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Abstract
The textile industry is critical for Pakistan’s economy since it significantly contributes to the country’s exports. However, most textile units in Pakistan are family-owned businesses, and their operational style is old and conventional. We proposed eleven hypotheses based on the Social Learning Theory and Attraction-Selection-Attrition model, including four mediating ones. We distributed 425 pre-developed questionnaires and received 414 useable responses. We have used Smart-PLS version 3.3 for statistical analysis, including reliability, validity, and discriminant analysis. Our results support all the direct and mediating hypotheses. The results also suggest that in the case of direct hypotheses, the strongest effect was on “the association of employee empowerment and work environment (β=0.523),” and the smallest effect on the association between training and development and organizational commitment (β=0.196). For the indirect hypotheses, the effect size ranges from β=0.094 to β=0.237. This study has focused on the textile sector. There is a need for more studies in other sectors and other cities. Our approach towards the study was limited. It restricted the
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consequences of work empowerment, working environment, and training and development to organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. Future studies may take a more holistic approach to analyzing the research problem.
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**Introduction**

Human resource is an essential element for sustainable growth and competitive advantage of a firm. It is far more important than resources, including capital, equipment, and monetary resources (Khuong, Mai, & Phuong, 2020). Nguyen, Yandi, and Mahaputra (2020) suggest that the human resource of an organization is far beyond the headcount of employees. Gan and Yusof (2019) assert that the richness in an organizational environment gives a firm a competitive edge. Many factors contribute to the organizational environment, including employee empowerment, policies, and procedures for the growth and development of employees (Nguyen, Yandi, & Mahaputra, 2020). All these factors have a relationship with motivation, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. Firms that manage their human resources efficiently and effectively grow steadily (Kerdpitak & Jermsittiparsert, 2020).

On the contrary, firms that cannot manage their human resources efficiently would have a short life. Even if these firms survive, they will constantly be operating under the threat of closure. Despite the importance of human resources, many firms fail to efficiently manage human resources, resulting in high turnover intentions and low organizational performance. Spanuth and Wald (2017) suggest that the antecedents to organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior are employee empowerment, working environment, and training and development. Extant literature suggests that these relationships are not as simple as they appear because some variables have mediating power (Prasetio, Yuniarsih, & Ahman, 2017). Thus, we have developed a conceptual framework that explores the direct relationships between the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment and the mediating roles of work environment and employee commitment. We have derived the following research questions to achieve the aim of the study.

1. What is the impact of working environment, employee empowerment, and training & development on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior?

2. What is the mediating role of the working environment on (i) employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior (ii) employee empowerment and organizational
commitment.

3. What are the mediating role of organizational commitment on (i) employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior, and (ii) work empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Theory and Conceptual Framework**

We have extended Bandura’s (1963) Social Learning Theory (SLT) and Schneider and Goldstein’s (2000) attraction-selection attrition (ASA) model for developing the conceptual model. The social learning model assumes that employees in an organization learn and adapt behavior by observing other employees (Agha, Nwekpa, & Eze, 2017). Thus, based on the information available to employees, they interpret it, leading to expectation, behavior, and consequences. Employees also adopt the norms and values and may exhibit cooperative behavior (Brown & Treviño, 2006). The social learning theory also assumes that a few role models inspire many employees. Such employees emulate the attitude and behavior of their ideal models in an organization (Hsieh, Weng, & Lin, 2018).

The Attraction-Selection Attrition (ASA) model suggests that employees have a strong tendency to join a group or an organization whose characteristics and attributes align with their traits. For example, an employee with deviant behavior would prefer to join a group that has such tendencies. On the other hand, another employee who helps others would join groups with similar tendencies. Employees’ stay in an organization depends on the compatibility between them and their employers’. A high variance in the norms and values of employees and employers would force the employee to find a new job (Lamm, Gordon, & Purser, 2010). An employer that does not appreciate the variance in norms and values, may coerce employees to switch to other organizations (Mensah & Bawole, 2019). Thus, the above discussion suggests that employee empowerment, work environment, commitment, training and development, and OCB are highly correlated. Based on the above theoretical discussion, we have proposed a model depicted in Figure 1 with seven direct and four mediating relationships.
Hypothesis Development

Employee Empowerment and Work Environment
Employee empowerment positively affects employees and organizations. Organizations benefit from improved performance, innovation, and quality of work (Zamanan et al., 2020). Employee empowerment improves employees' self-efficacy, motivation, and organizational identification. Consequently, it promotes a working environment where employees interact freely and learn by sharing their coworkers' experiences (Kiambati, Ngui, & Mathenge, 2018). Diab and Emam (2021) stress that employee empowerment makes employees more concerned about the organization and less about personal issues (Hashmi et al., 2021). Such attitudes and behaviors contribute to the success of organizations. Supportive management empowers employees by setting clear goals and provides all the possible resources to achieve their goals. Given the conducive environment, employees reciprocate by delivering more than their management expects (Ghanem, 2019). Such attitudes improve employees' self-concept and self-esteem.

Organizations have learned the importance of delegating decision-making to employees. Such policies not only improve work efficiency but also helps in developing future leaders (Rhee, Seog, Bozorov, & Dedahanov, 2017). A study found that employee
empowerment promotes a learning culture, leading to innovative processes and products (Jabbar & Hussin, 2018).

**H1: Employee empowerment significantly affects the work environment.**

**Employee Empowerment and Organizational Commitment**

Employee empowerment refers to delegating power and authority to employees. Employees with delegated power are more responsible and committed to the organization (Nikpour, 2018). They develop positive attitudes towards work which increases their job and organizational performance. Due to job empowerment, employees learn to make critical decisions, which helps build their confidence and self-esteem (Aggarwal, Dhaliwal, & Nobi, 2018). Bin-Jomah (2017) argues that empowerment is essential for the growth and sustainability of an organization. It motivates employees, due to which they extensively participate in decision-making. It also removes power distance between employees and management (Jafari, Ahmadi, & Norouzi-Koohdashti, 2017). Aranki, Suifan, and Sweis (2019) suggest that organizations benefit immensely by empowering employees. This empowerment increases employees’ sense of ownership and value to their inputs and decisions. Many researchers believe that empowerment makes employees’ the management spokesperson (Qing, Asif, Hussain, & Jameel, 2020). Many past studies have documented that employee empowerment is a precursor of employee commitment (Loke, Abu, & Lim, 2018).

**H2: Employee empowerment significantly affects organizational commitment.**

**Training & Development and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Training and development are vital for the success and growth of an organization. Han, Wang, and Yan (2019) assert that such programs promote organizational citizenship behavior (Ocampo, Tan & Sia, 2018). Extant studies have found that training and development practices and organizational citizenship behavior are positively associated (Miao, Humphrey, & Qian, 2018). The studies also suggest that training and development positively influence employee attitude and behaviors (Han et. al 2019). All employees do not have the same level of organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, organizations must motivate employees to demonstrate organizational citizenship behavior. For this, firms need to provide continuous counseling and training to employees (Nugroho, Widdah, & Hakim, 2020). A study on Pakistani university teachers concluded that training and development promote organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Noor, 2009).

Extant literature also suggests that training and development, directly and indirectly,
correlate with organizational citizenship behavior (Ocampo, Tan, & Sia, 2018). Ahmed (2016) in the banking sector of Sudan, found that HRM practices and training and development have a moderate effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, another study in the Malaysian telecommunication sector also concluded that training and development are essential for organizational citizenship behavior (Krishnan et al., 2017). Han et al. (2019) suggests that extensive training motivates employees to adopt organizational citizenship behavior, ultimately benefiting the organization.

H3: Training and development positively stimulate organization citizenship behavior.

Training & Development and Organizational Commitment
For sustainable growth, an organization needs highly skilled employees (Ahmad et al., 2019). Besides hiring skilled employees, firms need to impart training and development to employees continuously. Newly learned skills improve employee motivation and commitment (Bibi, Ahmad & Majid, 2018). Consequently, employees believe that employers care about them, promoting positive attitudes towards work and a sustainable relationship with employees (Jalal, Zaheer & Sultan, 2017). Many past studies have examined the association between employee’s perception of training and development and organizational commitment in different sectors (Aleem & Bowra, 2020). These studies have concluded that training and development promote organizational commitment leading to low turnover intentions (Desta, 2021). Committed employees attend training programs seriously and apply learned skills to improve their performance. Most firms realize the importance of training and development; therefore, they allocate appropriate resources (Rodriguez & Walters, 2017). The business environment is dynamic and rapidly changing, requiring new skills. Firms that do not upgrade their training programs would reduce the commitment level of their employees (Ramdhani, Ramdhani & Ainissyifa, 2017).

H4: Employee training & development significantly affects organizational commitment.

Working Environment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior
The working environment in an organization includes tangibles such as buildings, work stations, offices, and intangibles such as social and cultural values. Both tangible and intangible aspects affect employee attitude and behavior (Han, Wang & Yan, 2019). A pleasant and conducive environment motivates employees to give optimum performance. On the other hand, a poor and unpleasant environment adversely affects employee attitude and behavior. It also directs them to defy established rules and regulations (Supriyanto, Ekowati, & Maghfuroh, 2020).
In the current competitive era, organizations have to increase organizational performance for survival and growth (Organ, 2018). Apart from other factors, organizations need to develop and maintain a conducive environment that motivates employees to participate in decision-making activities and voluntarily follow established rules and regulations (Chen & King, 2018). Researchers for decades have been studying the association between organizational environment, employee citizenship behavior, and organizational performance in different sectors (Meynhardt, Brieger, & Hermann, 2020). Many past studies have suggested that several industries have addressed low productivity by making changes in the tangible aspects of the working environment (Organ, 2018). For example, firms have experimented by changing illumination, temperature, and atmospheric conditions. The effect of these changes on productivity varied from one study to another. Especially after the Hawthorne studies, researchers started experimenting on the social environment and organizational citizenship behavior (Anser, Shafique, Usman, Akhtar, & Ali, 2021).

**H5**: Working environment positively affects organizational citizenship behavior.

**Working Environment and Organizational Commitment**

Successful managers create an environment where employees feel confident and competent to take delegated job assignments. Consequently, their attitude towards work improves significantly (Lee & Cho, 2018). Aybar and Marşap (2018) suggest that in a conducive working environment, managers empower their employees, due to which their engagement and commitment increase significantly. Working environment factors, including peer relationships, supervisor support, and delegated authority, are significant predictors of affective commitment (Labrague et al., 2018). Ming, Tee, and Hua (2018) argue that a conducive and motivating environment helps employees realize and utilize their capabilities. Thus, employees benefit from an environment that promotes a sense of belonging and empowers them. These benefits improve employees’ motivation levels and enhance organizational commitment, leading to sustainable employee relationships (Silaban & Syah, 2018).

Similarly, Lee and Cho (2018) argue that environmental factors such as organizational support, working relationships, and employees’ participation in decision-making are essential for employee commitment. Extant literature suggests that the requirements of the working environment vary from one generation to another (Massoudi, Jameel, & Ahmad, 2020). Thus, firms that have the flexibility of aligning the environment according to the generation values would have sustainable growth. When firms are concerned about employees, it enhances their attitude towards work. Employee-friendly policies and procedures are essential for commanding employees’ trust and respect (Lee & Cho,
2018).

**H6: Working environment positively affects organizational commitment.**

**Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Organizational commitment increases the bonding between employees and employers. Djaelani, Sanusi, and Triatmanto (2021) assert that employee commitment motivates employees to engage in delegated and non-delegated jobs. Such engagement also motivates employees to follow organizational rules and regulations (Ullah, Jama, & Naeem, 2018; Nugroho, Widdah, & Hakim, 2020). Prasetio, Yuniarsih, and Ahman (2017) suggest that high organizational commitment is necessary for the sustainability of an organization. Committed employees support the organization and prioritize organizational and personal goals (Yang & Wei, 2018). The reason for sacrificing personal goals over organizational goals is that employees believe that the growth and sustainability of the organization, in the long run, will benefit them (Wombacher & Felfe, 2017). Djaelani, Sanusi, and Triatmanto (2021) found that organizational commitment promotes behavior in an individual that exceeds formal requirements. Committed employees are highly cooperative with other team members and motivated to follow the norms and values of the organization.

**H7: Organizational commitment positively stimulates organizational citizenship behavior.**

**Mediating Relationships**

We have proposed four mediating relationships as the above discussion suggests that employee empowerment affects the work environment and organizational commitment. Further, work environment and organizational commitment affect organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

**H8: Organizational commitment mediates employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior.**

**H9: Organizational commitment mediates work environment and organizational citizenship behavior**

**H10: Work environment mediates employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior.**
*H11: Work environment mediates employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior*

**Methodology**

**Population and Sampling**
The study has focused on the textile sector of Pakistan, as it significantly contributes toward employment generation and GDP in Pakistan. The other reason for selecting this segment is that most textile units are family-owned and may not have adopted professional management skills. The minimum acceptable sample size for the study was calculated as 384, based on a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. The authors’ personally visited several textile units and distributed 425 questionnaires non-randomly. We received 414 useable responses.

**Respondents Profile**
The data suggests that 65% of the respondents were from the management cadre, and 35% were from the non-management cadre. Age demographics show that 25% of the respondents were in the age group of 18 to 28 years, another 25% were in the age bracket of 29 to 39 years, 22% were in the age group of 40 to 50 years, and the remaining were over 51 years old. In terms of gender, we found that 55% were females, and 45% were males. Marital status suggests that 65% of respondents were married, and 35% were single. Further, we found that 35% of the respondents income was between Rs.15,000/= to Rs.25,000/=, 30% respondents had income ranging from Rs.26,000/= to Rs.35,000/=, 20% respondent income ranged from Rs.36,000/= to Rs.45,000/=, and 15% respondents income was greater than Rs.45,000/=.

The education profile shows that 35% of the respondents’ education was up to matric level, 40% of the respondents had an intermediate level of education, 20% of the respondents’ education level was equivalent to bachelor, and 15% had a Masters degree or higher level of education.

**Scales and Measures**

**Employee Empowerment**
Employee empowerment refers to “how organizations provide their employees with a certain degree of autonomy and control in their day-to-day activities” (Bose & Emirates, 2018). The study has taken eight items from Men (2011) to measure employee empowerment. The respondents rated the statements on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Cronbach’s Alpha values of all the items of employee empowerment are greater than 0.70.
Training and Development
Training and development refer to educational activities within or outside the company to enhance employee knowledge and skills. The training could be job-specific or soft skills (Haugen, Seiler, Sandbakk, & Tønnessen, 2019). The study has taken 12 items from Schmidt (2004) to measure training and development. The respondents rated the statements on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Cronbach’s Alpha values of all the items of training and development in the previous studies ranged from 0.75 to 0.88.

Organizational Commitment
It is the employee’s psychological and non-psychological attachment with the employer. Both these factors deter employees from switching to other organizations (Karim & Noor, 2017). The study has taken six items from Allen and Meyer (1993) to measure organizational commitment. The respondents have rated the statements on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” The Cronbach’s alpha values of all the items of organizational commitment are greater than 0.70. The Cronbach’s alpha values in earlier studies were as high as 0.78 and as low as 0.89.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) refers to the extent to which employees are willing to go beyond the formal work requirement (Choi & Ha, 2020). The study has taken five items from Podsakoff et al. (1990) to measure organizational citizenship behavior. The respondents have rated the statements on the five-point Likert scale, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” The Cronbach’s alpha values in earlier empirical studies ranged from 0.77 to 0.86.

Working Environment
A work environment refers to an organization’s tangible and intangible elements (Karim & Noor, 2017). The study has taken eight items from Akintayo (2002) to measure the work environment. The respondents have rated the statements on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” The Cronbach’s alpha values of all the items in past studies are greater than 0.70.

Statistical Analysis
The study has used Smart PLS software version 3.22 to check for robustness and estimate complex models accurately and efficiently. We performed the statistical analyses in two
steps. The study estimated the measurement model in the first step, which gives the model's reliability, validity, and predictability. As the values were within the acceptable range, we estimated the structural model in the second step.

Results

Descriptive Analysis
The study initially tested for internal consistency and univariate normality of the constructs used in the study. Table 1 illustrates the summary of the results.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Empowerment</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>-1.487</td>
<td>-0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>4.001</td>
<td>-1.115</td>
<td>-0.999</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>-0.899</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Environment</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>3.705</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>-1.980</td>
<td>1.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented in Table 1 shows that the highest Cronbach’s alpha value is for employee empowerment (Mean=3.882, SD=1.110, α=0.983) and the lowest is for training and development (Mean=3.882, SD=1.110, α=0.983), suggesting that the constructs used in the study have acceptable internal consistency (Roberts & Priest, 2006). Table 1 shows that the skewness value ranged from 0.900 to 1.459. Further, the highest Kurtosis value is 1.314, and the lowest is -0.987, suggesting that the constructs do not violate the requirements of univariate normality (Henderson, 2006).

Convergent and Discriminant Validity
The study has assessed convergent validity through the composite reliability values and average variance extracted. Moreover, the discriminant validity was assessed based on the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criteria. Table 2 illustrates the summary of the results.

Table 2: Convergent and Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>T&amp;D</th>
<th>WE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Empowerment</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Environment</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results depicted in Table 2 shows that the highest composite reliability is for employee empowerment (CR=0.921) and the lowest for training and development (CR=0.890). The average variance extracted (AVE) value ranges from 0.705 to 0.741. The AVE values are greater than 0.60, and composite reliability values are greater than 0.70, suggesting that the constructs used in the study have convergent validity (Golafshani, 2003). Similarly, we find that all Pearson correlation values are less than the square roots of AVE, suggesting the constructs are unique and distinct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

The study assessed the theoretical association of constructs and indicator variables through CFA. The summary of the results is illustrated in Table 3.

**Table 3: CFA Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Empowerment</th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Training and Development</th>
<th>Working Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE8</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: CFA Results (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Empowerment</th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Training and Development</th>
<th>Working Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have dropped the indicator variables whose loadings were less than 0.70. The retained indicator variables have factor loadings greater than 0.70, suggesting a theoretical association between the constructs and their respective indicator variables (Hurley et al., 1997).

**Predictive Power of the Model**
We have tested the predictive power of the model. Table 4 and Table 5 show the R-squared and Q-square values of the model, which suggests that the model has significant predictive power (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

**Table 4: R-Squared Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Environment</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Q-Square Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Org. Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Working Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fit Indices**
We have tested the model fitness based on commonly used indices. The SRMR value $=0.094<0.10$ and NFI$=.808 >0.80$. Other fit indices (refer to Table 6) are within the limit, suggesting that the model fits adequately.
### Table 6: Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saturated Model</th>
<th>Estimated Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.094 &lt;.10 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d_ULS</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>1.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d_G</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>364.535</td>
<td>363.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.808&gt; 0.80.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statistical Results

The study has tested 11 hypotheses, including four mediating through bootstrapping with 5000 sub-samples. Table 7 below illustrates the summary of the results.

### Table 7: Statistical Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T Stat.</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Hypotheses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Empowerment -&gt; Work. Environment (H1)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>7.568</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Empowerment -&gt; Org. Commitment (H2)</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Dev. -&gt; Org. Citizenship Behavior (H3)</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Dev. -&gt; Org. Commitment (H4)</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work. Envy. -&gt; Org. Citizenship Beh. (H5)</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>3.887</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work. Env. -&gt; Org.Com.(H6)</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment -&gt; Org. Citizenship Behavior (H7)</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>2.224</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Hypotheses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Emp. -&gt; Org. Com. -&gt; Org. Cit. Beh (H8)</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work. Env. -&gt; Org. Com. -&gt; Org. Cit. Beh.(H9)</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Emp. -&gt; work. Env. -&gt; Org. Cit. Beh.(H10)</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>3.497</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp. Emp. -&gt; Work. Env. -&gt; Org. Com(H11)</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>3.029</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our results support all the seven direct and four indirect hypotheses. The results suggest that in the case of direct hypotheses, the strongest effect was on “the association of employee empowerment and work environment (β= 0.523)”, and the weakest effect on the association between training and development and organizational commitment (β=0.196). For indirect hypotheses, the effect size ranges from β=0.094 to β=0.237.
Figure 2: Measurement Model

Figure 3: Structural Model
Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion
This study has extended the Social Learning Theory (SLT) and attraction-selection attrition (ASA) to examine the working environment, training, and employee empowerment in the textile sector of Pakistan. This study has discussed the empirical results with the past literature in the following sections.

Hypothesis 1 states that “employee empowerment affects the working environment,” which our results support. Employee empowerment motivates employees to actively participate in decision-making and other job-related activities (Nikpour, 2018). It enhances employee self-esteem, positively influences attitude and behavior, and enhances their job commitment. All these factors significantly contribute towards a conducive working environment (Aggarwal, Dhaliwal, & Nobi, 2018).

Hypothesis 2 postulates that “employee empowerment stimulates organizational commitment.” Our results support this hypothesis (Loke, Abu, & Lim, 2018). Empowering employees benefits both employees and employers. Employees’ sense of responsibility, attitude, and behavior increase significantly, leading towards employee commitment. At the same time, employee commitment is a precursor to sustainable growth and increased organizational performance (Qing, Asif, Hussain, & Jameel, 2020).

Hypothesis 3 proposes that “training and development stimulate organizational citizenship behavior.” The results support this hypothesis. Training and development are necessary for firms to stay competitive. Training enhances employees’ skills and improves their productivity (Han, Wang, & Yan, 2019). The extant literature has documented that training and development influences a positive work attitude and significantly improves organizational citizenship behavior (Ocampo, Tan, & Sia, 2018). Thus, firms need to impart counseling and training to employees regularly (Han et al., 2019).

Hypothesis 4 suggests that “training and development promote organizational commitment.” Based on our results, we have accepted this hypothesis. An organization’s sustainable growth requires a skilled and committed labor force (Jalal, Zaheer, & Sultan, 2017). Besides other factors, training and development are important for organizational commitment (Aleem & Bowra, 2020). The business environment is dynamic and changing rapidly, requiring new skills. Firms that do not upgrade their training programs would reduce the commitment level of their employees (Ramdhani, Ramdhani, & Ainissyifa, 2017).
Hypothesis 5 states that the “working environment stimulates citizenship behavior.” The results support this hypothesis. Extant literature suggests that an organization’s poor and unpleasant environment adversely affects employee attitude and behavior (Han, Wang, & Yan, 2019). On the contrary, firms that provide a conducive and pleasant environment enhances employees’ motivational level. Employees in such firms have high self-esteem and voluntarily follow established rules and regulations (Supriyanto, Ekowati, & Maghfuroh, 2020).

Hypothesis 6 postulates that the “working environment promotes organizational commitment.” Based on the empirical results, we have accepted this hypothesis. An environment where employees feel comfortable positively affects their attitudes and behavior (Lee & Cho, 2018). Extant literature suggests that environmental factors, including peer relation, supervisor support, and delegated authority, are significant predictors of affective commitment (Ming, Tee, & Hua, 2018).

Hypothesis 7 suggests that “organizational commitment promotes organizational citizenship behavior.” Organizational commitment is necessary for employees’ positive attitude, behavior, and organizational citizenship behavior (Yang & Wei, 2018). Committed employees support organizational goals and often sacrifice their personal goals. They believe that organizational success would benefit them (Djaelani, Sanusi, & Triatmanto, 2021).

**Mediating Hypothesis**

Our results support the following four mediating hypotheses. Organizational commitment mediates (i) employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior and (ii) work environment and organizational citizenship behavior. Also, we found that the work environment mediates (iii) employee empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior and (iv) employee empowerment and organizational commitment.

**Conclusion**

The textile industry in Pakistan is critical for Pakistan since it significantly contributes towards the economy. However, most textile units in Pakistan are family-owned businesses, and their operational style is old and conventional. We have extended Social Learning Theory and Attraction-Selection-Attrition model and proposed eleven hypotheses. Our results support all the hypotheses. Also, the results have revalidated the hypotheses proposed in earlier studies.

The study found that employee empowerment significantly affects the working environment and organizational citizenship behavior. The study also validated the
association of training and development on organization citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. We also found that the work environment stimulates organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. Furthermore, organizational commitment affects organizational citizenship behavior. The study has also tested for mediating relationships and accepted them. The results suggest that organizational commitment motivates (i) employee empowerment and organizational citizenship and (ii) work environment and organizational citizenship behavior. The results also suggest that the work environment mediates (iii) employee empowerment and organizational commitment.

**Limitations and Future Research**
This study has focused on the textile sector. There is a need for more studies in other sectors and other cities. The scope of the study was limited. It analyzed the consequences of work empowerment, working environment, and training and development on organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment. Thus, we advise future researchers to use more variables, including turnover intentions and work-family conflict. A country like Pakistan, due to ethnicity and rich culture, would also affect the organizational environment. We strongly recommend others to explore these aspects.
Constructs and Items Used in the Questionnaire

**Employee Empowerment**

EE1. I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
EE2. I feel competent to perform the tasks required for my position.
EE3. I am confident about my ability to do my job.
EE4. I feel adequately prepared to perform my job.
EE5. My manager trusts me to make the appropriate decisions in my job.
EE6. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.
EE7. I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.
EE8. I have the authority to make the decisions that need to be made to perform my job well.

**Training and development**

**Satisfaction with training**

TD1. Training meets employees’ needs.
TD2. Amount of training is satisfactory.
TD3. Ability to use training content on job.
TD4. Training applicability to job.

**Employee feelings about training**

TD5. Seeks out learning opportunities.
TD6. Views job training as continuous endeavor.
TD7. Proactive in seeking ways to improve.
TD8. Learning goals established for present and future positions.

**Organizational support for training**

TD9. Learning is planned and purposeful.
TD10. Department provides training opportunities.
TD11. Interest in personal and professional development.
TD12. Training is encouraged and rewarded.

**Organizational commitment**

OC1. Right now, staying with the organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
OC2. Even if it were to my advantage. I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization.
OC3. I would feel guilty if I feel my organization.
OC4. This organization deserve my loyalty.
OC5. I would not leave the organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
OC6. I owe great deal to my organization.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB1. I help others who have a heavy workload.
OCB2. I believe in working honestly for my organization.
OCB3. I avoid creating problems for coworkers.
OCB4. I attend meetings that are not mandatory but are considered important.
OCB5. I obey company rules and regulations at all times.

Work Environment

WE1. The supervisor provides me with sufficient information related to work.
WE2. The supervisor has reasonable expectations of work.
WE3. Immediate supervisors’ trust in fellow coworkers.
WE4. Responsibility of immediate supervisors toward employees.
WE5. Training helped in the advancement of my career.
WE6. Training helped to improve work efficiency.
WE7. The career advancement opportunities or your competence in general.
WE8. Communication between the immediate supervisor and employees.
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