

**The Role of Organizational Support towards Security in Terrorism affected Pakistan:
A Qualitative and Quantitative Exploration**

Fatima A. Junaid
School of Management, Massey University (Albany), New Zealand
Email: fatimaajunaid@gmail.com

Professor Jarrod Haar
School of Management, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
Email: jarrod.haar@aut.ac.nz

Professor Jane Parker
School of Management, Massey University (Albany), New Zealand
Email: J.Parker@massey.ac.nz

The Role of Organizational Support towards Security in Terrorism affected Pakistan: A Qualitative and Quantitative Exploration

ABSTRACT: Perceived organizational support (POS) is well established but some contexts remain under explored. The present study explores POS in terrorism affected Pakistan. In study one, 15 HR Managers were interviewed and thematic analysis showed clear distinctions between POS and Security POS (SPOS). Study 2 tested whether SPOS is distinct from POS and their influence on outcomes using a sample of 146 Pakistani employees. Factor analysis confirmed SPOS was distinct from POS. Similarly, while both were significantly related to outcomes, mediation (using monte carlo) analysis confirmed that SPOS enhances POS, which in turn positively predicts job satisfaction and work-life balance, and negatively predicts work-family conflict. The implications for understanding organizational support in unique cultural settings (terrorism-related) are discussed.

Keywords: organizational support, safety, terrorism, Pakistan, qualitative, quantitative.

Introduction. Over the last decade, the world has become less peaceful (IEP, 2014; MacAskill, 2014). European countries such as France, Belgium, Spain and Turkey have been recent targets of terrorism, showing how far and swiftly terrorism has proliferated. For some countries, such as the five worst terrorism affected countries (Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria and Nigeria), it has become part of everyday life. Collectively the losses in these five countries are far more than those experienced in the rest of the world. Even by conservative estimates, in Pakistan (the setting of the present research), more than 2,000 civilians have lost their lives annually due to terrorism over the last decade (IPPNW, 2015). Yet, despite the high rates of terrorism, organizations still operate, and people still work to attain workplace objectives and support their families. Consequently, organizations likely play an important role in helping employees in such contexts yet very little is known about the role of organizational support in such contexts.

Junaid and Haar (2015) asserted that greater exploration of organizations and their employees in terrorism affected countries is warranted. The present study contributes to the extant scholarship of employees living and working under on-going terrorism, specifically relating to how organizations support employees. Perceived organizational support (POS) is defined by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) as employee beliefs regarding how much their organization values them and cares about their well-being. Despite wide spread empirical meta-analytical support (e.g. Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart, & Adis, 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) little is known about how POS operates in organizational settings where terrorism is a daily occurrence (Junaid & Haar, 2015). Thus, Pakistan provides a setting of continuous terrorist attacks lasting well over a decade which is an unfortunate yet unique opportunity to understand employee perceptions

regarding the nature and role of organizational support while working under on-going terrorism. A study undertaken in Pakistan could be applied to countries with similar on-going terrorism (e.g. Iraq) where workplaces and situations might be similarly affected. The importance and timeliness of our research is also evident as management science researchers have been called to research on turbulent environments (British Academy of Management, 2016); terrorism (James, 2011a, 2011b; Toker, Laurence, & Fried, 2015), and more specifically focusing on the role of POS in hostile environments (Bader, Schuster, & Dickmann, 2015).

Overall, our paper makes three contributions. Firstly, the inquiry represents the unheard voices of employees in areas where workforces struggle with genuine life and death contexts on a daily basis. It also shapes our understanding of how POS might operate in such challenging contexts. Secondly, we undertake two studies and provide both qualitative and quantitative data, with an empirical survey confirming the themes discovered in the interviews. This provides greater depth and confidence in the findings that show that POS while evident can also be extended to include a safety dimensions. Lastly, we contribute to the organizational support theory (OST) by providing evidence of a new strand of POS that covers the safety of workers employed in such dangerous settings as those in Pakistan. We next discuss the existing literature of POS briefly, followed by POS in the context of terrorism, and lastly explain how our study is unique in relation to the existing literature.

Literature Review

POS concerns the degree to which employees believe that their workplace values their contribution, cares about their well-being, and fulfils socio-emotional needs (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Based on social exchange theory (Emerson, 1976), and the norm of reciprocity (Kurtessis et al., 2015), when employees feel cared for, they may become more productive, committed and satisfied with their job. In addition, they will be less prone to absence, turnover and undertaking deviant workplace behaviors (Kurtessis et al., 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, POS is often beneficial for both the organization and its employees. There are a handful of studies which have looked at POS in hostile environments, but these are with respect to expatriate assignments (Bader, Berg, & Holtbrügge, 2015). In those studies, no conclusive research support is available about the role of POS especially in the case of ongoing exposure to terrorism (Bader, Schuster, et al., 2015).

Furthermore, those studies are not entirely comparable to those which examine people living in the regions as locals because of three major reasons. First, in these works, the expatriate always has a choice to leave the area and go back to his or her own country. Second, the expatriate often functions at a high level official in a position of authority and control with considerable protection or works in humanitarian fields, knowing the threats at hand. Third, exposure to terrorism may not be for the duration suffered by local people. In addition, the typical focus of POS research is on employees and not managers, providing a useful area for extending our understanding of POS beyond the terrorism-related context. For example, there is limited research on supervisors related to POS in cases of terrorism (e.g. see (Toker et al., 2015)). Overall, the number of studies looking at POS in a terrorist context is extremely limited and none of these have explored the broader notion of POS and support in countries where terrorism occurs constantly and consistently. Overall, terrorism is not widely researched in the management science domain (Toker et al., 2015), and the limited research that exists is mostly focused on single terrorism incidents (Howie, 2005; Ryan, West, & Carr, 2003) such as the 9/11 (Perlman et al., 2011), London attack (DiMaggio & Galea, 2006) and Oslo bombings (Nissen, Birkeland Nielsen, Solberg, Bang Hansen, & Heir, 2015).

Consequently, our research aim is to explore whether the existing construct of POS, which is heavily embedded in western (Schouten, Callahan, & Bryant, 2004) and peaceful environments (Kurtessis et al., 2015), could be applied to the context of living under on-going terrorism. In a related approach, the literature on social support can be used as it is highly related to POS. A large body of social support literature that takes account of on-going terrorism shows that, when people are traumatized, they seek support from their social system (Hobfoll et al., 2012). Based on the conservation of resources theory, where traumatic incidents cause a loss of resources, social support helps to regain these resources. This can have a positive and somewhat healing effect on people (Bongar, Brown, Beutler, Breckenridge, & Zimbardo, 2007).

The present study explores two related research questions: (1) what support can organizations provide in the challenging and taxing context of on-going terrorism? and (2) what does this organizational support look like in this context? Specifically, can the western construct of POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986) which is used in case of peaceful environments, be extended to this context

of living under on-going terrorism, or would employees perception of organizational support differ due to the extremeness of the context? We answer these questions by conducting two studies: (1) a qualitative exploration of managers to determine how POS is perceived, and the nature (type) and level of support available to employees. Based on the findings of this study, (2) a quantitative study tested a developed instrument to explore context-sensitive POS. In the following sections, the two studies and their respective results, followed by a triangulation of key findings are addressed.

Methodology (Study 1). *Sample Procedure and Characteristics.* To provide new insights on POS in the context of living with on-going terrorism, the research was conducted in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) and federally administered tribal areas (FATA - tribal belt) region of Pakistan, the worst affected areas of the country (SATP, 2016). Full university ethics approval was attained for the research. The study was based on semi-structured interviews with 15 managers (mostly HR). We selected these managers to provide a broad range of insights into employees and employer views with respect to the Pakistani context. Due to the potentially extreme nature of the terrorism in which their workplaces function, we felt it would be easier for managers to talk about their employees rather than their own experiences. The distal nature of the questions (i.e. about others and not the self) also encouraged greater clarity in providing information regarding the context and potential role of POS. Managers were selected via the first authors personal contacts and contacted via email briefly outlining the project. The interviews were conducted over the telephone, recorded (with permission) and then transcribed. Most interviews lasted 30 minutes. All interviewees were called after work hours or on the weekend. The interviews were conducted from September to October 2015.

The ethics process required that direct victims (i.e. those with direct exposure and loss) be excluded from the study. Each interviewee was thus first asked about direct loss and then whether he or she wanted to be part of the study, and direct victims of terrorism were not included. This helped to reduce potential bias due to personal loss. Indeed, NATO guidelines for managing psychosocial services for people involved in major incidents, conflict, disaster and terrorism state that researchers need to exercise due diligence in dealing and conducting research involving people exposed to trauma and or terrorism (Williams et al., 2009). We ensured that respondents themselves would not have experienced direct loss or severe exposure to terrorism. Notwithstanding this, all respondents noted

they were aware of acts of terrorism in their everyday lives. Table 1 provides a breakdown of respondents and their organizations <<Insert Table 1 about here>>. The sample is representative of the national population as the United Nations (UN, 2012) including religion (CIA, 2016).

Questions. Interviewees were asked three broad questions: (1) to what extent do employees think that the organization is supportive of them? (2) to provide specific examples of how the organization provides support; and (3) about how helpful they think this type of support is for employees (if they responded that it is not very helpful, they were asked what barriers exist that might cause this).

Analysis. Responses were coded using NVIVO 10. First, narrow codes were developed and then some were merged into parent nodes. NVIVO allows researchers to develop themes by going from broad to narrow and vice versa and the latter was followed (from narrow to broad themes). For instance, monetary gains and flexible timings were coded into POS; while providing armed guards was coded into Security POS. An independent management researcher was asked to randomly select five interview scripts and code them to check the validity of the coding. There was strong similarity between their main themes. Overall, four themes were found: (i) POS, (ii) Security POS (regarding terrorism), (iii) POS as a hindrance to work, and (iv) no POS. These key themes are discussed below.

Findings. Variations were found across respondents' views regarding the POS that their organization provided. Of 15, only two managers discussed POS without referring to terrorism. For the rest, the context of on-going terrorism overshadowed the responses regarding POS. Nine stated that the organizations were providing support while four said organizations were not. <<Insert Table 2 here>> has the direct quotes referenced below. 1. *POS*: Two managers felt that organizations provided support in terms of care and monetary gains. The manager of a home delivery services whose organization has not suffered any losses felt terrorism was not a factor affecting their organizational life. Thus, the organizational support was discussed without any mention of context. He stated [ref 1]. He also attributed absence of fear or any other effects of terrorism to the organization having a young (all under 40 years) and all-male workforce. Thirteen out of the 15 interviewees in the first couple of minutes of the interview drifted from organizational POS towards discussing context of terrorism and how POS related to it, e.g. [ref 2]. 2. *Security POS*: The complexity of living with terrorism can be summarized by this comment from a male HR manager

(aged 29 years) from a local NGO who expressed a sense of helplessness [ref 3]. The vast majority (13) of the managers discussed POS in the form of armed guards and security, reflecting that terrorism is an important issue for both employees and their organizations. Nine said that there is good support because their employers provide heavy security for employees, while four viewed organizations as not supportive because they were not providing effective security. Other forms of support associated with terrorism were caring initiatives for employees'; comfort in risky areas; offering flexibility in terms of choice of risky locations; hiring local employees due to safety concerns; and giving time off from work to staff who had either lost family or were traumatized. Most managers responded that their organizations provided security checks; and trained security guards with bullet proof jackets, arms and security vehicles. A senior manager, who also worked as an independent consultant on various projects, concurred regarding extreme security measures he added [ref 4]. Two other managers, one from non-profit and the other from the profit sector, explained that they hired security teams to undertake initial environmental scanning so as to ensure the security of the area. In some cases, this had to be done daily [ref 5]. Other security-related support was discussed by the managers from a large bank and a beverage company, noting that, at times, travel was only possible through military convoy or helicopters (e.g. in FATA or Parachinar) so the organizations provided support and security in that way.

3. *POS as Hindrance*: Even though providing security and guards was considered supportive, (4) several managers felt that, at times, employees got irritated and frustrated by on-going site and physical searches, for example [ref 6].

4. *No POS*: The absence of POS was also coded separately because it reflected the perceptions of the managers. For example, some managers said outright that they do not have support; others stated that employees have left due to non-financial support or that the organization does not care about those in vulnerable areas. An important point on "no POS" was that it was only discussed in relation to terrorism. One manager from a private manufacturing firm gave the example of an incident where a loyal employee had been working for the last two decades left due to no support [ref 7]. Others expressed the lack of support with regards to terrorism and in terms of security [ref 8, 9, and 10].

Summary. The interview comments overwhelmingly related to the context of living under on-going terrorism. The most dominant response concerned the provision of armed security guards with bullet proof jackets and check posts to secure the premises for employees - so much so, that at times it was seen as a hindrance. The “no POS” responses showed that managers seemed disgruntled by their organization’s passivity and habituation. Overall, concern with employee safety emerged as the most dominant aspect of POS.

Discussion. The managers’ views showed that organizations are trying to support employees but their initiatives may differ from or fall outside what is conventionally known as POS. Our results also highlight that the context differs from the western context of exposure to terrorism where security and surveillance is high and an organization can focus on being prepared before, and psychological interventions after, any such incidents occur (Schouten et al., 2004). It is interesting that employees living under ongoing terrorism mainly stressed security and safety rather than any other interventions (e.g. counselling programs), perhaps reflecting the reality of the situations ie ‘keep me alive’ over ‘fix my mind’. In this study, it emerged that terrorism is so prevalent that it has literally become part of the fabric of the society, thus the threat is perceived to exist more outside of an organization, and organizations can at best try to protect employees while they are at work. Based on the managers’ responses, we developed a context-based POS instrument, discussed next.

Methodology (Study 2). Since Security POS surfaced in Study 1 as a different construct to the established POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986), we decided to develop items to explore Security POS. Having contextual knowledge about POS while living under terrorism, the second study aimed to discover whether Security POS was distinct from POS. In addition, we included a number of outcomes (job satisfaction, work-life balance, and work-family conflict) to also best understand how Security POS and POS influence outcomes. In previous work, POS has been related to increased job satisfaction, lower work-family conflict and higher work-life balance, either directly or via associated factors (Kurtessis et al., 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Kossek, PichlerBodner, & Hammer, 2011). Thus, we hypothesize that Security POS and POS will be distinct from each other (H1), and they will both be positively related to job satisfaction (H2), work-life balance (H3), and negatively related to work-family conflict (H4). Finally, that POS will mediate the influence of Security POS on

outcomes (H5). In this regard, we suggest Security POS will operate as a component of POS, ultimately signaling an organizations interest in the life and well-being of employees. Figure 1 <<Insert here>> shows our study 2 model. **Sample.** In total, 146 employees responded to the survey (a 76.4% response rate). A possible reason for this high response rate is the salience of the topic, to which many respondents felt they could relate. Purposeful sampling was undertaken to attract respondents (Coyne, 1997) for two key reasons. Firstly, the ethics committee had highlighted that only those people without an immediate loss in the last month (preferably two months) should be contacted. Secondly, as per the NATO guidelines, due caution and diligence was required. Therefore, purposeful sampling became the most suitable sampling choice.

On average, participants had an average age of 31.7 years (SD=7.9 years). They tended to be male (78%), married (55%) and a parent (51%). Average job tenure was 5.5 years (SD=5.8 years) and on average they worked 42.4 hours per week (SD= 11.6). The majority of respondents were highly educated, with 62% having a graduate qualification (e.g. Master's degree or MBA) and 37% having a Bachelor's degree. By industry sector, 41% of respondents worked in the private sector, 39% worked in the public sector and 21% worked in the not-for-profit sector.

Measures. POS measured with 8-items from Eisenberger et al. (1986), coded 1=strongly disagree through 5=strongly agree. Security POS was measured with 4-items, developed for this study (based on the qualitative data from study 1, coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. It included one established item "I feel safe at my workplace" (Nissen et al., 2015) to provide a general overview of safety. We conducted an exhaustive review of literature on safety at work in relation to terrorism (Bader and colleagues), but found it to be concerned with expatriates rather than a local population. This is important because locals cannot simply choose to go home. We also looked at safety climates (Cox & Cheyne, 2000) but these works were general in nature, without a focus on extreme events like terrorism (e.g. "In my workplace managers/supervisors show interest in my safety", Cox & Cheyne, 2000). Further, we confirmed the appropriateness of the items with two independent HRM professionals and two unrelated HRM academics. We confirmed the distinct nature of Security POS and POS by using exploratory factor analysis (EFA), with the data splitting into two distinct factors as expected. Table 3 shows all items, factor loadings and reliabilities, and provides evidence of construct

validity for our Safety POS measure as distinctive from POS <<Insert Table 3 here>>. Overall, the EFA confirms that the four items for Security POS load upon their own factor, as distinct from the eight items for POS. Furthermore, the Security POS and POS have strong reliabilities and represent diverse constructs. We further tested the differences using CFA in AMOS v 22. Here, we test the two-factor model (determined above) with a comparison one-factor model where all items are combined on a single construct. We followed suggestions by Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010) and find that the two-factor model is superior to the single-factor model: change $\chi^2(1)=128.6$ ($p=.000$). We then sought to improve the general construct validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) of our Security POS construct by undertaking tests of both convergent and discriminant validity. **Convergent Validity.** Evidence of convergent validity (Fiske, 1971) is “substantial and significant correlations between different instruments designed to assess a common construct” (Duckworth & Kern, 2011, p. 259). Consequently, we expected the Security POS construct to be related to outcomes similarly tested in the POS literature. Cunningham, Preacher, and Banaji (2001) asserted that such similarities provide confidence and validity to the new measure. Fiske (1971) warns that with new measures, there is often an assumption of convergent validity rather than specific testing. Achieving significant correlations between Security POS and our variables of interest in this study (job satisfaction, work-life balance and work-family conflict) will provide evidence of convergent validity. Job Satisfaction was measured using 3-items from (Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005), coded 1=strongly disagree through 5=strongly agree. A sample question was “Most days I am enthusiastic about my work”. This measure is well validated, including across numerous cultural samples (e.g.(Haar, Russo, Suñe, & Ollier-Malaterre, 2014) and has adequate reliability ($\alpha=.71$). Work-Life Balance was measured using the 3-item measure by (Haar, 2013), coded 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. A sample item is “I manage to balance the demands of my work and personal/family life well.” We conducted factor analysis (principal components, varimax rotation) and the three items loaded onto a single factor with eigenvalues greater than one (2.187), accounting for sizeable amounts of the variance (72.9%) and achieving adequate reliability ($\alpha=.81$). Work-Family Conflict was measured using the three items of the time-based conflict dimension scale by (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000), coded 1=strongly

disagree through 5=strongly agree. A sample item is “My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.” The measure had adequate reliability ($\alpha=.75$).

Discriminant Validity. Watson et al. (1995) argues that discriminant validity is also necessary with convergent validity. Unlike the similarities that convergent validity seeks to identify; discriminant validity is interested in differences and lack of significant relationships. In effect, this shows the construct is not so general as to be significantly related to everything. Wahlqvist, Carlsson, Stålhammar, and Wiklund (2002) define discriminant validity as “a low correlation between the measured variables and measures of a different concept” (p. 109). In this study, we test a personality-type construct relating to workplace fun (Karl and colleagues, 2005, 2007). Consequently, in order to provide evidence of discriminant validity, this personality variable should not be significantly correlated to Security POS. We used Fun Attitude, which was measured using the two-item *Attitude towards Workplace Fun* measure by Karl and colleagues (2005, 2007), coded 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree. The items used are “Having fun at work is very important to me” and “If my job stopped being fun, I would look for another job” and the measure achieved adequate reliability ($\alpha=.75$). The purpose of using this variable to validate it being construct that would not correlate with an unrelated variable. With control variables, we controlled for demographic factors typical of the support literature including Gender (1=female, 0=male), Age (in years), Job Tenure (in years), Industry (1=private, 2=public and 3=not-for-profit), marital status (1=married, 0=not) and parental status (1=parent, 0=not). **Analysis.** Hypothesis 1 tests via the factor analysis (details above) regarding Security POS being distinct from POS. We also confirmed the convergent validity and discriminant validity via the correlation table. Hypotheses 2 to 4 tested the direct effects of Safety POS to job satisfaction, work-life balance, and work-family conflict, while Hypothesis 5 tested POS as a mediator. In all models, control variables were entered in Step 1 (gender, age, job tenure, industry and firm size). Step 2 had the Safety POS construct while Step 3 held the potential mediator POS. We confirm mediation effects following the Monte Carlo Method for assessing mediation by Hayes (2013) using PROCESS.

Results. Descriptive statistics for the study variables are shown in Table 4 <<Insert here>>. Table 4 shows that Security POS and POS are moderately correlated ($r=.35$, $p<.01$); however, this correlation

is well below the threshold of concept redundancy that occurs at $r > .75$ (Morrow, 1983). Furthermore, the EFA and the CFA in SEM (with the outcome variables) also indicated that the two dimensions of support were distinct. Table 4 also shows that Security POS and POS are significantly related to all outcomes (all $p < .05$). The regression models for the direct effects of Security POS and the potential mediating effects of POS are shown in Table 5 <<Insert here>>. Table 5 shows two models for each dependent variable: model 1 where Security POS only predicts the outcome and then model 2, where an additional Step has POS included as a potential mediator. Table 5 shows that Security POS is significantly related to job satisfaction ($\beta = .31$, $p < .01$) accounting for an additional nine percent variance ($p < .01$) over the control variables. However, when POS is included as a mediator we see that POS is significantly related to job satisfaction ($\beta = .58$, $p < .001$) accounting for an additional 26% variance ($p < .01$) over the direct effects of Security POS. Furthermore, that effect reduces to $\beta = .08$ and non-significance, providing evidence of full mediation. Security POS is also significantly related to work-life balance ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$) accounting for an additional five percent variance ($p < .05$) over the control variables. However, when POS is included as a mediator we see that POS is significantly related to work-life balance ($\beta = .40$, $p < .001$) accounting for an additional 13% variance ($p < .01$), and this fully mediates the direct effects of Security POS, which reduces to $\beta = .07$ and non-significance. Finally, Security POS is significantly related to work-family conflict ($\beta = -.28$, $p < .01$) accounting for an additional eight percent variance ($p < .01$) over the control variables. Similar to the other outcomes, when POS is included as a mediator we see that POS is significantly related to work-family conflict ($\beta = -.34$, $p < .001$) accounting for an additional nine percent variance ($p < .01$) over the direct effects of Security POS. Furthermore, that effect reduces to $\beta = -.15$ and non-significance, providing evidence of full mediation. Combined, the direct effects support Hypotheses 2 to 4, while the significant mediation effects support Hypothesis 5. Monte Carlo test (1,000 iterations) supported the mediation effect of POS. Overall, the Security POS and POS models accounts for large amounts of variance ($R^2 = .26-.43$).

Discussion. The focus of the present study was to explore POS in a non-Western setting where employees face terrorism on a daily basis, and have done so for years. We were interested in understanding how POS operates and whether the challenging context of Pakistan provides a useful

backdrop for broadening our understanding of POS. Ultimately, we found strong support across our two studies for organizational support. Nevertheless, the terrorism setting clearly influenced the respondents' views, which was evident with the strong focus on security measures to be perceived as a part of organizational support. Importantly, in study 2 we empirically tested and confirmed that while Security POS and POS are distinct, it appears that Security POS is simply an important component of POS. Thus, an organization that provides strong security and safety towards their employees, ultimately signals that they care about the well-being of their employees, enhancing their POS. POS traditionally has shown to enhance job satisfaction and work-life balance, and reduce work-family conflict (Kurtessis et al., 2015) and these were supported in the present study 2. Furthermore, while Security POS was related to all these outcomes it was fully mediated by POS, indicating a process where by Security POS enhances POS, which in turn has beneficial effects on employee outcomes. Our survey-based study showed that employees living under constant terrorism do require POS, but the nature of POS is different from what is currently established in (safer) Western contexts. Employees want physical security as an important part of POS in Pakistan, which is understandable given the context. It is interesting to note that POS is dependent on safety POS and, collectively, these influence employee outcomes. Our study is important because no other study has highlighted this aspect, and it was only because of the qualitative inquiry that it was pointed out that safety is given so much importance that it overrides the other forms of support. (Bader, Berg, et al., 2015) looked at POS in terrorism endangered countries and the case of expatriates' family related safety concerns, and found POS to reduce the negative effects. The present study takes this even further and provides a greater context by exploring POS and terrorism amongst local employees, but also extends the focus to Security POS. We hope to encourage other researchers to explore and test established western constructs in the challenging context of terrorism affected countries such as Pakistan. While our sample has the limitation of being self-reported and cross sectional, but having two studies (qualitative and quantitative) pointing towards same findings provide greater confidence in the generalizability of findings. Especially since Security POS came out of study 1 and was empirically supported in study 2. Further research is needed to establish the generalizability of our findings and to determine whether Security POS is best understood as influencing POS, which in turn

predicts outcomes. Future research might also test these effects towards well-being outcomes (e.g., job burnout, mental health) to see whether the effects are maintained.

References

- Bader, B., Berg, N., & Holtbrügge, D. (2015). Expatriate performance in terrorism-endangered countries: The role of family and organizational support. *International Business Review*, 24(5), 849-860. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2015.03.005>
- Bader, B., Schuster, T., & Dickmann, M. (2015). Special issue of International Journal of Human Resource Management: Danger and risk as challenges for HRM: how to manage people in hostile environments. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(11), 1517-1519.
- Bongar, B. M., Brown, L. M., Beutler, L. E., Breckenridge, J. N., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2007). *Psychology of terrorism*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- British Academy of Management (2016). Thriving in turbulent times. <https://www.bam.ac.uk/civicism/event/info?id=3013>
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 56(2), 249-276.
- CIA, C. I. A. (2016). The World Factbook: Pakistan. CIA world factbook Retrieved 3rd of May 2016, from CIA <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html>
- Cunningham, W. A., Preacher, K. J., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). Implicit attitude measures: Consistency, stability, and convergent validity. *Psychological science*, 12(2), 163-170.
- DiMaggio, C., & Galea, S. (2006). The Behavioral Consequences of Terrorism: A Meta-Analysis. *Academic emergency medicine*, 13(5), 559-566.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Haar, J. M. (2013). Testing a new measure of work-life balance: a study of parent and non-parent employees from New Zealand. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(17), 3305-3324.
- Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work-life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(3), 361-373.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Johnson, R. J., Canetti, D., Palmieri, P. A., Hall, B. J., Lavi, I., & Galea, S. (2012). Can people remain engaged and vigorous in the face of trauma? Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. *Psychiatry*, 75(1), 60-75.
- Howie, L. (2005). There is nothing to fear but fear itself (and terrorists): Public perception, terrorism and the workplace.
- IEP. (2014). *Global Terrorism Index 2014*. New York: Institute of Economics and Peace. Retrieved from <http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Global-Terrorism-Index-Report-2014.pdf>
- IPPNW. (2015). *Body Count: Casualty Figures after 10 Years of the "War on Terror"*. Berlin: International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Retrieved from http://www.ippnw.de/commonFiles/pdfs/Frieden/Body_Count_first_international_edition_2015_final.pdf
- James, K. (2011a). Introduction to the special issue: Terrorism, disaster, and organizational science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(7), 933-937.
- James, K. (2011b). The organizational science of disaster/terrorism prevention and response: Theory-building toward the future of the field. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(7), 1013-1032.

- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: the role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(2), 257.
- Karl, K., Peluchette, J., Hall-Indiana, L., & Harland, L. (2005). Attitudes toward workplace fun: A three sector comparison. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(2), 1-17.
- Karl, K., Peluchette, J., & Harland, L. (2007). Is fun for everyone? Personality differences in healthcare providers' attitudes toward fun. *Journal of health and human services administration*, 29(4), 409-447.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2015). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*. doi: 10.1177/0149206315575554
- MacAskill, E. (2014). Fivefold increase in terrorism fatalities since 9/11, says report *The Guardian*, UK. Retrieved June 21st, 2015, from <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/nov/18/fivefold-increase-terrorism-fatalities-global-index>
- Nissen, A., Birkeland Nielsen, M., Solberg, Ø., Bang Hansen, M., & Heir, T. (2015). Perception of threat and safety at work among employees in the Norwegian ministries after the 2011 Oslo bombing. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*(ahead-of-print), 1-13.
- Perlman, S. E., Friedman, S., Galea, S., Nair, H. P., Erős-Sarnyai, M., Stellman, S. D., . . . Greene, C. M. (2011). Short-term and medium-term health effects of 9/11. *The Lancet*, 378(9794), 925-934.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
- Ryan, A. M., West, B. J., & Carr, J. Z. (2003). Effects of the terrorist attacks of 9/11/01 on employee attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 647-659. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.647
- SATP, S. A. T. P. (2016). South Asia Terrorism Portal (Terrorism figures). Retrieved 3rd May 2016 <http://www.satp.org/satporgt/p/countries/pakistan/database/index.html>
- Schouten, R., Callahan, M. V., & Bryant, S. (2004). Community response to disaster: The role of the workplace. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 12(4), 229-237.
- Toker, S., Laurence, G. A., & Fried, Y. (2015). Fear of terror and increased job burnout over time: Examining the mediating role of insomnia and the moderating role of work support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(2), 272-291.
- UN, U. N. (2012). *One UN Programme II 2013-2017 Pakistan*. Pakistan: United Nations Pakistan. Retrieved from http://www.un.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/OP-II_web.pdf
- Wahlqvist, P., Carlsson, J., Stålhammar, N. O., & Wiklund, I. (2002). Validity of a Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Questionnaire for Patients with Symptoms of Gastro-Esophageal Reflux Disease (WPAI-GERD)—Results from a Cross-Sectional Study. *Value in Health*, 5(2), 106-113.
- Watson, D., Weber, K., Assenheimer, J. S., Clark, L. A., Strauss, M. E., & McCormick, R. A. (1995). Testing a tripartite model: I. Evaluating the convergent and discriminant validity of anxiety and depression symptom scales. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 104(1), 3.
- Williams, R., Bisson, J., Ajdukovic, D., Kemp, V., Olf, M., Alexander, D., . . . Bevan, P. (2009). *Draft Guidance for responding to the psychosocial and mental health needs of people affected by disasters or major incidents*. Brussels: North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO).

Table 1: Study 1 Sample Characteristics

Manager No.	Firm Size	Organizational Type	Age	Gender
1	450	Private sector: Energy service provider	28	male
2	185	Private sector: non-profit organization	29	Male
3	95	Private sector: Local Bank	34	Male
4	1000	Private sector: cigarette company	33	Male
5	2,200	Private sector: helping service organization	29	Female
6	60	Private sector: Mobile service provider	50	Male
7	65	Private sector: Project based company	34	Male
8	12	Private sector: MNC Bank	33	Male
9	100	Public sector: School Chain	45	Female
10	13	Public sector: International non-profit	34	Male
11	47	Private sector: Home delivery service	27	Male
12	600	MNC FMCG	46	Male
13	125	Private sector: Furniture manufacturing	65	Female
14	250	Large private firm	55	Male
15	40	Not disclosed	33	Male
Respondents were typically male (12/15)				
Respondents were typically married (11/15)				
Respondents were aged between 28-65 years.				
All identified as Muslims except for one Christian.				

Table 2. Study 1 Direct Quotes

Ref	Quote:
1	“They [employees] are a great asset for us; we do not want them to be frustrated. Since we are a kind of virtual organization and keeping an eye at all times is a difficult task. We are working to build their loyalty; we do not want our riders to switch or leave us. For example, there is room for them whenever they are free they come in take rest for a couple of hours, have tea, and hang out there. We have developed a rotation system to promote them from their current position and to change their job specifications, because exposure to the same job for sufficiently longer time can frustrate an individual...”
2	“(t)he owner and the CEO...They try to give them as much support as they can by way of monetary gain, emotional support...They try as best as they can to look after them”. Later, they went on to discuss POS in relation to terrorism: “They have been given guards with (bullet proof) jackets and proper guns”.
3	“Basically, the organizations are working here because they have to work here, they cannot shift to any other province or city. They can direct employees not to go to crowded areas, but they cannot protect employees to a large extent. They can protect them within the premises, but even then they cannot fully guarantee their safety. Our organization is trying; all the organizations are trying. But terrorism is such an act that they cannot fully guarantee anything, they can just tell employees to be safe”.
4	“The organization had CCTV cameras to monitor who comes in and who goes out, and outside the premises to monitor that no one plants a bomb...Even if we go to cafeteria, or other key places; people are checked”.
5	“[After the initial environmental scanning], we hired security officers who would give employees clearance report of the threats that day then employees would know which areas to go to and which places to avoid”.
6	“We were working for an American company, their security officials used to come often to guest houses (where employees were staying) and the workplaces to check whether employees were involved in any suspicious activities or not. This really irritated our staff and employees complained that they didn’t like being searched again and again”.
7	“His father was kidnapped, and he asked the organization for monetary support. The organization could not provide it and then he lost his father and later left the job [This was neither the first nor the only time it happened]”.
8	“It’s a developing country, I don’t think in our kind of organizations there is anything like that. They don’t care about their employees, that they would arrange some extra security, to prevent such activities”.
9	“The organization doesn’t support employees much. All they do is just go for DUA (condolence after the loss of life in terrorist incident), and nothing more than that. Nothing as such is given as support. Because the situation is that it happens very frequently and they can’t let people go on breaks”.
10	“We should prepare them for handling stress and provide them stress management training and risk assessment (risk to life), so they will be prepared for these kinds of situations. But unfortunately it doesn’t happen. There is no support here”

Table 3. Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Questions followed the stem “My Organization...” and were coded 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree	Factor Loadings	
	POS	Security POS
1. I feel safe in my workplace from the threat of terrorism	.253	<u>.799</u>
2. My organization provides armed security at my workplace	.149	<u>.771</u>
3. I feel safe at my workplace	.211	<u>.761</u>
4. My organization values workplace security	-.072	<u>.719</u>
5. My organization cares about my general satisfaction at work	<u>.798</u>	-.023
6. My organization really cares about my well-being	<u>.779</u>	.230
7. My organization really cares about my well-being	<u>.762</u>	.103
8. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice [Rev]	<u>.750</u>	.184
9. My organization values my contribution to its well-being	<u>.749</u>	.294
10. My organization would ignore any complaint from me [Rev]	<u>.698</u>	-.005
11. My organization shows very little concern for me [Rev]	<u>.691</u>	.131
12. My organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me [Rev]	<u>.683</u>	.148
Eigenvalues	4.514	2.554
Percentage variance	37.6%	21.3%
Number of items in measures	8-items	4-items
Cronbach's Alpha	.89	.78

[Rev] = Reverse coded

POS = Perceived Organizational Support

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Age	31.7	7.9	--								
2. Job Tenure	3.2	3.6	.48**	--							
3. Industry	1.8	.76	.25**	.11	--						
4. Fun Attitude	3.7	1.0	.01	.09	.07	--					
5. Job Satisfaction	3.4	.83	.02	.06	.08	.14	--				
6. Work-Life Balance	3.0	.98	.13	.09	.12	.07	.40**	--			
7. Work-Family Conflict	3.5	.88	-.01	.01	-.09	.17	-.14	-.52**	--		
8. POS	3.2	.86	-.01	.01	-.05	.13	.51**	.39**	-.37**	--	
9. Security POS	3.6	.82	.01	-.02	-.02	.09	.19*	.18*	-.20*	.35**	--

N=146. *p<.05, **p<.01

Table 5. Regression Models for Security POS towards Outcomes

<i>Predictors</i>	Outcomes					
	Job Satisfaction		Work-Life Balance		Work-Family Conflict	
Step 1: Controls	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Age	-.03	-.04	.17	.17	-.02	-.01
Gender	.13	.023	.12	.04	-.05	.03
Job Tenure	-.02	.05	-.11	-.06	.23*	.20*
Industry	.12	.14	.20	.20*	-.18	-.18
Firm Size	-.21*	-.15	.00	.08	.27**	.23*
Change in R^2	.08	.08	.09	.08	.15*	.13*
F change	1.603	1.448	1.817	1.628	3.131*	2.672*
Step 2: Predictor						
Security POS	.31**	.08	.24*	.07	-.28**	-.15
Change in R^2	.09**	.09**	.05*	.05*	.08**	.08**
F change	9.790**	9.630**	5.661*	5.392*	8.974**	8.668**
Step 3: Mediator (models 2 only)						
POS		.58***		.40***		-.34**
Change in R^2		.26***		.13***		.09**
F change		39.915***		15.286***		11.668**
<i>Total F</i>	3.098***	9.323***	2.535*	4.493***	4.333**	5.373***
Overall R^2	.17	.43	.15	.26	.22	.30
Adjusted R^2	.12	.38	.09	.21	.17	.24

Notes: Values are standardized beta coefficients. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

POS= Perceived Organizational Support

Figure 1. Theoretical Model

