An example item is, "I see myself working at the company for a long time." Confirmatory factor analysis was used and showed that all items loaded onto one factor. The alpha coefficient for this scale was .83.

3.5. Control Variables
Rhoades and Eisenberger [26] noted that the demographic variable of tenure, along with several others, had not "eliminated bivariate relationships involving POS" but they did choose to include it to "decide the extent of [its] relationship with POS." Therefore, following Rhoades and Eisenberger, tenure was controlled for in this study. Tenure was calculated by asking the following question: "How long have you driven for Miller?" The responses were given in months. Analyses

Following the guidelines set forth by Baron and Kenny [6], linear regression analysis was used to test Hypotheses 1-4. Regression equations were computed in Hypothesis 1 by entering Intent to Quit as the dependent variable and Safety Climate as the independent variable. Next, Perceived Organizational Support was entered as the dependent variable with Safety Climate again as the independent variable. Then, Intent to Quit was entered as the dependent variable while Safety Climate and Perceived Organizational Support were both entered as independent variables. In the first analysis, tenure was not controlled. Then tenure was separated into two groups, those above the mean and those below the mean. Last, tenure was separated into three groups: lower quartile (25% of data set), interquartile range (50% of data set), and upper quartile (25% of data set). The steps provided by Baron and Kenny (1986) were taken again with each tenure group.

Results

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the study variables. Although not hypothesized, there was a significant, negative relationship between perceived organizational support and tenure (r = -.28). When looking at this relationship, it must be noted that the standard deviation in tenure was extremely high which may indicate distinct groups amongst the individuals surveyed. Table 2 shows initial support for Hypotheses 1-3. There was significant correlations between perceived organizational support and safety climate (r = .58; Hypothesis 1), perceived organizational support and intent to turnover (r = -.51; Hypothesis 2), and safety climate and intent to turnover (r = -.33; Hypothesis 3).

Variable	Likert Scale	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4
1. Safety	1-5	3.83	0.74	*0.68*			
2. POS	1-5	2.90	0.94	0.58**	*0.82*		
3. Intent to Quit	1-5	2.40	0.94	-0.33**	-0.51**	*0.83*	
4. Tenure	mo.	131.79	96.15	-.11	-.28**	0.04	

** p < .01

Coefficient Alpha for scales found on diagonal in italics

TABLE 2: Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

To further test these results and to adequately test the proposed mediation effect in Hypothesis 4, regression analyses were conducted in the manner set forth by Baron and Kenny [6]. Table 3 provides a summary of the models and results used to test Hypothesis 1-4.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that perceived organizational support would be positively related to safety climate. The regression analysis revealed that perceived organizational support was significantly related to safety climate (b = .619; sig. = .000), thus supporting Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 predicted that perceived organizational support would be negatively related to intent to turnover (b = -.525; sig. = .000), thus supporting Hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 3 predicted that safety climate would be negatively related to intent to turnover. Once again, the results showed support for Hypothesis 3 (b = -.450; sig. = .000).

Hypothesis 4 predicted that perceived organizational support would mediate the relationship between safety climate and intent to turnover. Given the results of Hypotheses 1-3, the preconditions for mediation were supported [3]. The final step for the mediation showed that, when regressed onto intent to turnover, perceived organizational support continued to be significant (b = -.381; sig. = .000) while safety climate was no longer significant (b = -.212; sig. = .058). This indicates that there was adequate mediation by perceived organizational support, thus supporting Hypothesis 4.

		df	b	s.e.	t	sig.
1	*All tenure included*	103				
	Safety Climate		-0.212	0.110	-1.918	0.058
	POS		-0.381	0.111	-3.429	0.001
2	*Tenure < 131*	59				
	Safety Climate		-0.386	0.143	-2.704	0.009
	POS		-0.247	0.136	-1.822	0.074
3	*Tenure >= 131*	44				
	Safety Climate		-0.120	0.165	-0.729	0.470
	POS		-0.453	0.187	-2.420	0.021
4	*Tenure < 50*	23				
	Safety Climate		-0.519	0.240	-2.165	0.043
	POS		-0.087	0.209	-0.417	0.681
5	*Tenure > 50 and < 190*	55				
	Safety Climate		-0.055	0.148	-0.368	0.715
	POS		-0.343	0.159	-2.162	0.036
6	*Tenure > 190*	25				
	Safety Climate		-0.646	0.206	-3.140	0.005
	POS		-0.212	0.232	-0.911	0.373

TABLE 3: Regression Analyses and Mediation Results

Though the preceding results seem compelling and do support the hypotheses developed, the significant relationship between perceived organizational support and tenure must be further investigated. Therefore, tenure was separated in two ways to test its influence on the relationships represented by the data. First, tenure was separated by simply creating two groups that were composed of those individuals with months of tenure above the mean tenure amount (m = 131) and those with tenure below the mean tenure amount. All of the steps provided by Baron and Kenny [3] were rerun for each group. This same procedure was conducted in the second separation procedure. In the second procedure, tenure was delineated between the lower quartile, the interquartile range, and the upper quartile of the data set. Results for these analyses may also be seen in Table 3.

Baron and Kenny's [3] preconditions were met with each of the five analyses. When looking at the group of individuals with tenure below the mean tenure amount, the mediation effect of perceived organizational support does not occur because safety climate does not become nonsignificant (b = -.386; sig. = .009) while perceived organizational support becomes nonsignificant (b = -.247; sig. = .074). In the second analysis, using those with tenure above the mean tenure amount, perceived organizational support continues to be significant (b = -.453; sig. = .021) while safety climate becomes nonsignificant (b = -.120; sig. = .470), thus supporting mediation. The lower quartile was then created, which included those individuals who had been with the company for less than 50 months. This analysis showed that perceived organizational support was nonsignificant (b = -.087; sig. = .681) and safety climate was significant (b = -.519; sig. = .043), thus not supporting mediation. The interquartile range consisted of those individuals with tenure between 50 and 190 months. This analysis showed that perceived organizational support was significant (b = -.343; sig. = .036) and that safety climate was nonsignificant (b = -.055; sig. = .715), thus supporting mediation. Last, the upper quartile was calculated and consisted of those individuals with tenure above 190 months. This analysis showed that perceived organizational support was nonsignificant (b = -.212; sig. = .373) while safety climate was significant (b = -.646; sig. = .005), thus not supporting mediation.

4. DISCUSSION

To summarize the results, it was found that (a) perceived organizational support was significantly and positively related to safety climate, (b) perceived organizational support was significantly and negatively related intent to turnover, (c) safety climate was significantly and negatively related intent to turnover, and (d) perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between safety climate and intent to turnover. Due to the great variability in the tenure of the drivers in this company and due to tenure's high correlation with perceived organizational support, further analysis was conducted that separated tenured individuals into groups. Perhaps the most notable finding from these results was that as tenure varied across the groups, so did the mediation effect of perceived organizational support.

The first supplementary analysis, which separated tenure above and below the median tenure amount, showed that those individuals with low tenure would likely quit due to issues regarding safety and that perceived organizational support was not of importance. The exact opposite was found by those individuals who have high tenure. A possible explanation for this relationship could be that when employees are hired for jobs that include issues of safety and hazard, they may find safety to be the most important factor indicating whether or not the company has legitimate concern for their value and well-being. Thus, the safety training and communication from the very start of dangerous jobs may help to reduce the amount of voluntary turnover within a company. As time goes on, safety climate's indication of concern for employee well-being may be met and then issues regarding perceived organizational support may become more salient. This would explain the mediation effect found when individuals in the organization have relatively high tenure.

Upon further analysis, a curvilinear effect was shown to exist in the data set. Individuals early in their career found safety to be highly important. Individuals with middle range tenure (interquartile range) found that perceived organizational support was more important. Last, individuals late in their career, once again, found safety to be highly important. These interesting results could lead to a number of interpretations. For example, as stated in the previous grouping, the lower tenured employees would likely be highly interested in their safety when starting a new job of a hazardous or dangerous nature. As time goes on and they become comfortable with the way the organization handles safety issues, they become more inclined to find factors of perceived organizational support to be more important when considering quitting the organization. Finally, as they enter the final years of their employment prior to retirement, they once again start to find safety to be an important factor in their intention to quit. This may mean that as individuals near the end of their careers in industries with dangerous work requirements, they will not find factors of perceived organizational support as important as in prior years. For example, a driver with the organization studied here, may begin to disregard whether or not his supervisor values him and his work efforts when he enters the final stages of his career with the company. He may be "counting the days" until retirement. Also, he may have reached a plateau in the organization's hierarchy and pay structure. Thus, at this time in his life, making it through the final years on the job would be more important than some of the factors involved with perceived organizational support.

From the results shown here, it could be argued that offering high levels of safety training at the beginning of an employee's career and offering more safety, or less dangerous work, to those who have been on the job for many years, would reduce their intention to quit the organization. In the current analysis, individuals who are in the upper quartile based on tenure would not be required to haul highly hazardous materials; they would be more involved in safety meetings; and they would be asked to help in the training of less tenured employees regarding safety procedures and concerns. In this case, employees in the lower quartile would receive adequate training and communication of the safety climate within the organization, and the upper quartile employees would take active participation in this activity while reducing their hazardous job requirements. This interpretation also supports the fact that safety climate may not be stable across time periods [24].

Although this study has interesting findings, it has several limitations that need to be addressed in future research. First, the cross-sectional design of the current study does not allow for causality to be inferred from the results. As noted by Wright, Gardner, Moynihan, and Allen [30], human resource practices have not been studied through predictive designs very often and this creates results that lack causal inference. It is not possible to infer whether or not reduced safety requirements for those with longer tenure would reduce the intent to quit the organization, and thus our results should be interpreted with caution. A way to combat this issue would be to use longitudinal designs when conducting research of this nature. A second limitation of this study is common method variance possibly created by using the same procedure from a single source to obtain the responses from drivers. An interesting addition to this research would have been to inquire on the opinion of the supervisors for the employees concerning safety climate and perceived organizational support. This data could then be compared with that of the employees for a better understanding. Another possibility would have been to use a mixed methods approach and include qualitative data with the results of the study. Personal interviews that contain open-ended questions would suffice in this endeavor. A final limitation to the study is its generalizability to other organizations. By using a company from an industry that has obvious safety issues, we have limited our generalizations to other companies found in similar industries. This may seem to be a grievous error but in actuality it fits well with our presentation of the theoretical foundations of the construct safety climate. Safety climate will be more salient to individuals who find themselves employed in industries that require high levels of safety regulation and training. Employment that requires high levels of safety can be found throughout many industries. In particular, transportation, manufacturing, and construction firms should find the results of this study to be valuable.

Future research should take into consideration the limitations of this study but the implications of these results should be furthered by scholars in a number of ways. First, perceived organizational support has been shown by Rhoades and Eisenberger [26] to have no temporal nature. The current study offers different results. By showing the issues of safety climate as more important to new employees and long-tenured employees than perceived organizational support, this study may be the first indication that perceived organizational support not only occurs after adequate time in the organization, but also may decline after many years of employment. Perceived organizational support continued to have a positive relationship with employees throughout all tenure groups. It was not until the mediation effect was analyzed that the implication of perceived organizational support fluctuating appeared. Scholars should investigate this further by looking at the mediating effects of other variables with perceived organizational support and their relationships with tenure. Also, research regarding the issues of safety climate needs further investigation in light of the analysis. Safety climate reacted in a similar manner to perceived organizational support when limited to tenure groups. Therefore, research previously conducted concerning the development of favorable safety climates [24] and safety climate's moderation of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship [21] need to be reassessed with tenure as a control variable. Last, from a practitioner's standpoint, the implications of this study may help alleviate the pressures felt from the enormous costs associated with safety, injuries, and turnover. Finding new ways to create a positive safety climate will likely be the contributions of later work. This paper's intent was to give a full description of the safety climate and perceived organizational support and to call attention to its significance. Hopefully, further research will be able to operationalize these ideas to help human resource managers meet their organizational objectives.

5. CONCLUSION
As shown through this analysis, safety climate and perceived organizational support both rely on discretionary management actions, adequate training of employees, legitimate concern for the value and well-being of employees, and each lead to reciprocal behaviors such as organizational commitment and more effective work habits. The empirical results of this study have added yet another similarity between these constructs. Intention to quit the organization was highly related to both safety climate and perceived organizational support, but there were mixed results when varying the tenure of the employees in the study. Different tenure levels may cause the saliency

of the constructs to change. Specifically, a curvilinear relationship was recognized, with those employees who had either relatively low or relatively high tenure finding safety climate to be more important in relation to their intentions to quit the organization. Despite several limitations in this study, scholars should be able to utilize these findings to create novel studies to further investigate these relationships.

6. REFERENCES

1. "Injury Facts". Chicago: National Safety Council. 2004

2. M. Abelson, and B. Baysinger. "Optimal and dysfunctional turnover: Toward an organizational level model." Academy of Management Review, 9: 331-341, 1984

3. D. G. Allen, L. Shore, and R. Griffeth. "The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resources practices in the turnover process". Journal of Management, 29(1): 99-
118, 2003

4. J. B. Arthur. "Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover".
Academy of Management Journal, 37: 670-687, 1994

5. J. Barling and I. Hutchinson. "Commitment vs. control-based safety practices, safety reputation,
and perceived safety climate". Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 17(1): 76-84, 2000

6. R. M. Baron and D. A. Kenny. "The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological
research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51: 1173-1182, 1996

7. A. V. Beekman and R. B. Robinson. "An exploratory study of the management of supplier relationships in rapidly growing entrepreneurial firms". Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 7(1): 23-43,
2001

8. P. J. Boettke. "Foundations of entrepreneurship and economic development". CATO Journal: 344-347,
2003

9. J. K. Caird and T. J. Kline. "The relationship between organizational and individual variables to on-the-job driver accidents and accident-free kilometers". Ergonomics, 47(15): 1598-1613, 2004

10. N. Cotterell, R. Eisenberger and H. Speicher. "Inhibiting effects of reciprocation wariness on interpersonal relationships". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62: 658-668, 1992

11. I. Dekker and J. Barling. "Workforce size and work-related role stress". Work and Stress, 9: 45-54,
1995

12. R. Eisenberger, J. Cummings, S. Armeli and P. Lynch. "Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction". Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(5): 812-820, 1997

13. R. Eisenberger, P. M. Fasolo and V. Davis-LaMastro. "Effects of perceived organizational

support on employee diligence, innovation, and commitment". Journal of Applied Psychology, 53:
    51-59,
1990

14. R. Eisenberger, R. Huntington, S. Hutchison, and D. Sowa. "Perceived organizational
    support".
Journal of Applied Psychology, 53: 743-750, 1986

15. R. Eisenberger, L. Rhoades, and J. Cameron. "Does pay for performance increase or
    decrease
perceived self-determination and intrinsic motivation?" Journal of Personality and Social
    Psychology, 77:
1026-1040, 1999

16. R. Flin, K. Mearns, P. O'Connor and R. Bryden. "Measuring safety climate: Identifying the
common features". Safety Science, 34: 177-192, 2000

17. A. C. Glebbeek and E. H. Bax. "Is high employee turnover really harmful? An empirical test
    using
company records". Academy of Management Journal, 47(2): 277-286, 2004

18. A. W. Gouldner. "The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement". American Sociological
Review, 25: 161-178, 1960

19. R. A. Guzzo, K. A. Noonan and E. Elron, "Expatriate managers and the psychological
    contract".
Journal of Applied Psychology, 79: 617-626, 1994

20. D. A. Hofmann and F. P. Morgeson. "Safety related behavior as a social exchange: The role
    of
perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange". Journal of Applied Psychology,
    84(2):
286-296, 1999

21. D. A. Hofmann, F. P. Morgeson and S. J. Gerras. "Climate as a moderator of the relationship
between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an
    exemplar".
Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(1): 170-178, 2003

22. C. L. Hulin, M Roznowski and D. Hachiya. "Alternative opportunities and withdrawal
    decisions:
Empirical and theoretical discrepancies and an integration". Psychological Bulletin, 96: 233-250,
    1985

23. M. Konovsky and S. D. Pugh. "Citizenship behavior and social exchange". Academy of
Management Journal, 37: 656-669, 1994

24. K. Mearns, S. M. Whitaker and R. Flin, R. "Benchmarking safety climate in hazardous
environments: A longitudinal, interorganizational approach". Risk Analysis, 21(4): 771-786, 2001

25. J. Pencavel. "Wages, specific training, and labor turnover in U.S. manufacturing industries".
International Economic Review, 13: 53-64, 1972

26. L. Rhoades and R. Eisenberger. "Perceived organizational support: A review of literature".
    Journal
of Applied Psychology, 87(4): 698-714, 2002

27. J. D. Shaw, J. E. Delery, G. D. Jenkins Jr. and N. Gupta. "An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover". Academy of Management Journal, 41(5): 511-525, 1998

28. J. D. Shaw, N. Gupta, and J. E. Delery. "Alternative conceptualizations of the relationship between voluntary turnover and organizational performance". Academy of Management Journal, 48(1):
50-68, 2005

29. S. J. Wayne, L. M. Shore, and R. C. Liden. "Perceived organizational support and leader-member
exchange: A social exchange perspective". Academy of Management Journal, 40: 82-111, 1997

30. P. M. Wright, T. M. Gardner, L. M. Moynihan and M. R. Allen. "The relationship between HR practices and firm performance: Examining causal order". Personnel Psychology, 58: 408-446, 2005

31. D. Zohar. "Safety climate in industrial organizations: Theoretical and applied implications". Journal of Applied Psychology, 65: 96-102, 1980