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With reference to previous research indicating that collectivism orientation of employees could influence team performance; this study examines the moderating effect of product diversification strategy on Collectivistic-HRM (C-HRM) and firm performance. While prior research focuses on individual and national level of collectivism, the present study focuses on organizational collectivism. Firms from the insurance industry in China were taken as the units of analysis. Survey results were collected from 30 companies. Secondary data from the *Yearbook of China’s Insurance Industry* were used. The following four research questions were answered: “Is there a relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and firm performance?”, “Is there a relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and employee loyalty?”, “Is there a relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and employees’ willingness to set up challenging work goals?”, “Does the firm’s strategy of diversification moderates the relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and firm performance?” Using regression analysis, it was found that high level of C-HRM practices was associated with better firm performance when the company had low level of product diversification. However, without “product diversification” as a moderator, the relationship between C-HRM and firm performance became negative. Hence, the impact of product diversification was significant. Implications for research and practice were further discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

In recent decades, China has been regarded as a rising dragon, the economy of greatest development potential. Although there is an obvious cultural difference, with China being more collectivistic while the western societies being more individualistic, many companies from the West still want to enter the Chinese market. However, some companies succeeded while others were forced to leave after huge investment. Interestingly, most of those who remain in the market have certain levels of local adaptation, suggesting that these organizations might have tried to modify their corporate culture to fit the local context. To state it more explicitly, these successful organizations may have adopted a collectivistic management style. Provoked by this observation, it is postulated that Collectivistic-HRM may be one of the success factors for business. If this is the case, companies may consider changing their HRM practices to enhance firm performance.

Contribution of the study

Some literatures suggested that individual collectivism was associated with social loafing in an organization. Under the Collectivistic-HRM culture, emphasis on team performance might lead to social loafing due to the difficulties in measuring individual contribution. Thus, individual collectivism negatively impacts on individual performance. Others suggested that individual
collectivism could improve group performance through various organizational citizenship behaviors. Up till now, the effects of individual collectivism on job performance still remain inconclusive.

Further, little attempts were made to investigate the effects of collectivism at an organizational level. While pervious research of collectivism has mainly been focusing on individual and country level perspectives, limited research has been done on how Collectivistic-HRM practices affect firm performance. Therefore, it is my aim to fill up this gap.

Finally, to my knowledge, this study is the first test of the moderating effect of product diversification on C-HRM and firm performance. Not many studies have tested the possible moderating effects that may influence the linkage between C-HRM and firm performance. Without addressing the factors that have impact on C-HRM – firm performance linkage, it is difficult to understand the dynamics of C-HRM practices. Therefore, it is essential to identify and test factors that strengthen or weaken such a relationship.

**Purpose**

This study particularly focuses on examining the moderating effect of firm strategy on Collectivistic-HRM and firm performance. Specifically, there are 4 research questions:

a. Is there a relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and firm performance?

b. Is there a relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and employee loyalty?
c. Is there a relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and employees’ willingness to set up challenging work goals?

d. Does the firm’s strategy of diversification moderates the relationship between Collectivistic-HRM and firm performance?

Literature Review

Collectivistic-HRM

Collectivism as a cultural dimension was first introduced by Greet Hofstede in 1980. While Hofstede viewed collectivism as a national variance, other scholars later on narrowed down to examine collectivism on an individual basis. (Clugston et al., 2000; Hui et al., 1995; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Ramamoorthy & Carroll, 1998; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2002; Wagner, 1995; Workman, 2001).

Indeed, collectivism not only can be analyzed at a country level and individual level, it can also be examined at an organizational level. Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, and Neale (1998) defined collectivist organizational cultures as those that emphasize shared objectives, interchangeable interests, and commonalities among members. In contrast, individualistic organizational cultures are those that emphasize individuals’ unique attributes and emphasize differences among employees. Although not much empirical research has been focused on organizational collectivism, some findings suggested that firm performance could be influenced by the individualistic/collectivistic organizational culture, which might be manifested in the variations of Human Resource Management (HRM) practices.
According to Erez and Earley (1993), HRM practices varied in individualistic and collectivistic cultures, with an emphasis on independence and rationality in the former, and an emphasis on interdependence and obligations in the latter. Such emphases are disguised in selection, performance appraisal, job-design, and termination processes in organizations. For example, Triandis and Vassiliou (1972) found that employers in Greece gave more weight to recommendations of friends and relatives when making hiring decisions, as compared with employers in the United States. While current research suggested HR as a strategic partner, influencing firm performance, could mean that Collectivistic-HRM practices (C-HRM) might play a part in impacting firm performance.

**Hypothesis 1**

*C-HRM has a significant and positive effect on firms’ growth over the years.*

**Hypothesis 2**

*C-HRM has a significant and positive effect on firms’ profitability over the years.*

**Employee loyalty**

C-HRM might encompass various cultural dimensions. Culture is difficult to be measured. Therefore, criteria to determine the degree of C-HRM are needed. Amongst all criteria, employee loyalty and challenging work goals were regarded as the most relevant ones in this study.
Employee loyalty is conceptually associated with the degree of organizational collectivism. Parkes et al. (2001) reported that collectivists tended to exhibit greater commitment to the organization and had longer tenure than individualists. Similarly, Kirkman and Shapiro (2000) reported that collectivists were more committed to their teams than individualists and preferred teamwork. Collectivists formed stronger bonds with in-group members and were more likely to make sacrifices for the good of the group (Ho & Chiu, 1994; Oyserman et al., 2002; Triandis, 1995), making withdrawal less likely. Another research finding revealed the fact that higher level of individualism orientation resulted in a lower level of team loyalty ($\beta = -.84$, $p < .01$). The above results reflected that high degree of organizational collectivism would lead to high degree of employee loyalty.

Since employees with a collectivistic orientation tend to develop close relationships with others and appreciate the feeling of belonging to a social entity, these employees are assumed to build stronger relationships with their organization and show higher commitment. On top of this, numerous researches have come into consensus that employee commitment would improve organizational performance. Hence, C-HRM is thought to have a positive influence on employee loyalty and firm performance.

_Hypothesis 3_

There is a significant and positive relationship between C-HRM and employee loyalty.
Challenge work goal

It is possible that emphasis on group performance in C-HRM culture leads to social loafing because of the difficulty in measuring individual contribution, which reduces group performance and indirectly reduces firm performance.

Nevertheless, it is also possible that C-HRM may be associated with employees’ willingness to set up challenging work goals, thus, resulting in better firm performance. Since collectivistic-HRM stresses more on organization goal than individual goal. Employees under the C-HRM culture may have the urge to comply with group norms, resulting in escalation of commitment, which brings about greater willingness to take up challenging work. Since commitment to work may be recognized or rewarded by the company, this further reinforces employees’ willingness to set up challenging work goals.

Hypothesis 4

There is a significant and positive relationship between C-HRM and employees’ willingness to set up challenging goal in their work.

Product diversification strategy

The effect of product diversification on firm performance has been a major research topic. According to Varadarajan and Ramanujam (1989), product diversification is “the entry of a firm or business unit into new lines of activity, either by process of internal business development or acquisition, that entails changes in its administrative structure, systems or other management
processes.” Following this vein, product diversification refers to an increase in the number of industries in which firms are active, rather than a simple extension in product line. (Berry, 1975).

Product diversification can be divided into related diversification and unrelated diversification. Many researchers supported the argument that the more unrelated the diversification of a firm from its core industry, the more its performance would suffer (Rumelt, 1974; Bettis, 1981; Christensen and Montgomery, 1981; Bettis and Mahajan, 1985). It could be resulted because of the nature that unrelated product diversification provides few operating synergies. Recent research showed that product diversification negatively impacted performance in general (Berger and Ofek, 1995; Denis et al., 1997).

Another research, with its context in Singapore proposed that “Non-product diversified firms outperform product diversified firms.” The above postulation was supported as non-product diversified firms generated higher accounting returns than their diversified counterparts ($p < 0.05$), non-product diversified firms experienced greater capital appreciation in the financial market than their diversified counterparts ($p < 0.05$), and non-product diversified firms created greater intangible value than their diversified counterparts ($p < 0.01$). It is then concluded that product diversification is negatively related to performance. (Tongli, L., Ping, E., & Kwok, W., 2005) Based on the above findings, hypotheses 5a and 5b were generated.
Hypothesis 5a

Firm strategy of diversification moderates the relationship between C-HRM and firm performance. Other conditions being equal, the positive effect of C-HRM on firms’ growth is more likely to be observed under the condition of low diversification.

Hypothesis 5b

Firm strategy of diversification moderates the relationship between C-HRM and firm performance. Other conditions being equal, the positive effect of C-HRM on firms’ profitability is more likely to be observed under the condition of low diversification.

The figure below shows the conceptual framework of the five hypotheses.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Data and Sample

Both primary and secondary data were used in this study. To tap company culture, employee loyalty and employees’ willingness to set up challenging work goals, printed questionnaires were given to managers in the insurance companies operating in China. The questionnaires were distributed by mail to 30 companies.

Other data were collected from the Yearbook of China’s Insurance Industry, the official publication of the Insurance Association of China. It consisted of all 68 domestic and overseas insurance firms operating in China in 2006. The entire population consisted of 23 local Chinese firms and 45 Sino-foreign joint ventures or wholly owned foreign enterprises. Data reliability and validity were assured by an independent editorial board, which comprised of representatives from the insurance companies and officials from China’s Statistical Bureau.

Since two data sets from two different sources were adopted in this study, the problem of common source bias could be eliminated.
Variables and Measures

Assuming that the institutionalized policy of human resource management among the sample firms would remain basically unchanged for several years, I conducted another study linking their human resource policy their actual performance. Before I did this, I confirmed this assumption by asking the firm managers a question, which was “is there any major change in your firm’s human resource policy in the past few years?” Only those firms with a “no” answer would be included into the data analyses in Study 2. Based on the scores of C-HRM, I divided the firms into two groups, namely, high C-HRM and low C-HRM. The former was the group of firms with a score of C-HRM higher than the mean score (value = 1), and the latter was the group with a score lower than the mean score (value = 0). I used this measure to test the effect of C-HRM on firm performance over the years.

Independent variables

C-HRM

C-HRM is an independent variable in this model. I used a four-item scale to measure C-HRM. The items were adapted from the GLOBE study of collectivism and institutional collectivism practice at (cf. House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004). Four 7-point items were selected after a factor analysis, in which 1 = low COHRM and 7=high COHRM. 1) The pay and bonus system in this organization is designed to maximize (individual/collectivism). 2) In this organization, the majority of employees have a long-term employment contact (strongly disagree/strongly agree). 3) This organization shows loyalty to its employees (strongly disagree/strongly agree). 4) In this organization, employees take pride in the accomplishment
of their organization (strongly disagree/ strongly agree). We conducted a pre-test of this four-item scale and found that these four items had a reliability alpha higher than 0.7. In addition, the GLOBE had already developed the Chinese version for these items so that we could use the questionnaires in China directly.

**Employee Loyalty**

Employee loyalty was measured by two items using a 7-point scale with 1 = high loyalty and 2 = low loyalty. 1) In this organization, Managers encourage employees to be loyal to the company even when it involves personal sacrifices (strongly agree/ strongly disagree). 2) In this organization, employees show their loyalty to the company (strongly agree/ strongly disagree).

**Willingness to set up challenging work goals**

Willingness to set up challenging work goals was tapped by the following statement. “In this organization, most employees are willing to set up their own challenging work goals” (strongly disagree/ strongly agree). Once again, a 7-point scale measurement was used with 1 = low willingness to set up challenging work goals and 7 = high willingness to set up challenging work goals.

**Dependent variable**

**Firm Performance**

Firm performance is the dependent variable. Many relevant past researches measured firm performance by a firm’s growth rate and profitability. (e.g., Richard, 2000) I, therefore,
adopted the same measurement in our study. A firm’s growth rate is calculated through its return on assets (ROA). ROA is the ratio of total profit to total assets of each firm.

\[
\text{ROA} = \frac{\text{Net Income}}{\text{Total Assets}} \times 100\%
\]

A firm’s profitability is calculated through the average profit generated per employee in a firm.

\[
\text{Profitability} = \frac{(\text{Total Revenue} - \text{Total Costs})}{\text{Number of employees}}
\]

**Control variables**

**Entry mode**

Entry mode was measured as a dummy that took the value of zero for local ownership and one for equity joint venture. Entry mode was controlled because whether a firm was an equity joint venture (EJV) or a local ownership would influence its performance. An EJV is a partnership between an overseas and a Chinese individual company/enterprise or financial organizations. In an EJV, a firm can benefit from a partner’s knowledge and expertise. It can also gain by sharing the costs and risks in operating the business. All these factors may improve a firm’s performance. However, EJV has potential risks of the inability to realize location and experience economies and the inability to engage in global strategic coordination, which might hinder firm performance. (Hill, C., 2008) In contrast, local ownership may gain from having more control on the business, which results in quicker response to the market and better firm performance. Nevertheless, local ownership incurs higher costs and risks. All of the above show that entry mode may interfere with the study of the relationship between C-HRM and firm performance. Therefore, it should be controlled.
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**Country**

Developed from the resource-based view (RBV) of the firm, Tan, Brian R. (2007) discovered that product diversification was negatively related to performance in more munificent environments but positively related to performance in less munificent environments. As different countries differ with its resources endowment and resources endowment may affect a firm’s performance, country was taken as a control variable in this study.

**Types of insurance**

Different types of insurance, for instance life insurance and property insurance are associated with different market risks. Obviously, performance of these firms can differ significantly. Thus, to test the relationship between C-HRM and firm performance, the types of insurance has to be ruled out.

**Firm age**

Firm age was coded as the number of years from the founding of a firm to 2006. Firm age was included as one of the control variables since prior research revealed the significant moderating effect of firm age on the collectivism-firm performance relationship. (p = 0.30) (Ling, Y., Zhao, H, & Baron, R. 2007)

**Firm size**

Firm size was calculated as the logarithm of the firm’s total number of staff. Firm size was included as a control variable because larger firms might have more resources than smaller firms, which might moderate the relationship between C-HRM and firm performance.
CHAPTER 3
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data collected from questionnaires and the Yearbook of China’s Insurance Industry were inputted into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences statistical software for analysis. To test the hypotheses, I conducted two studies. Data for Study 1 were obtained from the questionnaires while data for Study 2 were obtained from the Yearbook of China’s Insurance Industry.

Study 1

Due to limited data, this study tested only the correlation of the variables. Data in Study 1 were used to test hypotheses 3 and 4. Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations and zero-order correlations of the variables.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations among the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C-HRM</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee loyalty</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>0.530**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willingness to set up</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>0.653**</td>
<td>0.694**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that all three variables, C-HRM, employee loyalty and willingness to set up challenging work goals, were significantly correlated with each other. A positive and significant relationship was found between employee loyalty and C-HRM (r = 0.530, p < 0.01). Thus,
hypothesis 3 was supported. Furthermore, positive and significant relationship also existed between C-HRM and willingness to set up challenging work goals \((r = 0.653, p < 0.01)\). The result supported hypothesis 4.

**Study 2**

Regression analysis was used to test hypotheses 1, 2, 5a and 5b. The scores for the variables were centered before being multiplied. Then, the dimension of firm performance, including ROA and firm profitability, were entered as dependent variables. Next, control variables, such as entry mode, firm size and firm age were entered (Model 1). Following that, product diversification and C-HRM were added (Model 2). Consequently, the interaction between product diversification and C-HRM was included (Model 3).

Table 2 presents the results of the regression analyses with firm growth and firm profitability as the dependent variables, and product diversification as the moderator.

### Table 2: Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJV</td>
<td>- 0.084</td>
<td>- 1.216</td>
<td>- 0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>- 0.009</td>
<td>- 0.113</td>
<td>- 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life/property insurance</td>
<td>- 0.059</td>
<td>- 1.014</td>
<td>- 0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm age</td>
<td>- 0.028</td>
<td>- 0.515</td>
<td>- 0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese owned/Foreign owned</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm size</td>
<td>- 0.007</td>
<td>- 0.111</td>
<td>- 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product diversification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.183***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product diversification X C-HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R )</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.03179</td>
<td>0.03130</td>
<td>0.03090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *\( p < 0.05 \); **\( p < 0.01 \); ***\( p < 0.001 \).
The standard errors for Model 1, 2 and 3 were 0.03179, 0.03130 and 0.03090 respectively. This means only 3% of chance that the results were due to error.

Although there was no overall linear relationship between the independent variable (Model 2), C-HRM and the dependent variable, firm performance, the relationship between these two variables became positive when product diversification was included (Model 3). This means that C-HRM has an effect on firm performance only when the firm has certain level of product diversification. Thus, hypothesis 1 and 2 were partially supported.

In addition, product diversification was positively and significantly related to firm performance. ($\beta = 0.183$, $p < 0.001$ and $\beta = 0.310$, $p < 0.001$) This suggests that firm performance increases with high product diversification and reduces with low product diversification. The result indicates a significant effect of product diversification on firm performance.

Moreover, the significant and negative beta suggests that the effect of C-HRM is more likely to be observed under the condition of low product diversification ($\beta = -0.211$, $p < 0.001$). In other words, product diversification moderates the relationship between the independent variable, C-HRM and the dependent variable, firm performance. Hypothesis 5a and 5b were supported.

Adjusted $R^2$ changes from 0.003 in Model 1 to 0.034 in Model 2 and then to 0.058 in Model 3, which implies that the variables added in Model 2 and Model 3 improved the explanatory power of the final model. In the very beginning, the control variables accounted for 3% of the changes in the model. When product diversification and C-HRM were added into Model 2, 34% of the changes were
explained. 58% of the changes were illustrated when the interactive effect between product diversification and C-HRM was considered.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Discussion and Implications

The results imply that the philosophy of C-HRM and low product diversification are consistent. Therefore, low product diversification strengthens the positive relationship between C-HRM and firm performance. Take insurance companies as an example, when product diversification is high, different individuals or different sales teams are selling different financial products. There are difficulties in communicating a common objective across teams and within the company, which hinder the establishment of corporate culture. When individual objectives, departmental objectives and company objectives are not aligned, firm performance is not maximized. In other words, C-HRM becomes more effective in the context of low product diversification because both variables have similar intent.

In fact, C-HRM practice can be regarded as a firm’s strategic move. This thought goes with the RVB approach, suggesting that people are valuable resources for business success, and can be the sources of sustainable competitive advantage of the firm (Schuler & MacMillan, 1984; Ulrich, 1991; Wright & McMahan, 1992). This is to say, C-HRM can be effective only when it is considered as a coherent whole of the company’s strategy.

Along with this logic, the practice of C-HRM can improve firm performance when a firm’s HRM strategy is aligned with its business strategies. In this study, product diversification acts as an
example of a firm’s business strategy. It is likely that other business strategies, if taken into account, would influence the effectiveness of C-HRM. Therefore, one should not neglect the fact that C-HRM consists of only one aspect of the firm strategy. To effectively improve firm performance, the context for the implementation of C-HRM is of paramount importance.

Apart from the context, conventionally, it is believed that high product diversification would bring about lower firm risks, which in turn leads to better firm performance. Nonetheless, results from this study refuted the conventional view. Instead, better firm performance is associated with low product diversification, especially in companies with C-HRM practices. Practitioners may, then, have to redesign the company’s strategy in order to boost firm performance.

Prior researches indicated a positive relationship between C-HRM and firm performance. Yet, the effect of product diversification was not addressed in those studies. Contrast with previous researches, this study shows a positive relationship between C-HRM and firm performance only when there is a low level of product diversification. This finding sheds light to firms that target on a niche market. Since firms targeting on a specific market segment market usually have low product diversification, they should consider adopting C-HRM practices to improve firm performance.

Furthermore, results from this study may suit more on newly established firms than on older firms because newly established firms are in the development stage of the product life cycle (Vernon, 1966). Development stage is characterized by having one or few products, meaning that product diversification is low. As stated earlier, the effect of C-HRM on firm performance is positive when product diversification is low. Therefore, newly established firms should consider applying C-HRM
practices. On the contrary, for firms that aim at expanding its business through offering more diversified products, C-HRM may not be the best practice to improve firm performance.

**Limitations and Recommendations**

There are several limitations in this study. First, there may be the problem of self-report bias. In this study, respondents are required to give ratings on his/her perception towards C-HRM, loyalty and willingness to set up challenging goals, which may be subject to self-report bias. Nevertheless, research also shows that self-reported data are not as limited as commonly expected (Spector, 1992). Therefore, it may not be a serious problem.

Second, cross sectional design is used. Therefore, the results could only demonstrate correlations among the variables rather than a cause-and-effect relationship. It is possible that firm performance may lead to C-HRM, rather than C-HRM results in firm performance. The arguments were tested based on theoretical logic and literature reviews, but it was difficult to rule out such reverse causality. Longitudinal research is needed to confirm the direction of causality assumed in this research.

Third, the results from Study 1 may not be highly representative due to the small sample size. In the future, more extensive research could be done on testing the relationships among C-HRM, employee loyalty and employees’ willingness to set up challenging work goals.
Fourth, as data were collected from a specific industry in a specific context, the results may not be generalizable to all situations. It is recommended that future research to be carried out in other industries and other countries to verify the findings.

**Conclusion**

With reference to previous research indicating that collectivism orientation of employees could influence team performance; this study tested the effect of collectivism at organizational level. Specifically, the relationship of Collectivistic-HRM practice and firm performance was tested together with the moderating role of product diversification. Although findings were generally consistent with the hypotheses, it would be interesting to replicate or extend this research to a more heterogeneous cross-national sample to further validate our findings. Hopefully, this research could contribute to future research and provide business insights to organizations in China and other countries.
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Appendix

Printed Questionnaire
说明：本部分旨在了解贵公司的组织状况。答案无所谓对错，且不代表组织好坏。请您依照题意圈选适合您组织的选项。

1. 本组织中，即使牺牲个人目标，管理者仍鼓励对团队忠诚

   非常不同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常同意

2. 本组织的薪酬及奖励系统，其设计目的主要为了谁的利益

   个人利益 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 集体利益

3. 本组织中，员工对组织非常忠诚

   非常不同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常同意

4. 本组织中，员工多数获得长期雇用

   非常不同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常同意

5. 本组织中，成员对组织工作不悔感到荣耀

   不悔感到荣耀 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 感到非常荣耀

6. 本组织经常表示对员工的忠实

   非常不同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常同意

7. 本组织中，个人之影响力主要是基于

   个人能力及对其组织的贡献 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 个人职位权力

8. 本组织中，职工会因其领导的个人成就而感到光荣

   非常不同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常同意

9. 本组织中之工资及奖金主要着眼于扩大

   个人利益 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 集体利益

10. 本组织中，多数的成员自己设立挑战性工作目标
非常不同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常同意

11. 本组织中之成员，对集体的成就

不会感到光荣 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 感到非常光荣

12. 本组织中之成员间彼此有严重不一致时，他们会把事情告诉谁？

只告诉单位同事 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 告诉任何她想倾吐的人

13. 本组织显出对员工的爱护责任心

非常同意 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 非常不同意