ABSTRACT
We integrate the boundaryless career concept and the social exchange theory to propose that perceived organizational support for development (POSD) is significantly and positively related to job satisfaction and affective commitment, and negatively related to absenteeism. A perceived organizational support for development scale was created and empirically tested. We collected data from 413 individuals and conducted a path analysis. The results show that POSD significantly and positively relates to job satisfaction ($\beta=0.56$, $\rho<.01$) and affective commitment ($\beta=0.55$, $\rho<.01$), explaining the variance of 40% and 63%, respectively. However, POSD had no significant relationship with absenteeism. The implications are later discussed.
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INTRODUCTION
Companies spend billions of dollars in the U.S. on the training and development of their employees with the impression that such initiatives can be mutually beneficial to both the firm and the employee. In 2012 alone, an estimated $164.2 billion was spent by U.S. firms on the implementation of training and development programs (Miller, 2012). Organizations make these substantial investments and allocate additional resources into developing their talent pool because they understand the importance of their human capital and the positive effects it may have on organizational performance (Mayo, 2001).

The extant literature has supported this notion by providing evidence that link employee training and development to various positive individual and team outcomes such as higher job
satisfaction, higher job performance, higher affective organizational commitment, lower intent-to-turnover, etc. (Arthur Jr, Bennett Jr, Edens, & Bell, 2003; Bartlett, 2001; Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, Liden, & Bravo, 2011; Owens, 2006; Patton, Marlow, & Hannon, 2000; Schmidt, 2007) However, what has received much less attention is the employee’s perception of organizational support for career development, and whether or not this affect by itself has a significant relationship with individual behaviors and outcomes. Perceptions of organizational support for career development (POSD) are more than the actual formal training and development programs put into place by the organizations. POSD is multidimensional and includes, mentoring opportunities, rewards that emphasize achievement, educational assistance, promotion opportunities, lateral mobility, and performance reviews contingent on training and certifications.

This gap in the literature is very important to examine since it is imperative for decision makers to go beyond simply investing resources into training programs and to grasp employee mindsets. Understanding the importance of and responding to these mental models of employees’ perceived organizational support for career development can be beneficial to organizations as they look for ways to best motivate their employees and maximize their contributions to organizational outcomes. As a result, we seek to make a number of contributions to the management literature. First, we add to the career development literature by exploring the construct of POSD and studying its relationship with three job-related attitudinal and behavioral outcomes: job satisfaction, affective commitment, and absenteeism. Second, we create and test a scale for the measurement of perceived organizational support for development (POSD). Finally, we add to the boundaryless career concept and social exchange theory by integrating the two theories as a perspective into our investigation.

The organization of this paper is as follows. The next section will discuss a selected literature review and POSD conceptualization. The following section will be focused on our theoretical development and model. Then the methodology will be discussed in the fourth section. And the fifth section will highlight our results. Finally, the last section will be devoted to our discussion, implications for research and practice, limitations, and recommendations for future steps.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human Capital and the Resource-based view

Respected scholars have shown the importance of the development of human capital in the workplace (Crook, Ketchen, Combs, & Todd, 2008; Takeuchi, Lepak, Wang, & Takeuchi, 2007). Human capital is defined as the “knowledge, skills, and abilities” that manifest in human beings (Coff, 2002; Crook et al., 2008). According to resource-based theory (J. Barney, 1991; J. B. Barney, 1986, 2000, 2001; Lippman & Rumelt, 1982), firms that possess valuable resources that are rare, valuable, and not easily imitated, or substituted, will enjoy a competitive edge over rivals that can be sustainable. Superior human capital is a valuable resource that is limited in supply. And the knowledge, skills and capabilities that are embedded within an individual cannot be readily and easily be imitated by competitors. Some researchers argue that these assets are the most universally valuable resources that a firm can possess (Coff, 2002; Kogut & Zander, 1992).

Formal Training and Development and its limitations
Training and education have long been linked to human capital (G. S. Becker, 1964; Mincer & Polacheck, 1974). Because of this rapport, organizations have traditionally relied upon formal training and development programs as ways to facilitate learning and foster their workers’ skills, knowledge and abilities. Formal training and development programs have been shown to be advantageous to both individuals as well as organizations (Bartel, 1992; Binder et al., 1997; Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Le, Oh, Shaffer, & Schmidt, 2007). For the individual, not only do these initiatives offer rewards such as increased salaries and wages (Bartel, 1992), but they have also been shown to have positive effects on job satisfaction (Jones, Jones, Latreille, & Sloane, 2009). Concurrently for organizations, superior human capital can act as essential drivers of strategy and performance (Crook et al., 2008; Crook, Todd, Combs, Woehr, & Ketchen Jr, 2011; Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Crook et al. (2011) confirmed this in their meta-analysis of 66 studies, which showed evidence of human capital being key in determining operational performance as well as firm performance.

Relatedly, formal training and development programs as independent entities have been argued to have some shortcomings and limitations (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009; Cascio & Boudreau, 2010). These programs are not only often expensive to implement, but efficient implementation and effectiveness are constrained by budgets, workload demands, and a geographically scattered workforce (Noe, Clarke, & Klein, 2014). In addition, simply offering formal programs and requiring employees to attend may not be very beneficial to either the employee or the organization. Hicks and Klimoski (1987) asserted that the employee’s degree of choice, or the extent to which employees perceive that the training opportunities align with their needs and desires, is an important factor in the success of formal training programs. When merely obligated to attend these programs, employees may not be motivated to fully reap the benefits of the training. Thus, without the trainees exerting the proper attention and energy needed to engage and learn, these programs add little or nothing to the actual development of its employees.

In comparison, Sessa and London (2006) observed that continuous learning, which occurs outside of formal training, is more crucial to the development of human capital. A form of continuous learning is informal learning (Marsick & Watkins, 1990), which is estimated to account for up to 75% in the learning that occurs in the organizations (Bear, 2008). Informal learning includes self-learning, learning from colleagues and mentors, and learning from reading (Doornbos, Simons, & Denessen, 2008; Lohman, 2005; Noe et al., 2014). The knowledge, skills, and abilities that are acquired through informal learning promote more meaningful and enduring experiences relative to formal training programs (Benson, 1997; Noe et al., 2014; Tannenbaum, Beard, McNall, & Salas, 2010).

**Perceived Organizational Support for Development (POSD)**

We argue that firms need to go beyond simply investing and implementing formal training and development programs. Instead, organizations should create an environment that, in their employees’ perceptions, fosters and supports career development. We borrow from Kraimer et al. (2011) and define POSD as “employees’ overall perceptions that the organization provides programs and opportunities that help employees develop their functional skills and managerial capabilities”. We believe that POSD encompasses more than formal training and development programs that are offered by the organization. Case in point, employees do not see formal training programs as the only way to improve themselves. They value other experiences and
opportunities such as educational support, rewards that emphasize achievement, mentoring opportunities, etc.

Although employee training and development has been rigorously studied in literature and linked to numerous individual and organizational outcomes including as higher job satisfaction, higher job performance, higher organizational commitment, lower intent-to-turnover, financial performance, etc. (Aragon-Sanchez, Barba-Aragón, & Sanz-Valle, 2003; Bartlett, 2001; Kraimer et al., 2011; Owens, 2006; Patton et al., 2000; Schmidt, 2007), the literature on POSD is scarce. After thorough research, we have found only one study that empirically examines the influence of employees’ perceptions of organizational support for development. Kraimer et al. (2011) tested two behavioral outcomes of POSD: turnover and job performance. Using a sample 264 employees and supervisors, they found that POSD by itself was not significant in determining job performance and employee turnover. However, perceived career opportunity (PCO), or the “degree to which work assignments and job opportunities that match [employees’] career interests and goals that are available within their current organization” (Kraimer et al. 2011) moderated the relationship. POSD was shown to be positively related to job performance when PCO was high. Similarly, when employees’ PCO was high, POSD had a negative rapport with turnover.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT /MODEL

Boundaryless Career Concept and the Social Exchange Theory

In today’s increasingly competitive business environment, the promise of upward mobility or lifelong employment is no longer given to employees by organizations (Farr, Tesluk, & Klein, 1998). According to the boundaryless career concept, employees have expected and accepted that their careers will unfold across numerous organizations and that the management of their career falls on their own shoulders (Kraimer et al., 2011; Pearce & Randel, 2004; Roehling, Cavanaugh, Moynihan, & Boswell, 1998). We combine this concept with the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and propose that employees perceive that organizational support for development goes beyond formal training and developmental programs offered by an organization. In fact, it includes many factors and experiences such as educational support, rewards that emphasize achievement, mentoring opportunities, reviews and feedback based on training. When organizational development initiatives are responsive to this mental model, employees will perceive organizational support for development as more than just an important resource to improve their skills, knowledge and capabilities. These programs also are symbolic to employees that they are valued and respected by their organization. Consequently, through the reciprocity of social exchange, (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960) the employees will be more motivated and committed to the organization.

Job satisfaction. Cognitive evaluation theory posits that social environments can facilitate or hinder intrinsic motivation depending on how they nurture one’s innate psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Ryan and Deci (2000) asserted that people are naturally curious and self-motivated. They are constantly striving to learn, master new skills and be inspired. We posit that POSD can act as an intrinsic motivator to satisfy employees’ inherent drives to learn and improve themselves. Consonant with this expectation, organizational support for development can create an environment that fulfills individuals’ needs for competence and autonomy. As such,
Hypothesis 1: POSD is significantly and positively related to job satisfaction.

Affective commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) conceptualized organizational commitment as a psychological state with three separable components reflecting a desire, a need, and an obligation to contribute to an organization. Our study focuses on the “desire” component of organization known as affective commitment. Affective commitment is defined as “the positive emotional attachment to the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 2002). We chose this facet because it has been shown to link more strongly to positive outcomes in the U.S. (J. Mayfield & M. Mayfield, 2009). Employees’ affective commitment has been shown to be very beneficial to U.S. firms. It has been negatively linked to absenteeism and employee work-family conflict and stress. Moreover, affective commitment has also been shown to be positively associated with job performance (J. Mayfield & M. Mayfield, 2009) and employee well-being (Maltin, 2011). We posit that if the employees perceive that the organization offers such career development opportunities, the employees will reciprocate through their commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2: POSD is significantly and positively related to affective commitment.

Absenteeism. According to Cascio and Boudreau (2010), absenteeism occurs when employees fail to report or remain at work, regardless of situation or reason. Absenteeism is very costly to organizations and employee morale. Therefore, it has received increased attention in management literature (Biron & Bamberger, 2012; J. Mayfield & M. Mayfield, 2009; Peretz & Fried, 2012; Shoss & Penney, 2012). In line with social exchange theory, employees who perceive that their workplace fosters development that aligns with their needs will be more motivated to reciprocate and come to work as scheduled.

Hypothesis 3: POSD is significantly and negatively related to absenteeism.

The preceding hypotheses are represented in the model shown in Figure 1.

Conceptual Model

Figure 1: Conceptual Model of Perceived Organizational Support for Development and Selected Key Outcomes
METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants for this study were drawn from the Mechanical Turk web site. This site provides a mechanism for posting job tasks, and these tasks can be completed by people across the globe for a specified payment. This potential respondent pool is a useful way of recruiting participants for psychological surveys and experiments. Huff (2014) tested the demographic characteristics of USA Mechanical Turk workers, and found their Mechanical Turk respondent work characteristics are very similar to the work characteristics of the general work USA population. In addition, several study findings (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011) have demonstrated that Mechanical Turk responses are generalizable to the population as a whole. Also, Peer and colleagues (2014) performed a study which found that the worker reputation feedback mechanism instituted on the Mechanical Turk site provided a strong motivation for respondents to answer accurately and conscientiously in research settings.

Respondents were recruited by posting a solicitation for workers in the USA who were willing to complete a survey on their workplace environment. Respondents were provided a monetary incentive of US$0.50 for survey completion. Completion time took an average of 21 minutes (this study was part of a larger investigation of the workplace environment). The recruitment and completion process took place over eight days, from 13 March 2015 to 21 March 2015. The solicitation was for 400 respondents, however 427 people completed at least some portion of the survey (some participants who completed the survey did not submit their requests for compensation).

Females (53%) were a slightly higher proportion of respondents than males (47%). Most respondents had some education beyond high school (20% with an associate’s degree, 38% with a college degree, 18% with a graduate degree, and 24% with a high school degree). Median respondent age was 32, with lower and upper quartile ages being 27 and 42 respectively. The vast majority of respondents were native-born USA citizens (96%), with non-US born workers having spent a median of 15.5 years in the US.

Respondents had median 11.5 years of overall full-time work experience, with a median of four years of work experience with their current employer, and a median of three years of work experience in their current position and with their current supervisor. For their current work situation, 87% self-classified as full-time workers, and 13% self-classified as part-time workers. Respondents were evenly divided on the size of the organization they worked for, with 33% working in small (less than 100 employees), 36% working in medium (100 to 1,000 employees), and 30% working in large (more than 1,000 employees) organizations. The greatest number of respondents self-classified as having highly skilled/professional jobs (46%), with 39% selecting skilled labor, and 14% selecting unskilled labor as their job classification.

Respondents came from a wide variety of industry sectors, with industrials (production of goods used in construction and manufacturing) representing the largest single sector at 15%. Information technology and government were the next largest sectors at 13% each, with healthcare being represented by 12% of the respondents, and utilities making up 10% of the respondents. All other sectors amounted for less than 10% of subjects. Within all of these sectors, 21% of respondents classified themselves as professional workers, 19% as managers, 14% as office and administrative support, and no other category had more than 10% of the
respondents.

**Materials and Procedures**

For this study, respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire relating to their perceptions of organizational support for development in their workplace. This scale was developed based on extant theory about perceived organizational support for development, and supplemented by other opportunities provided by organizations. The theoretical support for these items is presented in this manuscript’s background section.

In order to evaluate the scale’s validity, it was first tested for factor unity through a scree plot of the factors’ eigen values. The scree plot showed a strong indication of a single factor for each construct, with a drop in eigenvalues from 15.64 to 3.43, or a difference in magnitude of over 4.50. However, since other factors had eigen values above 1.00, a factor analysis was performed on factor structures of two (to capture the effect of a two factor structure) and nine factors (to include all factors with an eigen value greater than one). In both cases, only the first factor had items that substantially loaded (with scores at or above 0.71) on a factor.

Once the scale’s factor structure was determined, the next step was to determine which items should be retained. In other words, this step determined which items were clearly a part of the perceived organizational support for development scale. To select the items, an iterative process was employed. First, the scale’s factor loadings were examined to determine if any items loaded lower than 0.71. (This factor loading cut-off is fairly stringent, but it guarantees that the item in question will load more highly on the given factor than any other potential factor.) If there were one or more items that fell below the cut-off criteria, then the lowest loading item was removed. Once the item was removed, the factor analysis was run again. This process was repeated until all items loaded at or above 0.71. An iterative process was employed since a poorly fitting item can distort the overall factor structure and alter the loadings of other items. Therefore, removing multiple items at once may result in an overly aggressive pruning of scale items.

Initially the scale had sixteen items. After the scale examination using factor analysis, eight items were retained. The single retained factor accounted for 63% of total variance in the data set. In addition, the first factor of the trimmed scale had an eigen value of 11.52, and the second factor had an eigen value of 1.15 – a difference in magnitude of over 10. The final factor analysis results are presented in table 1.

**Table 1: Final Factor Analysis Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization gives me many training opportunities that I can use at work.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization offers me training that is important to achieving organizational goals.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization always gives me rewards when I complete a training program.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization regularly provides opportunities for me to gain professional certifications.</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have many opportunities to be mentored in my workplace. 0.75
My organization is highly supportive of me advancing my formal education. 0.73
My organization provides me with many training opportunities that will help me get promoted. 0.88
Completing training programs is a big part of my performance reviews. 0.74

Once the scale’s retained items were selected, the scale’s reliability was tested. The perceived organizational support for development scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.93 and a confidence interval of 0.92 to 0.94. There was no indication that removing an item would increase the reliability of the scale. The full scale is presented in appendix 1, with an indication of which items were deleted.

In addition to the perceived organizational support for development scale, respondents were also asked to complete measures of their job satisfaction, absenteeism, and affective commitment. These measures were taken from existing, tested scales. For the absenteeism measure, respondents were asked a single item question on how many work days they had missed in the past month. No reliability measure is available for this item, but other studies have examined this measure and found it to have adequate validity for measuring the intended construct (J. Mayfield & Mayfield, 2009; M. Mayfield & Mayfield, 2011). The Hoppock job satisfaction measure (Hoppock, 1935) was used to measure job satisfaction, and had a reliability of 0.89 in this study, with a confidence interval range of 0.86 to 0.91. Affective job commitment was measured using the affective portion of Meyer and colleagues’ (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002) three component model of organizational commitment. In this study, the affective portion of the scale had a reliability of 0.89, and a confidence interval range of 0.87 to 0.91.

RESULTS
Statistics and Data Analysis

For analysis, the independent variable was created by averaging a participant’s responses for all retained items in the perceived organizational support for development scale. The same process was performed for the dependent variables (except for the single item absenteeism measure). If responses were missing for a given variable item, the completed items were used to calculate the average. Since there were very few missing items across respondents, this method for dealing with data incompleteness seems appropriate and in-line with current methods (Graham, 2009). Once the variables were calculated, respondents with missing data were removed from the sample. After respondents were removed, there remained 413 complete response sets. Table 2 presents the relationship between all variables, and summary statistics for these variables.

Table 2: Variable Correlations and Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POSD</th>
<th>Days Absent</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Aff. Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSD</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To test the study hypotheses, a path analysis test was implemented using partial least squares latent variable analysis. Path analysis allows for examining complex models with more than one dependent variable. The analysis was performed using the plspm package of the R statistical analysis programming language.

The data set was standardized using a z-transformation, so all effects are in terms of standard deviations – similar to standardized regression analysis results. The statistical analysis showed a significant and positive relationship between perceived organizational career development opportunities and worker job satisfaction and affective commitment. For job satisfaction, perceived organizational support for development opportunities had a path coefficient of 0.56 with a confidence interval of 0.48 to 0.63. Additionally, perceived organizational support for career development opportunities accounted for 40% of the variance in job satisfaction. Similarly, perceived organizational support for career development opportunities had a path coefficient of 0.55 with affective commitment, and a confidence interval of 0.48 to 0.63 around this path coefficient. This relationship also accounted for 63% of the variance in affective commitment. There was no significant relationship between perceived organizational support for career development opportunities and days absent. Pertinent statistical results are presented in table 3.

**Table 3: Path Analysis Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path to</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient Confidence Interval</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09 to 0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00 to 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48 to 0.63</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23 to 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff. Commitment</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.48 to 0.63</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.23 to 0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

Kraimer et al. (2011) encouraged future researchers who study POSD to be more consistent in the definition and operationalization of the construct. We respond to this by adopting their definition and developing a more comprehensive scale to measure and test POSD on additional job-related outcomes: job satisfaction, affective commitment, and absenteeism. Using a unique way of data collection from the Mechanical Turk from a cross-organizational and industry sample, we were able to test our scale on 413 individuals. We found that our POSD scale is...
reliable and that this conceptualization has a significant and positive relationship with job satisfaction and affective commitment, supporting our hypotheses 1 and 2. However, absenteeism was shown to have a non-significant relationship with POSD, thus rejecting our hypothesis 3. We believe that this relationship merits further investigation for potential moderators and mediators. In particular, HR policies towards work-life balance such as availability of daycare, telecommuting, on-site mental health counseling, among others, may influence employee absenteeism. Another possibility is that we did not differentiate between voluntary vs. involuntary absenteeism (e.g. missing work due to unavoidable family issues, health problems, etc.).

For practice, the implications are that managers have relied too much on formal training programs to increase their human capital and develop their employees. Our results suggest that formal training is only one element of employees’ overall perceived career development opportunities, and that the POSD construct has significant relationships with employee job satisfaction and affective commitment. Based on these insights, managers would do well to investigate employee demand for and the costs/benefits of implementing appropriate informal initiatives that are captured in the survey. It is equally important to note and understand that this construct measures the perceptions of employees. Therefore, it is imperative that organizations effectively communicate and offer a climate that supports these career development opportunities. With this strategy, managers can better promote a more conducive environment for employee development not only to enhance their human capital, but also as an employee motivator which helps to maximize organizational outcomes. As Becker and Huselid (2006) showed in their study, the integration of HR policies and procedures does influence the organization’s bottom line.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This paper is an exploratory study and does include some limitations. However, these limitations can serve as avenues for future studies. The first limitation is the lack of moderator/mediator investigation in this preliminary study. Future studies can test possible moderators and mediators which heighten understanding about the relationship between POSD and salient outcomes, absenteeism in particular. For example, Kraimer et al. (2011) showed that perceived career opportunity (PCO) and POSD are distinct constructs and that PCO moderated the relationship between perceived organizational support for development, turnover, and job performance. Other possible moderators may include demographics, personality traits, coordination of development opportunities with organizational culture, strategy and other HR initiatives, such as in the case of absenteeism and work-life balance benefits. For example, Bertolino, Truxillo, and Fraccaroli (2011) showed that the interaction between younger employees and the presence of a proactive personality significantly affected their perceptions of career development.

In addition, this exploratory study’s research scope only examined three job-related outcomes of POSD: job satisfaction, affective commitment and absenteeism in the context of U.S. workers. Future investigations can examine the same outcomes and others in cross-cultural settings extending POSD’s expected relationships to continuance and normative commitment. Gelfand, Erez, and Aycan (2007) and other scholars have encouraged re-examination of such organizational relationships in multi-cultural settings.
The third limitation is that this study uses cross-sectional data. A longitudinal study would enrich our understanding for theory and practice. Moreover, our data may include self-report bias. Future studies may incorporate qualitative measures and multi-source responses. Finally, this preliminary study cannot show causality. Future investigations can employ the use of quasi-experiment or experimental design to offer more insights.

CONCLUSION

We build upon Kraimer et al.’s (2011) work by integrating the insights of the boundaryless career concept and social exchange theory to study the relationship between POSD and additional, key job-related attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. The current investigation sheds light on the importance of POSD and reveals its powerful relationship with job related attitudes and behaviors that are vital to competitive advantage through growing human capital.

APPENDIX

Career Development Perceptions
Listed below you will see a set of questions about how your organization supports your career development. For each of those statements, please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree (from Completely Disagree to Completely Agree) by selecting the choice that best matches your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My organization gives me many training opportunities that I can use at work.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My organization offers me training that is important to achieving organizational goals.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My organization always gives me rewards when I complete a training program.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My organization usually promotes its own employees to fill open positions.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My organization regularly provides opportunities for me to gain professional certifications.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My organization gives me training that cannot be used in its workplace.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have many opportunities to be mentored in my workplace.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My job means something to me beyond a paycheck.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I not allowed to make decisions about my job activities.</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. My organization is highly supportive of me advancing my formal education.

11. I never have a chance to interact with people higher in the organization other than my boss.

12. I frequently have chances to do different types of work at my organization.

13. My organization provides me with many training opportunities that will help me get promoted.

14. I have many opportunities for overseas assignments.

15. Completing training programs is a big part of my performance reviews.

16. I often have opportunities to network with peers from outside of my department.

17. I have many opportunities for transfers to other departments or work areas.

18. I often have the chance to work with people outside of my area of expertise.

This scale is released under a Creative Commons, Attribution-ShareAlike 2.5 Generic license. For full legal details of this license, please go to https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.5/legalcode. For a license summary, please go to https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.5/. For attribution purposes, please use the author names of this manuscript in order of the author listing.
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