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ABSTRACT

Employee turnover is important to individuals, organizations and society. From an individual's perspective, turnover can have both potentially positive and negative consequences not just on himself or herself, but also on his or her family members and those who remain with the organization, irrespective of whether they are close associates with the person who has decided to leave the organization. From the organizational perspective, employee turnover can be costly – time and effort on loss recruitment, training, socialization investments, disruption, etc. From the societal perspective, turnover can bring in significant consequences which include mobility and migration to new industries and organizations for economic development.

This study focuses on the relationship between one of the antecedents of organizational commitment – group/leader relations and the turnover intention of local marketing officers in securities firms owned by foreign interests in Hong Kong. Various studies have shown that the antecedents of organizational commitment such as personal traits, job characteristics, group and leader relations and company attributes are related to the turnover intention of staff but not much of it has been done in Hong Kong. The primary objective of this study is to propose a parsimonious model to address the issue of employee withdrawal among a sample of marketing executives working in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong SAR. The research design is quantitative in nature, testing various hypotheses on two levels of exchange within organizations – between subordinate and organization and between subordinate and supervisor. Factors involved in the first category of exchange – subordinate/organization are referred to as organizational factors and those in the second category (subordinate/supervisor) as supervisory factors. These factors were regressed against turnover intention to establish their role in the employee withdrawal process. Organization commitment was then introduced into the model as a mediating variable and results on further regression of the organizational and supervisory factors against turnover intention were noted.
Before organizational commitment was introduced as a mediating variable, all the hypotheses with the exception of leader participation were rejected. When organizational commitment was introduced as a mediating variable on the regression of turnover intention on organizational and supervisory constructs, all of the hypotheses with the exception of group cohesiveness and leader participation were rejected. While the results seemed to lend some support to the postulation on the important role played by organizational commitment and group/leader relations in the employee withdrawal process, more studies must be carried out to substantiate the findings. Directions on future study were discussed and managerial implications for both practitioners and researchers were suggested.
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CHAPTER I: THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

"He worked for only three months and complained that we didn’t use his brain or talent, that the job was not interesting and the pay was not enough. So he quit." Remarked by one human resources manager (Khartri, et al. 2001). While it is true that people become complacent when they have been on the same job for too long, it is equally damaging to have high turnover. Employee turnover is important to individuals, organizations and society. For instance, the individual may lose his nonvested benefits, may disrupt the family’s social support system and can be subject to some personal disillusionment. Furthermore, turnover can have negative implications on the individuals who remain with the organization, irrespective of whether they are close associates with the person who has decided to leave the organization. In fact, it has often been found that the resignation of a key member in an organization can trigger disillusionment among other members who have no connection, one way or the other, to the one who has just resigned. From the organizational perspective, employee turnover can be costly – time and effort on loss recruitment, training, socialization investments, disruption, etc. Finally, from the societal perspective, turnover again can bring in potentially serious negative consequences. For example, excessive turnover could depress productivity growth and orderly development.

An indication of the importance of employee turnover is reflected in the ample amount of research interest the subject has generated and the tremendous amount of studies that appear in the organizational literature (Borland 1997; Griffeth 1995; Hom 1992; Lynch 1998; Mangione 1973; Mathieu 1990; Mobley 1979; Price 1977; Seybolt 1978). However, it is amazing to find that in Hong Kong, there is a dearth of research on employee turnover (Khartri et al. 2001). Most of the studies on employee turnover in Asia are conducted in Singapore (Aryee 1990; Campbell 1997; Chew 1996; Debrah 1994; Khartri 2000; Koh 1995) and it would be interesting to find out how the theories and models on employee turnover perform in Hong Kong which is in a slightly different cultural setting compared to Singapore.
A comparison between Singapore and Hong Kong on how human resources have been directed to different sectors of the economy over the last forty years sheds light on why some of the studies and findings on Singapore cannot be applied to Hong Kong directly. Since Singapore proclaimed its independence in 1965, there has always been a strong need for the government to attract talent to the public sector. This, coupled with the traditional Chinese philosophy of ranking civil servants ahead of farmers, technicians and merchants in the social structure, has directed most of the talent to the government. Given the rigid compensation structure in most government bodies and the immobility of switching from the public sector to the private sector, most civil servants tend to be relatively stable, exhibiting low turnover rate. This has spilled into the private sector in which job security and stability have been preferred to monetary rewards.

The situation in Hong Kong has been very different. As the British government re-established its reign after the brief Japanese occupation of 1942 – 1945, the most urgent need was to recruit a pool of talent who could execute orders effectively. During the 1950’s and 1960’s, tertiary education in Hong Kong was restricted to a handful of people who could afford it. Most of these talent preferred going into the commercial sector to the public sector in which the British held all the senior positions. Even when tertiary education became more popular in the 1970’s, young executives found the private sector more challenging and rewarding. They were ready to look at opportunities all the times, accounting for the high turnover rate in the private sector of Hong Kong. This difference in mentality explains why the research results from Singapore cannot be directly applied to Hong Kong. The next question is which industry should be the focus of this study.

A review of the economic developments in the U.S. since the end of the Second World War suggests that the service industry has been growing much faster than the manufacturing industry. According to Bloomberg (Bloomberg 2001), the number of people employed in the service sector in the U.S. grew more than five times, from 18.7 million in 1939 to 106.7 million in 2001 whereas those in the manufacturing sector only doubled from 12.9 million to 25.7 million in the same period. This is probably due to the relative change in the weighting assigned to different factors of production. As labor becomes more educated, entrepreneurs are ready to employ
more units of labor in substitution for capital. In addition, entrepreneurs are aware that the amount of resources tied up in labor versus capital is smaller, leading to a much higher profit margin. As this trend continues, dramatic structural changes occur in the service industry because both the service providers and the users become much more sophisticated in the product, service and performance requirements.

Hong Kong is no different in this economic change. Since Hong Kong shifted its emphasis from manufacturing to service in the early 1970's, staff turnover in most servicing industries has always been a problem. This is partly due to the fact that the education system has not been fast enough to generate the required number of qualified personnel to replace those who have retired and partly due to the fact that the demand from new comers has been growing in an exponential way. In other words, both demand and supply of the labor market are pushing for a rapid rise in salaries and wages which intuitively is one of the most important factors affecting employee turnover.

A comprehensive review of the financial services industries such as banks, insurance and securities companies suggests that the situation is even more acute. Back in the 1970's, when foreign banks could not establish any branch in Hong Kong, they pressed the Hong Kong government for relaxation of the banking ordinance to allow foreign banks to establish a local presence. This brought in the Deposit Taking Companies Ordinance of 1976 and numerous foreign banks flocked to Hong Kong. Every new financial institution tried to scramble for marketing managers of banks whose average salary was doubled between 1976 and 1978. Fast developments in new products and services in the banking industry during the next ten years continued to push up the salaries of bankers.

1.2 Focus of research

This study focuses on the marketing personnel in a specific service industry in Hong Kong – foreign securities firms which are defined as securities companies with majority interest, that is more than 51%, being owned by foreign entities. During the 1970's, foreign firms started to move into Hong Kong to tap into the successful manufacturers whose wealth was accumulated through the flamboyant export
industries of apparel and toys. Banks came as pioneers, followed by securities firms. Some of the foreign securities firms included in this survey have been established in Hong Kong for over thirty years. Most of the products and services offered by securities firms are grouped under the following categories:-

1) origination of new securities issues of corporations, supranationals and government agencies;
2) pricing and underwriting of those new issues; and
3) distribution of those new issues to investors, both institutional and retail.

Investment banking house operates by purchasing all of the new issues from a corporation at one price and selling the issue in smaller units to the investing public at a price sufficiently high to cover expenses of sale and leave a profit. Out of the three major functions performed by securities firms, the distribution of new issues to the final investors is probably the most important one since it provides an essential link in the mechanism that transfers capital funds from savers to users. The transfer may involve intermediaries such as savings banks, insurance companies and investment trusts. The ultimate user of the funds may be a corporate or any of the various levels of government from municipalities to national states.

In connection with the distribution of securities, it must be pointed out that interest in the ownership of securities has changed dramatically over the decades. Inflationary tendencies have directed attention to various means of offsetting rising prices. Stock exchanges have cultivated the knowledge of investors through public relations program. Government regulatory authorities have strengthened public confidence in stock trading procedures which have given support to the capital markets in order to facilitate business financing. Institutions such as insurance companies, mutual funds, pension funds, foundations, universities and high net-worth individuals have become very important players in the global securities markets. As these players become more sophisticated, their need for quality products and services also grows and the importance of having quality marketing executives at the securities firms cannot be over-emphasized.

With the inflow of foreign securities firms into Hong Kong, the scramble for quality marketing personnel becomes more acute because marketing officers are the
executives who can generate business for the securities firms, directly impacting on the profits and losses. Turnover among marketing personnel of securities firms has been notoriously high. While no official study has been conducted, it has been said that some marketing personnel at securities firms could change jobs twice a year with pay being the primary focus prior to 1997. The situation is even more acute among foreign securities firms which pay hefty premiums to scramble talent from the market. Moreover, foreign securities firms also use more sophisticated training and attractive career paths to entice people to join them.

In this study, the emphasis is on local staff as distinguished from the international or expatriates. Local staff simply refers to those employees who are recruited locally with Hong Kong being their home base. International or expatriates are usually recruited from countries outside Hong Kong with foreign countries such as the U.S., Germany, Taiwan, etc. being their home base. The terms and conditions of employment of locals are governed by the local employment contracts which dictate the overall compensation packages and to some extent their career paths. One could argue that the expatriates are less inclined to look for job opportunities because their primary focus is on the career path at the headquarters.

Marketing officers in this study refer to all front-line staff who have frequent contacts with clients in the distribution of securities. This excludes those assistants who are not qualified as officers yet, e.g. sales assistants, office assistants, etc. Only securities firms that are at least 51% owned by foreign interests are included in this study. Foreign interests are defined as corporations, partnerships or individuals who are not residents of Hong Kong.

Past research has suggested that disruptions due to employee turnover could impede on the quality of the products or services offered to the customers. The situation is even more acute when business relationship depends on the interaction between the client and the service provider (Bateson 1992). Marketing officers in foreign securities firms belong to this camp as most clients develop faith and trust in a specific person who represents the company (Darmon 1990). It takes time for the new recruits, who might be more experienced and more qualified, to build up rapport
with the existing customers. To that extent, it is imperative to keep the quality marketing officers satisfied and rewarded to prevent disruption of services.

1.3 Research questions

While this study focuses on the relationship between organizational commitment, group/leader relations and turnover intention, it also seeks answers to the following questions:

i) How do relationships between the employee and the organization, and the employee and the supervisor affect employees' turnover intention?

ii) How does group-leader relations which is one of the antecedents of organizational commitment affect turnover intention of the local marketing officers at securities firms owned by foreign interests in Hong Kong?

iii) What are some of the special factors that should be taken into consideration in a cultural setting such as Hong Kong where this study is to be conducted?

iv) What are the possible implications that can be drawn up from the study to assist management who are concerned with the high turnover rate among the local marketing officers at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong?

1.3.1 Research objectives

The research questions were explored through the following research objectives:

i) To find out how the relationships between employee and organization and between employee and supervisor in affecting employees’ turnover intention by conducting a thorough review of the existing literature and propose an integrated hypothetical model of turnover intention of employee that fits the relationship-centered Chinese context. The relationships of the different direct and indirect variables, mediating and criterion variables in the integrated model will be studied.

ii) To focus on the role played by group-leader relations in employees’ turnover intention in the study under (i)

iii) To identify the special factors in a cultural setting such as Hong Kong.

iv) To provide a comprehensive discussion of managerial implications on findings that are of value to researchers and practitioners.
1.3.2 Rationale for research questions and objectives

Given the importance of employee turnover, a number of models have been developed to explain employee turnover intention (Lum 1998; Price 1981; Parasuraman 1989; Weisman 1980). The general consensus from these models is that turnover intention is a multi-stage process which does not evolve overnight. It involves attitudinal, decisional and behavioral interaction between the employee and the organization before the final decision is made. This process could take weeks, months or even years to develop. A simplified model of turnover determinants is presented in Fig. 1.1 The term determinants is used in a generic sense to describe any variable potentially related to turnover – either directly, indirectly, causally or correlationally.

The general classes of determinants of turnover are: the state of the economy (e.g. the availability of alternative jobs, inflation, etc); individual variables (which include external factors) such as spouse’s career, family considerations, leisure preferences, turnover behavior, etc.; internal factors such as the individual’s job-related values, expectations, abilities, etc. and organizational variables such as leadership, reward system, job design, etc.
Fig. 1.1  A simplified model of causes of staff turnover

External Economy
e.g. unemployed levels, inflation etc.

Organizational Variables
e.g. size, reward system, job design, centralization, etc

Individual non-work Variables
e.g. non-work values, spouse's career, family responsibility, etc.

Individual non-work Variables
e.g. values, expectations, satisfaction, commitment, abilities, intentions, etc.

Quit/Stay

Consequences
An apparent relationship exists between turnover rates and the state of the economy. March and Simon (March and Simon 1958) suggested that under nearly all conditions, the most accurate single predictor of labor turnover was the state of the economy. While it is true that the general environment plays an important role in determining staff turnover, the organization should also assess the relationship between employment-unemployment in its specific labor markets and turnover among its employees. Overall unemployment as a predictor fails to account for occupational differences in labor market demand. In fact, effective understanding and management of turnover depends, to some extent, on the analysis of individual level variables. Such analysis requires an individual employee's perceptions of the availability of acceptable alternative jobs.

Very few empirical researchers have addressed the possible relationship between inflation and turnover. In fact, inflation can influence turnover and other turnover-related variables in a number of ways. For example, inflation can encourage turnover as a means to protect earnings, assuming higher paying jobs are available. Inflation can also discourage turnover involving geographic mobility due to the cost of moving. Given the high rate of inflation in Hong Kong in the '90's, greater research emphasis on the relationship between inflation and turnover at both the aggregate and individual levels would be useful. There is ample evidence of a strong negative aggregate relationship between unemployment levels and turnover rates (Becker and Billings 1993). However, unemployment is unevenly distributed across geographic regions, industries or occupations. From a managerial perspective, this relationship should be broken down to compare the organization's turnover with appropriate labor markets. Inflation may influence turnover but this relationship has not been adequately researched.

Analysis of the individual variables involves individual demographic and personal factors, work and non-work values and perceptions and evaluations of the external economy and the organization. With regard to age, it is natural to think that there is a consistent negative relationship between age and turnover – younger employees have a higher probability of leaving (Mobley et al. 1979). The age/turnover relationship may be based on a number of factors. Younger employees may have more entry level job opportunities and few family responsibilities, thus making changing jobs much
easier. They may also have high expectations on their work which may not be easily fulfilled in the early stages of their career.

As with age, a consistent negative relationship between length of service and turnover has been reported. In particular, turnover is significantly higher for shorter tenure employees. Mangione (1973), in a national multivariate study, found that the length of service is one of the best predictors of turnover. While it is true that the percentage of female officers in foreign securities firms is significantly higher than in other lines of industry, it is not sure whether sex interacts with other variables as does occupation and family responsibility.

As advanced education becomes more popular, it is questionable whether there is a strong and consistent relationship between education and turnover. Moreover, reliability of education as a variable is dubious given the wide disparity in the quality of education.

It is quite natural to think that people who leave the organization tend to be at the extreme end of such personality factors as achievement, aggression, independence and self-confidence. However, given the probable interaction between personality and organizational environment, we should be careful in analyzing the relationship between personality and turnover.

Relationship between turnover and the performance of employee is extremely important. From both the organizational and individual perspective, it is useful to evaluate the individual performance-turnover relationship. Some of the studies have found that improving performers are more likely to leave. Others come up with different conclusions (Seybolt et al. 1978). While the performance-turnover relationship does not seem to lead to any conclusive evidence, we incline to feel that more research is needed in this area. From an organizational point of view, the performance of those who stay and those who leave is an important piece of information to be analyzed carefully.

With regard to organizational variables, the focus is on the categorical, structural and descriptive characteristics of organizations and the relationships discussed are
aggregate. Conceptually, there is a strong relationship between pay levels and turnover rates. Given the high level of inflation in Hong Kong in the last ten years, it is easy to understand that one of the motivations behind changing jobs is to get better pay. Numerous causes of pay satisfaction have been proposed. These include personal and job inputs, monetary and non-monetary outcomes, the comparison process, and pay policies and administration. Current models of pay satisfaction originate from the equity theory (Adams 1965) which suggests that pay satisfaction comes from the feelings regarding the equity of one’s pay. In essence, an employee formulates a ratio of outcomes (including pay) to inputs. This ratio is then compared to the outcome/input ratio of some referent source. If the ratio is in conformity with benchmark, pay equity and satisfaction result. However, if an employee’s pay is perceived to be less than the referent source, feelings of being inequitably underpaid may ensue.

Since an organization is made up of different units, it is mandatory to observe the interaction between the different elements of an organization. In particular, it is important to develop a consultancy framework for understanding how organizations work and what contribute towards their effectiveness. Equally important is recognition of the importance of business strategy and some of the factors and techniques that influence its development. This study aims at identifying the components of organizations, leading to explanations on how they might influence the effectiveness and performance of the individual employee. This will also bring out the importance of organizational commitment that will be further elaborated in the chapter on literature review.

While the study will only focus on one important element of organizational commitment – group/leader relations, every effort will be made to identify the mechanisms for changing organizational culture and suggest ways of overcoming traditional barriers to organizational change. Effective recommendations for solving a range of practical and managerial and organizational situations and problems will also be made.

Since the study is carried out in Hong Kong which is the meeting point between the East and the West, the natural question is whether special attention should be paid to
the specific cultural setting. While this is not a study on culture, it is imperative to have a good understanding of culture, especially Chinese culture.

What is culture? The standard work on culture is a book by Kroeber and Kluckhohn (Kroeber and Kluckhohn 1952, p.18) in which they defined culture as “consisting of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action.”. Hofstede (1991) has further narrowed culture down to “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another”. When one starts to look at the Western and Eastern cultures, it is natural to find the long lasting impact that Confucianism has had on the Asian countries.

Chinese values have been around for centuries. But only in the latter half of the twentieth century have they become values, something that is closely examined and questioned. Whenever people talk about Chinese philosophy and values, they usually think about the Confucian ideas of hard work, thrift, respect for authority and seniority, filial piety and a strong belief that the family is more important than the individual. In fact, Chinese values are often quoted as the main reason why China has been able to protect and nurture their traditions in the face of lax moral and utilitarian globalization. Chinese philosophy is also said to be behind the economic rise of those countries in which they have been most practised, e.g. Japan, Korea and some Asian nations.

But Chinese values have also had negative consequences. They have stymied independent thinking and creativity and supported authoritarian regimes (Weber 1964). Critics point to the essentially one-party government in China and other countries such as Vietnam and Myanmar. Democracies in countries such as Malaysia and Singapore, where practically one-party rule has been in place since independence, are quite different from the Western models. Chinese values are not so valuable when they lead to a media which only knows how to flatter the ruling
regime and a mass population which meekly tolerates corruption and cronyism because in Confucianism, it is not right to criticize a ruler, supervisor, or parents. As Singapore’s senior minister, Lee Kuan Yew, has said, “There are many Asian values as there are types of Asian. There are Hindu values, Muslim values, Buddhist values and Confucius values. And even among Confucius followers, there are differences. But they form a coherent group. I don’t think those values are ever going to change” (Lee 1999).

As Myers (1987) has pointed out, Confucianism has played a very important role in China’s business history. Business culture has been from the very beginning an integral part of Chinese culture and cannot be misconceived as an isolated phenomenon confined only to the business world. In fact, business culture constantly interacts and intermingles with cultures arising from different walks of life. It has generally been recognized that during the last two thousand years, Chinese society was guided by the principle known as “emphasizing on the importance of agriculture at the expense of commerce” (chung-nung ching-shange) with the result that merchants were placed at the bottom of the social ladder. The changing position of “merchants” versus the intellectual “elite” over the centuries illustrates the relative importance of business culture in any given period of Chinese history (Yu 1995).

The other research question is to summarize the possible implications that can be drawn up from the study to assist management who are concerned with the high turnover rate among the local marketing officers at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. What has made the problem more acute is the growing emphasis on party politics. For example, instead of lobbying for their votes individually, the Legislative Council electoral system in Hong Kong in 2001 encouraged candidates to attach to parties. This was in conformity with traditional Chinese culture that emphasized on the importance of group and party, not the individual (Ferraro 1998; Gelfaufd 1999). Since most of the studies on employee turnover have been conducted in the Western contexts, there are reservations on whether findings of these studies could be applied to Asia given the differences in the cultural and social environments (Cotton 1986). Most of the research in the Asian setting, albeit limited in number, have used only a few variables with small samples, thus raising further concerns on the validity of their models.
The major objective of this study is to understand the employee withdrawal process of the local marketing officers at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. The focus will be on the interaction between the group-leader relations which is one of the antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intention. To achieve that objective, a thorough review on the literature on the existing employee withdrawal process with special reference to those studies conducted in the Asian settings will be made. In the meantime, the relationships between the different direct and indirect predictors, mediators and criterion variables in the withdrawal process will also be studied. This will be achieved through a field study by collecting data from the marketing executives working with foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. A comprehensive discussion of the managerial implications on the findings that are of value to practitioners and researchers will also be made.

1.4 Significance and contribution

Over the years, researchers have developed various concepts and constructs to help them better understand the turnover process. One of these constructs is organizational commitment which has grown in popularity in the literature of industrial/organizational psychology and organizational behavior. A number of studies have been conducted on this concept and organizational commitment has been linked to a number of key variables such as job satisfaction, turnover intention, absenteeism, performance, etc. (Morrow 1983; Mowday 1982; Reichers 1985; Steers 1977; Weisberg 1993). In fact, Mowday (1982) has suggested that a better understanding of organizational commitment helps one develop insight into the behavior of employees, organization and society as a whole. It is argued that organizations value commitment among their employees which is important in reducing withdrawal behaviors such as lateness and turnover. Moreover, employees who have strong organizational commitment are more likely to take on extra responsibilities and are usually more creative or innovative. Wong, Hui and Law (1996), in the longitudinal study of 485 Hong Kong graduates, found organizational commitment a strong predictor of turnover. Others (Arnold 1982; Ben-Bakr 1994; Kim 1996; Tett 1993) have also suggested organizational commitment to be an important predictor of turnover.
In Hong Kong, whenever people are told that Mr. "A" has changed job, one naturally jumps to the conclusion that A’s pay must have been raised by a substantial premium. While Hong Kong is probably one of the most capitalistic cities in the world, pay may not necessarily be the most important factor in explaining turnover initiative (Lum et al. 1998). In particular, it has been found that over the last few years, especially in the securities industry, executives tended to move from one firm to another in groups rather than individually. This is probably due to the fact that most people dislike uncertainty. If they have established favorable working relationship with a specific group of people, they would like to continue that working relationship as long as possible. This is also reflected in the case of senior appointments. Instead of looking for qualified candidates from outside, senior management tends to identify potential candidates from internal sources to reduce the uncertainty of recruiting an executive who may not be able to work smoothly with other executives. By focusing on the group/leader relations, this study helps unfold the important factors that affect the turnover of local marketing executives at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong.

In addition, it has been found that in Hong Kong, there is a dearth of research on employee turnover (Khatri et al. 2001). Most of the studies on employee turnover were conducted in Singapore (Aryee 1990; Campbell 1997; Chew 1996; Debrah 1994; Khatri 2000; Koh 1995) and it would be interesting to find out how the theories and models on employee turnover perform in Hong Kong which is different from Singapore, as explained earlier.

In terms of the contribution of the study, it is expected that the findings can be generalized to other related services and probably to the Western world outside Hong Kong. This is due to the fact that the fundamental changes affecting the securities industry in Hong Kong might have also happened to the same industry elsewhere. In fact, with internet and other technological changes, almost all kinds of industries including the securities industry have to manage different challenges. Such challenges include globalization of financial markets, privatization of government enterprises, geometric growth in the volume of financial transactions, increasing demand from customers in terms of product features and returns, compliance and
accounting/reporting issues due to de-regulation and above all, the rapid developments in information technology (Turnbull and Moustakatos 1996).

Such challenges are global since they are the results of dramatic technological innovations, relatively short product cycles, and increasing sophistication of customers. The shift in importance from the manufacturing sector to the service sector further suggests that the human factor is probably one of the most important factors, if not the only one to ensure that a specific company can survive from all these challenges.

In addition, given the infra-structure set up by the former British Administration, Hong Kong may well rank ahead of the others in its interaction with the Western world. Consequently, Hong Kong may be the appropriate center for testing theories based on Western literature because of its proximity to the Western culture and above all, the meeting point of the East and West.

1.5 Contents of the thesis

This study is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter, highlighting on the background of the study, the research questions, the research objectives and significance and contribution of this study.

Chapter 2 is a review of the current literature on organizational commitment, group/leader relations and turnover intentions. Emphasis will be placed on the different facets comprising group/leader relations including group commitment, group homogeneity, task interdependence, group cohesiveness, leader initiating structure, leader communication, leader consideration and leader participation. It is important to try to identify the research gaps from the literature, adding value to the current study.

This is followed by Chapter 3 which is on research model and hypotheses. Basically, the research model from Mathieu and Zajac (Mathieu and Zajac 1990) is used as the base. All the factors, variables and links in that model will be described, leading to the development on the hypotheses to be tested.
Chapter 4 focuses on the methodology and design. A brief discussion on the paradigm of research with particular reference to the qualitative and quantitative debate will be made. This will be followed by justification on the methodology to be chosen - the positivist research coupled with the survey method as the primary data collection method. The design of questionnaire, the reliability and validity measures and the choosing of sample will also be discussed.

Analysis of the findings will be presented in Chapter 5 which will be followed by Chapter 6 on discussions and implications. The results and tests of hypotheses will be discussed systematically and implications in terms of the local context will be made. Chapter 7 deals with conclusion and future directions. Important findings together with limitations and future directions will be discussed in this chapter.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

While this study focuses on the relationship between one of the antecedents of organizational commitment – group/leader relations and turnover intention of local marketing officers in securities firms owned by foreign interests in Hong Kong, there is no better place to start literature review than organizational commitment. A review of organizational commitment will not be complete if the basic theories of employee turnover are not discussed. From there, the various employee turnover models will be examined which will shed light on the constructs that should be included in this study. As will be discussed, one of the antecedents of organizational commitment is the relationship between the leader and the group and one of the major consequences of organizational commitment is the study on the turnover intention of the respondents in the survey. All these three concepts, namely, organizational commitment, group/leader relations and the turnover intention, are all closely connected and should be studied in details.

To ensure that there will be a logical flow on the ideas, the literature review will be carried out in the following sequence:-

- Review of employee turnover models
- Organizational commitment
- Group/leader relations
- Chinese culture
- Turnover intention
- Theories of turnover

As it was pointed out earlier, the Chinese are very conscious of their relationship with the people around them. In particular, the relationship with senior/leader is always one’s focus. A good employee withdrawal model should always take this into consideration. Having said that, this study does not focus on the cultural influence on employee’s withdrawal behaviors. Instead, the intention is to develop a model with those constructs that are relevant to this relationship-centered Chinese cultural characteristic.
2.2 Review of employee turnover models

In this section, a review of the employee turnover models will be conducted to find out more about those constructs that offer better predictive ability on employee withdrawal. From there, some or all of the constructs that will be included in the study will be modified. Some of the models that will be reviewed include the following:

2.2.1 March and Simon’s Model on Organizational Equilibrium

March and Simon (1958) pioneered the first formal theory in explaining the conceptual analysis of the withdrawal process. They introduced a general theory of motivation called organizational equilibrium (Barnard 1938; Simon 1947), which describes the organization’s ability to pay individual workers with the objective of motivating them to continue their participation in the organization. Each worker will participate so long as the inducements such as pay and benefits match or exceed the member’s contributions. To each individual, every inducement he receives from an organization generates different utility value. In return for these inducements, each individual contributes work, called “contributions” to the organization. Both the individual and organization will work for an equilibrium between inducements and contributions to assure survival of an organization.

This model suggests that for those individuals who perceive an increase in the balance of inducement utilities over contribution utilities will have a lower propensity to leave the organization and vice versa. Two distinct, but interdependent, factors are at work in this balancing process: the perceived desirability of movement and the perceived ease of leaving the organization. On the perceived desirability of movement, the most important influencing factor is the individual’s satisfaction with the job. Apart from job satisfaction, organizational size also influences the desirability of moving. The “larger the organization, the greater the perceived possibility of organizational transfer, and therefore, the less perceived desirability of leaving the organization” (March and Simon 1958, p.99). On the perceived ease of movement, March and Simon believed that the single most important predictor of
labor turnover is the state of the economy. This, coupled with the individual’s extra-organizational alternatives, will determine an individual’s ease of movement.

Although March and Simon’s model was not extensively tested, their conceptualization sheds light on the successive generations of theorists which include Hulin, Rozonwski, and Hachiya (1985), Lee and Mitchell (1994), Mobley (1977) and Steers and Mowday (1981).

2.2.2 Porter and Steers: Met-expectations Model

In 1973, Porter and Steers (1973) came up with their met expectations model and suggested that the central determinant of decisions about turnover was the meeting of expectations. Although individual employee looks at pay, promotions, leader-subordinate relationship and peer-group interactions, each employee has a distinct set of expectations. If the organization fails to meet an individual’s set of expectations, dissatisfaction will result, leading to possible withdrawal. They view this “as a process of balancing perceived or potential rewards with desired expectations” (Porter and Steers 1973, p.171).

In fact, Porter and Steers (1973) felt that the entire process of meeting expectations of work rewards does not happen overnight. Two new employees, having different sets of expectations, could have their expectations fulfilled in different ways at different times of their career with the organization. Such difference in timing could have led to two diametrically decision: one chooses to stay with the organization and the other looks for opportunities outside the organization.

Porter and Steers’ contribution lies with the fact that they have introduced an integrative construct which summarizes the effects of work-related determinants on turnover and the existence of personal attributes which influence expectation levels. This model has been helpful in explaining why realistic job reviews (RJP) work (Datel 1969; Wanous 1973; Youngberg 1963). Realistic job reviews present the positive and negative aspects of a job to new employees and such communication should encourage longer tenure in a job.
The met expectations concept is not entirely free of criticism. In its present form, the concept may be too simplistic (Ilgen and Dugoni 1977). Louis (1980) further argued that the met expectations model fails to differentiate between unmet expectations and those that are exceeded. It was suspected that “overmet” expectations could produce surprise rather than dissatisfaction. Griffeth (1981) suggested a stronger curvilinear relationship between dissatisfaction and met expectations which deviates from Porter and Steer’s hypothesis that dissatisfaction arises when expectations are not met but will decline linearly as expectations are exceeded. In addition, Wanous (1973) pointed out that there is a missing variable in the entire equation between unmet expectations and turnover – the individual’s perceived alternatives to his or her present job.

2.2.3 Mobley’s Turnover Process Model

In response to the weak correlation between satisfaction and turnover, Mobley (1977) developed a series of intermediate linkages between an individual’s evaluation of his or her present job and turnover. This model is based on the postulate that if an employee is satisfied with his current organization, he or she will think of quitting from his job, resulting in a cost/benefit analysis which is based on the opportunities from alternative employment versus the costs of quitting. If the individual finds that the exit costs are not exorbitant, he or she will be induced to make a search for alternatives, assess the various options available and compare them with the present job before making the final decision to quit or not.

Though March and Simon (1958) provided the impetus for modern theory and research, it is Mobley’s Turnover Process Model that dominated all the work on psychological approaches to turnover as it inspired substantial theoretical elaboration and refinements. For example, some researchers (such as Mobley et al. 1979) refined Mobley’s model by introducing additional determinants into the process of quitting. Others restated the termination process (Steers and Mowday 1981), refined the model by reconfiguring intervening mechanisms that relay dissatisfaction (Hom and Griffeth 1991) or treated Mobley’s withdrawal sequence as one of the multiple routes to turnover (Lee and Mitchell 1994).
Other researchers took a more aggressive attitude and adopted some of Mobley’s constructs which included withdrawal intentions (Price and Mueller 1986) and perceived alternatives (Hulin 1985; Rusbult 1983). While Mobley was able to shed light on how the organizational withdrawal process should be structured, findings suggested that the structural relations proposed by Mobley might not represent the true sequence of the entire withdrawal decision process.

2.2.4 Hom and Griffeth: Revised Intermediate-Processes Model

In view of the challenges on Mobley’s structural relations (Hom 1984; Lee 1988; Steel 1981), Hom, Griffeth and Sellaro (1984) proposed an alternative network. Like what Mobley had said, Hom (1984) suggested that dissatisfaction leads to thoughts of quitting which, in turn, stimulate decisions to quit and an evaluation of the expected costs and benefits of search and quitting. This is where the similarity ends. Hom (1984) further postulated that employees follow either one of the following two alternatives: some employees will undertake job search and compare the alternatives with their present jobs; others will simply resign after deciding to quit without getting any firm offer on hand.

Hom and Griffeth (1991) tried to validate their proposal in two nursing samples and in general, the results were quite encouraging. In essence, the analysis supported the theorized causal directions with some causal effects occurring instantaneously while others transpired over time. While Hom and Griffeth’s results are encouraging, their model requires further corroboration. Since Hom and Griffeth only used two nursing examples to substantiate their model, other researchers demand elaboration from samples of other workers who may withdraw from organizations for different reasons (Hom et al. 1992). In fact, it is interesting to note that Mobley’s depiction of intervening mechanisms between dissatisfaction and turnover is incomplete (Hom and Griffeth 1991). Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino (1979) pointed out that the attraction of job or future improvements in the job may interfere with the translation of dissatisfaction into departure. If dissatisfied employees expect improvements in the job, they may decide not to leave. Hom and Griffeth’s model encourages further research on the introduction of other variables that modify the impact of dissatisfaction on exits.
2.2.5 Price’s Structured Model of Turnover

James Price (1977), a sociologist, developed a model that integrated past findings in labor economics, sociology and psychology on turnover. Price suggested that pay, integration, instrumental communication, formal communication and centralization lead to job satisfaction which in turn influences turnover. Furthermore, the availability of alternative employment works as a moderator between satisfaction and turnover. The significance of Price’s model lies with the voluminous tests and evaluations carried out to assess the model and the subsequent inspiration into a more comprehensive theory (Bluedorn 1982; Gerhart 1990; Hulin 1985; Rusbult 1983; Steers 1981). Based on Price’s model of 1977, Price and Mueller (1981) proposed that repetitive work reduces satisfaction and individuals who are allowed to participate in job related decisions, receive work-related information, establish close friendships with peers, make decent pay and enjoy opportunities for promotion, etc., are more likely to be satisfied. In 1986, Price and Mueller (1986) made further modifications to their model by introducing two more antecedents to satisfaction – role overload and family pay. They also brought in the size of the company and the work group as the determinant of decision to quit.

The few research studies of the Price-Mueller models partly affirmed their nomological networks. A test by Griffeth and Hom (1990) found that the Price-Mueller models provide less parsimonious explanations of turnover compared with Hom. Furthermore, further validation of the Price-Mueller theories should be conducted on samples of workers other than nurses or hospital personnel.

2.2.6 Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino: Expanded Model

Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino (1979) developed an expanded version of the model developed by Mobley (1977). They proposed quit intentions as the immediate precursor to turnover and further suggested intentions and turnover as a function of job satisfaction, expected utility of the present work role and expected utility of alternative work roles. They defined job satisfaction as an affective response resulting from the evaluation of job. Drawing from Locke’s theory (Locke 1969;
1976), they proposed that personal values and job-related perceptions determine job evaluation.

Apart from job satisfaction, the "expected utility of the present role", that is, an individual's "expectation that the job will lead to the attainment of various positively or negatively valued outcomes" and expectancy of retaining the current job – also underpins decisions about turnover (Mobley et al. 1979, p.518). It can be argued that an employee may not quit a dissatisfying job if he or she feels that the job could lead to better things in the future.

Mobley (1979) also suggested that the expected utility of alternative roles can be another determinant of intentions to withdraw, based on the work of March and Simon (1958), Forrest, Cummings and Johnson (1977) and Schneider (1976). The logic is simple: the absence of attractive alternatives may discourage dissatisfied employees from resigning while the availability of desirable employment opportunities may motivate even satisfied employees to leave (Mobley 1979; Mobley 1982). Mobley (1979) further posited that employees who cannot find attractive alternatives might engage in other forms of withdrawal, such as absences, accidents and sabotage. One major criticism of this model is the failure to specify the relative impact of the antecedents of turnover on job-related perception, individual value and perceptions of the labor market. Furthermore, this model ignores the casual interactions within and between classes of these antecedents (Hom and Griffeth 1995).

2.2.7 Muchinsky and Morrow: Multidisciplinary Model

Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) postulated that macro-economic factors such as employment rates and opportunity to obtain work, are the immediate precursors of turnover. Muchinsky and Morrow's argument is based on the assumption that most people will not leave their job unless alternative opportunities exist. Individual and work-related factors will then be combined with economic opportunities which affect turnover. When job opportunities are abundant, individual and work-related determinants affect turnover more than they do when jobs are not plentiful. Consequently, the relationship between job dissatisfaction and intentions to resign is
much more significant for employees who have alternative jobs than those who do not. Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) further suggested that other forms of withdrawal such as absenteeism or deterioration in morale could be prevailing if employees fail to find more attractive alternatives.

While Muchinsky and Morrow’s model has rarely been tested, Carsten and Spector (1987) examined the proposition that employment affects the relationship between individual and work-related variables. Results indicated that the relationship between satisfaction and intention to quit tended to be strong during low employment and weak during high unemployment. Based on these findings, other researchers substantiated the moderating effects of unemployment on relationship between perceived alternatives and quitting and on structural networks of the causes of turnover (Gerhart 1990; Steel 1989; Hom 1992). These studies in turn prompted other researchers to work on the effects of unemployment rate on individual’s turnover. In essence, high unemployment depresses turnover rates, thereby weakening the relationships between turnover and its antecedents (Steel and Griffeth 1989). However, owing to its neglect on the process underlying turnover, the Muchinsky and Morrow model (1980) omits many essential process determinants which are obviously important in the turnover process.

2.2.8 Farrell and Rusbult: Investment Model

Farrell and Rusbult (1981) created a model from social exchange (Homans 1961) and interdependence theories (Thibaut 1959; Kelly 1978). From these basic concepts, they defined organizational commitment as “the binding of the individual to behavioral acts” (Kiesler and Sakumura 1966, p.349) “Thus, job commitment is related to the probability that an employee will leave his job, and involves feelings of attachment, independent of affect. Job commitment reflects behavioral intention primarily [but not solely] the degree of intention to stay with a job” (Farrell and Rusbult 1981, p.79).

Farrell and Rusbult (1981) further postulated that organizational commitment is affected by various antecedents but notably job satisfaction which arises from a comparison between job rewards and costs and what he feels he deserves. They also
suggested that availability of alternatives undermines commitment whereas job investments by the organization in the form of training, enrichment of jobs, invested retirement benefits, etc. reinforce job commitment.

This model is predicated on an interdisciplinary sociological and psychological constructs. It is surprising to see that only Farrell and Rusbult have tested the model. Nevertheless, Farrell and Rusbult (1981) have found that job rewards and costs strongly predicted job satisfaction, that a combination of reward and cost values, the value of alternatives, and investment size strongly predicted job commitment and that job commitment predicted turnover better than did job satisfaction.

While the study is encouraging, Rusbult and Farrell’s model has too narrowly defined the commitment construct as primarily withdrawal cognition. This is in contrast to the more popular, multidimensional commitment constructs which cover not only withdrawal cognition but also identification with organization values and willingness to go beyond formal work-role definitions (Mowday et al. 1982; O’Reilly and Chatman 1986).

2.2.9 Steers and Mowday: Multi-route Model

Steers and Mowday (1981) put forth another turnover model that integrates previous theories and overcomes their conceptual weaknesses. Steers and Mowday hypothesized that an individual’s value system influences his or her expectations about various aspects of a job such as the nature of the job and rewards for satisfactory performance. Age, tenure and family responsibilities were brought into the model and Steers and Mowday (1981) further suggested that the accuracy of prior information about the job and the company will make the initial expectations more realistic and lower turnover. Job expectations and values would interact with organizational characteristics and experiences, and job performance would influence affective responses which include job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job involvement. As job performance and organizational experience modify job attitudes, organizational experience and job performance will be affected (Horn and Griffeth 1995). In addition, poor job attitudes may prompt employees to change the work environment or transfer to other jobs before they decide to leave.
Steers and Mowday's (1981) model put forth a number of innovative constructs which include efforts to change the work environment, efforts to change the job and non-work influences. Nevertheless, their definition of work influences is vague and Steers and Mowday's model recorded mixed support for its validity (Lee and Mowday 1987).

2.2.10 Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya: Labor-Economic Model

Contrary to the usual belief that job satisfaction influences alternatives, Hulin, Roznowski and Hachiya (1985) proposed that work alternatives can directly affect job satisfaction. They hypothesize that there are three mechanisms to explain why perceived alternatives affect individual turnover.

The first mechanism is that economic expansion lures marginal workers into the work force because of the increase in real wages due to the sudden increase in demand. However, these marginal employees will not stay long and once they have made enough money, they will quit to go for personal pursuits. Consequently, these workers may not necessarily go through the complex cognitive processes theorized by turnover scholars.

The second mechanism is that economic activities such as employment levels affect job satisfaction. When economic conditions are depressing, high unemployment indirectly boosts job satisfaction as workers are afraid to lose their jobs. Conversely, when job opportunities are abundant, employees become more demanding on the organization as the opportunity cost of foregoing alternatives increases.

The third mechanism is that job opportunities affect turnover directly. The contribution of Hulin et al.'s (1985) model lies with the proposition that alternative work and dissatisfaction about the job interact in affecting quitting. Job dissatisfaction and job offers must both exist for withdrawal to occur. While Hulin's model that the availability of alternatives directly influences satisfaction in two ways is consistent with the economic utility theory, some employees who are not satisfied with the organization may simply reduce their job inputs, a common work
withdrawal. One major drawback of the Hulin’s model is the neglect on many fundamental constructs such as commitment to the organization, outside influences and job search that have been affirmed as underpinnings of turnover (Blau 1993; Horne and Griffeth 1991; Lee and Mowday 1987; Price and Mueller 1986).

2.2.11 Lee and Mitchell: Unfolding Model of Turnover

While neo-classical theories of turnover suggest that individuals maximize the subjective expected utility, Lee and Mitchell (1994) generalized Beach’s image theory (1991) on the assumption that people make decision by comparing the fit of the options in the decision to various images. With the constant bombardment of information, people must filter all information to select suitable options. This process involves the comparison of the characteristics of options to one of three internal images: value (set of general values and standard that define the self); trajectory (set of goals that energizes and directs individual behavior); or strategic (set of behavioral tactics and strategies for attaining personal goals). If a behavioral option meets the test, the individual will then compare the alternative to the status quo. Usually, inertia dictates one to continue with the status quo. Sometimes, the individual may behave differently, choosing the best alternative according to the cost/benefit analysis.

Lee and Mitchell’s theory (1994) contributes interesting theoretical insights and offers a completely new perspective. Their notion of system shocks – external, unexpected or random events has accorded greater attention to the origin of the turnover process as the test results of the Lee and Mitchell model (1996) suggested that individuals follow different and distinct psychological processes in quitting their jobs. Nevertheless, the model is quite complicated and may be less comprehensible to general practitioners, suggesting that not much research validation has been carried out yet.

2.3 Organizational Commitment

Subsequent to the use of the psychological model in the explanation of labor turnover, a lot of interest has been developed in organizational commitment (OC).
Part of the reason is that OC has been linked to various personal variables, role status and aspects of work environment. Part of it is due to the fact that OC has been used to explain employees’ behavior such as performance, absenteeism and turnover (Morrow 1983; Mowday 1982; Reichers 1985; Steers 1977).

Organizational commitment has been defined in various forms. All of these, however, share the common theme that OC is considered to be a bond or linkage of the individual to the organization. The definition differs in terms of how the bond is developed. The most common type of OC is attitudinal which is defined as:

"the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors: a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (Mowday et al. 1982, p.27).

The second most popular form of OC is calculative commitment. Based upon the work of Becker (1960), calculative OC is defined as “a structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual organizational transactions and alterations in side-bets or instruments over time” (Hrebiniak and Alutto 1972, p.556). In other words, individuals have put in a lot of sunk costs or “side bets” with the organizations that they cannot afford to break the bond or linkage easily.

Other types of OC have also been proposed such as normative commitment (Wiener 1982) and organizational identification (Hall et al. 1970). While these new versions of OC are interesting, readers generally group them into the attitudinal or calculative definitions for simplicity sake. Alternatively, these new versions of OC have been treated as correlates to OC. Good examples include treating organizational identification as one of the subdimensions of attitudinal commitment as defined by Mowday (1979). In the meantime, normative commitment refers to the interaction between organizational actions (e.g. selection and socialization procedures) and individual predispositions (e.g. personal-organizational value congruence and loyalty or duty attitudes) which leads to the development of OC (Wiener 1982).
It should, however, be pointed out that attitudinal and calculative commitment are not distinct and separable concepts. In fact, there are so many overlaps that each tends to contain elements of the other. For example, one may be tempted to join an organization initially because of exchange relationships (i.e. calculative OC) and then develop attitudes consistent with maintaining membership (i.e. attitudinal OC). All these suggest that the two processes are closely linked over time.

According to Mathieu and Zajac (1990), the antecedents of OC can best be divided into three major categories - personal characteristics, job and organizational characteristics, and group/leader relations. While this study will focus on the group/leader relations, a brief discussion on the personal and job and organizational characteristics will also be useful.

2.3.1 Antecedents of Organizational Commitment
2.3.1.1 Personal Characteristics

At least nine variables have been identified under this category – personal characteristics. The first variable, age, has found to be significantly more related to attitudinal than to calculative commitment. This is contrary to the usual belief which suggests that age should be more highly related to calculative commitment (March and Simon 1958). However, Meyer and Allen (1984) have suggested that older workers become more attitudinally committed to an organization for a number of reasons which include greater satisfaction from their jobs, taking up more senior positions and cognitively more convinced to stay with existing organization.

The second variable is sex. Past research seems to indicate that women tend to be more committed than men because women have to overcome more barriers than men to become more accepted (Grusky 1966). While the latest research seems to suggest a stronger relationship between sex and attitudinal commitment, there does not appear to be any consistent relationship between sex and OC.

The third variable is education which has exhibited a small negative correlation with commitment. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) suggested that this inverse
relationship may result from the fact that more educated individuals have higher expectations that the organization may be unable to meet. Others have said that more educated employees usually have a greater number of opportunities and are less likely to stay in any one position of a company for a long period of time.

The next variable is marital status. In previous research, marital status correlations were coded such that higher values referred to married individuals. Very little theoretical work has been done to specify why marital status may be related to commitment though intuitive thinking suggests that marital status may be more related to calculative commitment because married employees are, in general, likely to have greater financial burdens.

With regard to the antecedents related to the organization, tenure has often been treated as a good measure of side bets (Meyer and Allen 1984). The assumption is that as individuals gain seniority with a company, they are likely to have more investments in a company such as vested interest in pension plans. While it is important to distinguish between tenure associated with the organization and the tenure from a particular position, it is generally agreed that organizational tenure is a better surrogate measure of side bets. Theoretically, years spent in an organization are likely to yield greater side bets and develop greater commitment. However, the causal direction of these relationships (i.e. whether increased tenure increases commitment or whether more committed employees stay with an organization longer) is unclear and likely to be reciprocal.

Another interesting variable is perceived competence which has exhibited a large positive correlation ($R^2=0.630$) with attitudinal commitment. Morris and Sherman (1981) suggested that individuals will become committed to an organization to the extent that it provides growth and achievement needs. However, it has also been argued that such findings must be treated as preliminary given the limited amount of research in this area.

Closely related to perceived competence is ability. Stevens, Beyer and Trice (1978) have shown that highly skilled and capable employees are of great value to organizations which have a direct impact on their rewards and their calculative
commitment. However, other researchers (Howell and Dorfman 1981) fail to show the correlation between ability and commitment and it is suggested that given the relatively little research devoted to this area, it might be premature to speculate on how employee’s ability may relate to their commitment levels.

Another important element under “personal characteristics” is pay or salary. While pay is generally perceived to be a significant side bet which will increase calculative commitment, most research, unfortunately, focus on the link between pay and attitudinal commitment. Surprisingly, the results seem to suggest a very low positive correlation between salary and commitment and further research is warranted.

Several work values have been proposed as potential antecedents of OC. However, only the Protestant work ethic, which is defined as “commitment to the values of hard work, to work itself as an objective, and the work organization as an inevitable structure within which those internalized values, can be satisfied” (Kidron 1978, p.240) has received sufficient attention. It has found to be positively correlated with OC at a moderate level.

Another interesting antecedent is job level which has found to be positively correlated with commitment. The moderator analysis by type of commitment, according to Mathieu and Zajac (1990), indicates that job level seems to be highly related to attitudinal commitment.

2.3.1.2 Job Characteristics and Organizational Characteristics

The other major group of antecedents of organizational commitment is job characteristics and organizational characteristics. While no theoretical models have been used to explain why job characteristics and OC should be related, most researchers tend to draw on support from Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) job characteristic model to suggest that enriched jobs are likely to yield higher OC (Steers 1977). Empirical tests of the validity of the job characteristics model (Fried 1987; Loher 1985; Spector 1985) generally support this proposition which provides a useful framework for examining the relationships between aspects of jobs and organizational commitment. Using Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) classification, skill
variety and OC are found to have a small positive correlation. In fact, a negative correlation has been found between skill variety and commitment for part-time employees which suggests that aspects of the job may have little impact on commitment levels of employees where work is not a primary role.

While autonomy and OC seems to have a small positive correlation, job challenge is positively correlated with OC. Although job challenge is not formally a component of the job characteristic model, it does imply that the more challenging the jobs, the higher will be the OC, particularly for those employees with growth potential. The job scope variable is found to correlate more positively and more consistently with OC than the three components listed above. Stone and Guental (1985) concluded in their study of job characteristics that individuals do not view jobs as having certain levels of variety, autonomy, task significance, and so forth, but instead see jobs in terms of a gestalt or summary dimension that might be labeled job complexity. Their findings seem to suggest that jobs which are perceived to be more complex, or perhaps more enriched tend to yield higher commitment.

Closely connected to organizational commitment is organizational trust which is defined as an employee’s faith in the leaders, actions and policies of organizations leading to the attainment of corporate goals that are mandatory to the employees (Kao and Ng 1993; Kim and Mauborgne 1993; Konovsky and Cropanzo 1991). As Fox (1974) pointed out, it is important to identify two levels of organizational trust – vertical versus lateral trust. Vertical trust literally means the trust relationship between an employee and his immediate supervisor, lines of management to whom his supervisor reports and board of directors of the organization, whereas lateral trust refers to the trust relationship among peers and subordinates within an organization. In essence, organizational trust is mandatory to the survivor of an organization because it has been shown that trust in an organization’s supervisory and managerial capability is closely related to performance (Becker 1996; Ward 1997).

As Rotter (1967) pointed out, on the relationship between trust and effectiveness, one of the most salient factors in the effectiveness of the present complex social organization is the willingness of one or more individuals in a social unit to trust others. The efficiency, adjustment, and even survival of any social group depend
upon the presence or absence of such trust. Increasing attention has been placed on
decentralization, team effort and organizational trust (Chan 1997), which suggests
stronger organizational commitment and trust (McCauly and Kuhnert 1992).

While the literature in this area is growing, there is a gap in literature in terms of how
trust is going to impact on the turnover intentions of an individual employee. This is
especially true in the case of highly educated individual such as the securities
marketing executive under this study. In particular, if an individual has been lured by
his/her supervisor to consider moving to a different organization, the importance of
trust cannot be over-emphasized. This study aims to fill in this gap in literature by
posting interesting questions related to trust on supervisors.

A natural extension of organizational trust is perceived organizational support (POS)
which is defined as the employees' perception of the organization's commitment to
them (Eisenberger et al. 1986). By focusing on the POS, employees will reinforce
their commitments to the organizations because there is an obligation to reciprocate
the commitment of their organizations through the attainment of organizational goals
suggested that organizational commitment is the result of a series of social exchange
dealings through which the organization demonstrates its willingness to reward
increased work efforts and meet needs for approval and affirmation on the part of
employees.

In summary, there are only a few studies on affect-based trust as a variable mediating
the relationship between perceived leader supportiveness, perceived fairness and
organizational commitment. Further investigation on this mediating relationship
merits attention and the current study is expected to shed some light in this direction.

2.3.2 Group Cohesiveness

Cohesiveness has long been regarded as a key factor affecting group performance
(Seashore 1954) and is considered central to the study of group dynamics (Zander
1979). While considerable research has addressed the relationship between group
cohesiveness and performance, doubts have been raised on whether there is a direct
relationship or if another variable mediates the impact of cohesiveness on group performance. For example, Stodgill (1972) found that the cohesiveness-performance relationship was inconsistent. Benne and Sheats (1948) and Festinger, Back, Kelley and Thibaut (1952) suggested that cohesiveness did not have a positive relationship with performance unless combined with task-focused or task-oriented group norms. It is also interesting to note that although cohesive groups are often more enjoyable, they are not necessarily more productive.

Both Evans and Dion (1991) and Mullen and Copper (1994) found positive relationship between cohesiveness and performance. However, they suggest that there may be an optimal level of cohesion for work groups and that very high cohesiveness could produce the opposite effect to performance.

The cohesiveness of a group can be thought of as the extent to which members of the group like each other and want to remain members of the group (Shaw 1981). It is a construct that has no meaning outside the context of a group because it is based entirely on attitudes towards other group members. Festinger, Back, Kelley and Thibaut (1952) linked group productivity to the interaction of group cohesiveness and task-oriented group work norms. This followed from the observation that cohesive groups had more power to influence members to conform to group norms (Feldman 1984; McGrath 1984). A more cohesive group influences its members in whatever direction the norms are oriented. Goodman, Devadas and Hughson (Goodman et al. 1988, p.29) noted:

"[In highly cohesive teams] there was deviant behavior that was punished and changed but the behavior had to do with whether team members would rotate jobs, not whether productivity standards would be achieved."

Group cohesiveness alone is not sufficient for high group effectiveness unless combined with task-oriented norms. In fact, the more cohesive a group, the more pressure can be brought to bear on the individual member to conform to group norms and the more rapid and effective punishment for deviancy can be (Levine 1980). Groups with high cohesiveness and task-oriented norms are therefore expected to do
better than other groups with any other combination and groups with high cohesiveness and explicit non-task-oriented norms are expected to perform less well.

There is little evidence to suggest that high cohesiveness in a group could have detrimental effects on productivity or performance by itself – that is, without the presence of dysfunctional work norms. However, there could be special situations, tasks, or organizational environments for which strong cohesiveness by itself may have a detrimental impact on effectiveness.

While group size may have some influence on group cohesiveness, the more important factor is the skills of group leader (Tziner and Vardi 1982). Groups with leaders who are able to better co-ordinate and direct activities of the group, or to better communicate with supervisors, for example, will be more effective than groups with less skilled leaders. In other words, the effectiveness of group cohesiveness depends a lot on the quality of the individual leader who is exemplified by his style on communication, consideration, initiation and participation.

In general, group cohesiveness is measured by the amount of help and feedback among group members, by the friendliness and co-operation of group members toward on another, by the desire to remain the group and most important of all, by the amount of off-duty affiliation between group members. This simply implies that group cohesiveness does not stop at the office. It depends a lot on how individual group members interact with the rest of the group during the weekends, holidays, etc. To a large extent, this requires participation from the leader.

Langfred’s (1998) test indicates that the effectiveness of groups with high cohesiveness is very dependent on the orientation of norms in the group. If the norms are task oriented, the highly cohesive groups will outperform others, but if the norms are not, then the high cohesiveness of a group can be detrimental to group performance. Thus, groups with high cohesiveness and task norms were effective than other groups and that the combination of high cohesiveness and non-task norms was associated with poor performance. Individuals with strong identification tend to strive towards group objectives much harder and engage in more pro-social activities (Kirkman and Shapiro 2001).
In short, while there have been some studies examining the direct influence of group cohesiveness on group behavior (Shaw 1981; Langfred 1998), only a limited number of constructs have been studied and they are not as comprehensive as the integrated framework proposed in this study.

2.3.3 Perceived Organizational Support and Group Commitment

In the previous section, perceived organizational support (POS) in which employees form an opinion on how an organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being has been discussed. While employees tend to consider actions by agents of the organization, namely, managers and supervisors, as actions of the organization itself, there is increasing evidence that subordinates pay attention to the actions of the supervisors. Personification of the organization is based on a number of considerations: 1) the organization has a legal, moral and financial responsibility for the actions of the agents; 2) organizational traditions, policies, and norms provide continuity and prescribe role behaviors; and 3) the organization, through its agents, exerts power over individual employees (Eisenberger et al. 1986). When one member quits to take a new job elsewhere, others may re-assess their own jobs (Dess and Shaw 2001). Recent studies (Lee 1999; Mollica 2000; Shah 2000; Sheehan 1995) show that this kind of shock may lead to potential turnover even if the individual is satisfied with his or her current position. This effect could be more pronounced in teams given the more active discussions and the higher sense of collective expectations. In other words, a group member’s decision to stay at or to leave a particular job is a function of the quality and pattern of interaction with other group members. As suggested by Chan, (2001), it is interesting to examine the extent of supportive actions provided by his or her supervisor as perceived supervisory support (PPS) (Hutchison 1997; Kottke 1988).

Closely connected to organizational support is perceived supervisory support and a comprehensive review of the literature on perceived supervisory support has identified two types of leadership behaviors: transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership behaviors refer to an exchange process in which the leader provides rewards in return for the subordinates’ efforts (Burns 1978). However,
others including Podsakoff MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (Podsakoff et al. 1990, p.108) argue that transformational leadership or charismatic behaviors are characterized by those “who make followers more aware of the importance and values of task outcomes, activates their high-order needs, and induce them to transcend self-interests for the sake of the organization”. Such behaviors are regarded as leader supportive. In addition, there are also six key transformational leadership behaviors, namely, 1) identifying and articulating a vision; 2) providing an appropriate model; 3) fostering the acceptance of group goals; 4) high performance expectations; 5) providing individualized support; and 6) intellectual stimulation. Furthermore, transformational leaders should spend more time on extra-role performance, rather than in-role performance. Consequently, transformational leaders should aim at a level “over and above technical compliance with the routine directives of the organization” (Katz and Kahn 1978, p.528).

Leader supportive behaviors refer to those charismatic behaviors that “make followers more aware of the importance and values of task outcomes, activates their higher-order needs and induce them to transcend self-interests for the sake of the organization” (Podsakoff et al. 1990, p.108). Such behaviors are also defined as transformational leadership as opposed to the transactional leadership behaviors of those leaders who set up rewards in return for the subordinates’ efforts in the exchange process. According to House and Dessler (1974), a supportive leader issues guidance to his or her subordinates, values their input and treats them well. Consequently, leadership support can be perceived from the degree of support and guidance a person receives from his supervisor. It is important to note that under the path-goal theory, leadership support leads to job satisfaction (Brown 1993; Penner 1997; Wofford 1993). Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) have found a direct effect of individualized leader support on job satisfaction. In fact, teams that have a strong sense of potency or ability are less likely to experience the sense of helplessness that would lead to turnover. Teams with low potency are likely to create an environment that amplifies feelings of helplessness especially related to assembling the skills necessary to succeed (Abraham 1999).
2.3.4 Group Homogeneity

Group homogeneity is closely linked to the difference in culture among members of the group. Prior research has suggested significantly higher turnover rates in demographically diverse work groups (Jackson et al. 1993) and O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett (1989) proposed that disagreement within heterogeneous groups triggers the departure of members. Communication is expected to be easier and faster between individuals with shared social experiences. While there has been considerable interest in the study on the attitudes, behavior and motivation of managers and employees across different cultures (Chen et al. 1998; Hofstede 1980a), the enthusiasm to learn more is escalating given the rapid globalization of the world’s economy as well as cultural diversification of the work force in different countries. Hofstede (1980b) suggested that many differences in individual motivation and group behavior could be traced back to the basic differences in culture. This then boils down to the basic question – should one lead differently in different cultural settings? While there are a number of models to explain cultural differences on what constitutes effective leadership (Dorfman 1996; Earley and Mosakowski 2000), few studies have been carried out on the effects of differences in cultural orientation on the effectiveness of group interactions.

To explain all these, two types of leadership have to be distinguished – transactional versus transformational. Transactional leadership was defined by Burns (1978) as one who motivates followers primarily through contingent-reward-based exchanges. Theoretically, the main focus of transactional leaders is on setting goals, clarifying the link between performance and rewards, and providing constructive feedback to keep followers on task (Bass 1985).

Transformational leadership, on the other hand, involves the development of a closer relationship between leaders and followers, with its roots in trust and commitment than on contractual agreements. In other words, transformational leaders help followers see the importance of transcending their own self-interest for the sake of the mission and vision of their group and/or organization (Jung and Avolio 1999). With emphasis on the followers' self-confidence, self-efficacy, and self-esteem,
positive influence on the followers’ levels of identification, motivation and goal achievement can be built up (Gardner 1998; Klein 1995; Shamir 1993).

A number of cross-cultural studies suggest that collectivists tend to exhibit stronger attachment to their organizations (Earley 1989; Triandis 1995) It also follows that collectivists will subordinate their individual goals to group goals. In particular, collectivists show high levels of loyalty and commitment to the leader (Jung et al. 1995). In contrast, people in individualist cultures are usually motivated to satisfy their own self-interests and personal goals (Hofsted 1980a) Under such cultural settings, individual employees are supposed to take care of themselves and will prompt them to place higher priority on individual initiative and achievement, as well as on personal rewards. As a result, individuals will be more motivated by transactional leadership which is typically more short-term oriented and in conformity with the values orientation in more individualistic cultures.

A supervisor’s liking of a subordinate does more than just guide performance rating; it also influences expectations and subsequent exchanges with the subordinate. Liden, Wayne and Stilwell (1993) showed that both leaders’ and members’ perception of value similarity and perceived similarity in problem solving together significantly predicted leader member exchange quality.

Subordinates from collectivist cultures are expected to follow their leader’s vision more closely for two reasons. First, collectivists tend to accept their leader’s beliefs more readily, due to the high power distance in those cultures (Hofsted 1980a; Triandis 1995). This is particularly true in most Asian countries which tend to demonstrate high degrees of power distance. Second, there is also a high level of value congruence between followers and leaders due to extensive socialization (Jung et al. 1995).

The difference in cultural orientation brings along different implications for the design of work tasks (Cox et al. 1991; Wagner 1995). Earley (1989) illustrated collectivists’ strong tendencies to prefer to work in groups and to perform better in groups than when working along on the basis of social loafing theory. Earley (1989) further suggested that collectivist Chinese managers did not engage in social loafing
when they worked in groups since group goals were placed above individual goals. On the other hand, individualist American managers performed much better on an individual basis and were more likely to loaf since individual contributions were placed way above group goals. Erez and Somech (1996) tried to explain the same phenomenon in terms of "independent" and "interdependent" selves. In Erez and Somech's view, collectivists perceive themselves as an integral part of social relationships and are likely to define their self as tied to others in their social network. Thus, working with others and making significant contributions to group performance help collectivists fulfill the interdependent self and enhance their group identity. Individualists, who value the independent self more than the interdependent self, perceive their contributions to groups as less important in enhancing their self-accomplishment. All these lead to Jung and Avolio's (1999) study that the aggregate performance of individualists will be higher when they work alone and have a transactional leader than it will be under all other leadership and task conditions. Conversely, the aggregate performance of collectivists will be better when they work in groups and have transformational leaders than it will be under all other leadership and task conditions.

Jung and Avolio (1999) further found that the same leadership style can lead to different results under different cultural settings. In other words, it is dangerous to assume that the same leader behaviors and statements will be interpreted similarly by followers with different cultural orientations. For example, a leader who discussed followers' personal problems with others in their absence could be perceived as considerate in the case of Japan but would be regarded as invading the followers' privacy in the United States (Smith et al. 1989).

While this study does not intend to examine the impact of culture on the organizational behavior of marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong, there is expectation that this study can bridge the gap by providing some insight on how future research on the impact of culture on turnover intentions of marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong can be conducted.
2.3.5 Task Interdependence

Operational researchers have shown keen interest in employee involvement and participative decision making for the last 50 years (Lewin and Lippitt 1938; Likert 1967; Seashore and Bowers 1970). In the 1970s, most of the studies centered on job enrichment (Hackman and Oldham 1976) and in the next two decades, research was focused on employee empowerment. The theme of all these was to convert relatively uninfluential individuals into those who exercise personal control (Greenberger and Strasser 1986; McWhirter 1991).

While an individual is expected to focus on his or her own job, it has been found that worker's involvement in other tasks increased self-motivation that produced strong business and other benefits (Rose 1978; Legge 1995). Back in the 1960s, the concept of task interdependence and job enrichment were already proposed as an alternative work theory to provide job satisfaction to employees with regular feedback on performance (Herzberg 1968; Herzberg and Mausner 1959; Honold, 1997).

Task interdependence is a structural feature of work: the instructions and materials that define a task create a level of interdependence that in turn influences how much members interact in executing the task (Wageman 1995). According to Goodman, Ravlin and Schminke (1987), outcomes on organizational research on groups such as group performance, may vary greatly based on structural variables. Liden, Wayne and Bradway (Liden et al. 1997) argued that task interdependence is probably the structural variable with the greatest effect on group performance. Several studies have examined the effect of task interdependence on group effectiveness. Task interdependence has been found to affect levels of motivation (Hirst 1988; Kiggundu 1983; Wong and Campion 1991) and in turn, group effectiveness (Larson and Fasto 1989; Saavedra et al. 1993). In another study, relationship and task conflicts were found to be healthy and related to effectiveness in groups that were high, but not low in task interdependence (Jehn 1995). However, high task interdependence may also encourage dysfunctional behaviors such as social loafing (Kidwell and Bennett 1993).
In fact, it has been argued that some degree of task interdependence is a necessary condition for semi-autonomous work groups (Cummings 1978; Klein 1991). Supporting this view, it has been found that providing more autonomy and control over group decisions through more task interdependence results in better performance (Saavedra et al. 1993). Meanwhile, when groups are low in task interdependence, performance may suffer. Forcing autonomy and decision at the group level, when task interdependence is low, may lead to dysfunctional outcomes. Excessive amount of effort is required in articulating activities.

Interest in the concept of empowerment and task interdependence has continued to grow due to a number of factors. First, studies on leadership and management skills suggest that the practice of creating task interdependence and empowerment is mandatory for managerial and organizational effectiveness (Bennis and Nanus 1985; McClelland 1975). Second, it has been found that the effectiveness of organizational power grows with the sharing of power and control with subordinates. As Kanter (1979) has pointed out, effective leaders are more ready to delegate, promote task interdependence and reward talents. Finally, studies on team building within organization also suggest that task interdependence and job enrichment play a critical role in group development and maintenance.

According to Rappaport (1981), empowerment is a process by which individuals gain control over their lives. It includes intrapersonal (i.e. cognition), interactional (i.e. how people think about and relate to their environment), and behavioral. Focusing on the individual perspective of empowerment, Spreitzer (1995) defined empowerment and task interdependence as intrinsic motivation manifested in four cognitions reflecting an individual’s orientation to his or her work role. According to Thomas and Velthouse (1990), these cognitions include meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. Meaning refers to the fit between the requirements of a work role and on person’s beliefs, values and behaviors (Brief and Nord 1990). Competence, a personal belief in one’s own capability to perform job functions with skills (Gist 1987), is one’s self-efficacy specific to work and is analogous to effort-performance expectancy (Bandura 1989). Self-determination, a sense of choice in initiating and regulating one’s actions (Deci et al. 1989) is a reflection of autonomy over the initiation and continuation of work behavior and processes (Bell and Staw
1989). Finally, impact refers to the extent an individual’s influence on strategic, administrative or operating outcomes at work (Ashforth 1989).

To elaborate on all these concepts, Keller and Dansrea (1995) carried out a study on 20 managers, 30 professionals and 42 hourly workers, which ended in 92 dyads consisting of matched supervisors and subordinate reports. In that study, empowerment was conceptualized as subordinates’ percepts of control that is considered integral to one’s self-concept and self-esteem. Keller and Dansrea further proposed that perceived control equates to receipt of supervisory control, suggesting that subordinates do not have any power to upgrade themselves and that supervisors have violated the basic principle of reciprocity and trust. These findings also imply that subordinates who receive support for self-worth and negotiating latitude perceive they control the supervisor/subordinate relationship.

Liden, Wayne and Bradway (Liden et al. 1997, p.172) also said that “just as implementing group-level control on groups that are low in task interdependence may result in lowered group performance, it may be equally dysfunctional to withhold group-level control from groups that are high in task interdependence”. Group effectiveness may suffer in task interdependence groups that possess little control. Consequently, group performance is expected to be low in groups with little control and high task interdependence as well as in low-task interdependent groups that do possess group control. Performance is expected to be better in groups that have controls and are high in task interdependence as well as in groups that are low in control and task interdependence.

2.3.6 Group/Leader Relations
2.3.6.1 Leader Initiating Structure and Leader Consideration

Trust between supervisors and subordinates is an important element in the overall dyadic organizational relationship (Graen and Scandura 1987). According to McAllister (1995), there are two main components in the dyadic relationship – cognition-based trust and affect-based trust. Cognition-based trust arises from a logical analysis of the various factors such as responsibility and competence and the final outcome is supported by a quantitative analysis of the probabilities. On the
other hand, affect-based trust is more “emotional” in nature and partners involved in the process do show concern for each other in expectation of reciprocity at some point in the future.

Followers perform beyond expectations because they trust and respect transformational leaders (Yukl 1989). Effective leaders transform or change the basic values, beliefs and attitudes of followers so that they are willing to perform functions and duties beyond the normal requirements stipulated by the organization (Podsakoff et al. 1990). The elements in a leader most valued by followers are integrity, honesty and trustfulness (Kouzes and Posner 1987).

McAllister (McAllister 1995, p.26) defined trust as “consisting of the bonds between individuals as they make emotional investments in trust relationship, express genuine care and concern for the welfare of partners, believe in the intrinsic virtue of such relationships and believe that these sentiments are reciprocated. Trust building generally requires creation of a "virtuous circle" in which initially modest activities lead to trust generation and hence to a willingness of parties to take a risk with more ambitious joint activities.

In addition to these behaviors, which rely mainly on a leader’s verbal and written communication and on symbolic devices such as rituals and ceremonies, the leader's personal behavior is also important. This category of behaviors includes such acts as displaying self-confidence, showing high involvement in the task, engaging in self-sacrifice to show commitment to the mission, demonstrating social and physical courage and setting a personal example in overall lifestyle. By demonstrating determination, optimism and self-confidence, a leader will then be able to inspire confidence and raise both self-efficacy and group-efficacy.

Since supervisors represent the organizations, subordinates tend to generalize their perceptions of supervisors to their organizations at large (Kozlowski and Doherty 1989). As individuals extend their leader-subordinates relationships to that of organizations, it is mandatory for the leaders and subordinates to maintain a trust relationship so that the organizations can function effectively. Scott and Bruce (1994) suggested that individuals generalize their supervisor-subordinate
relationships to their organizations. Bennis and Nanus (1985) also posited that effective leaders earn the trust of their followers. Yukl (1989 and 1994) noted that followers are motivated to perform beyond normal requirements because of trust in and respect for the transformational leader. Furthermore, the leader’s style of setting a personal example enhances identification with and admiration for him or her. When subordinates admire and identify themselves with a leader, they are more likely to strive for higher level of excellence.

While trust in supervisor is perceived as an important element in the organizational relationship, few people have done research on it. Only a few empirical studies have enriched our understanding of the supervisor behaviors that have direct impact on a subordinate’s trust in his or her supervisors (Butler 1991). Further studies in this area definitely enhance the understanding on why people resign in groups.

Perceived fairness deals with the perception on whether employees have been treated fairly in their jobs and how those determinations influence other work-related variables (Moorman 1991). As a result, Folgers and Greenberg (1985) have identified two sources of organizational justice: distributive justice, which is the fairness of outcomes received by an employee; and procedural justice, which describes the fairness of the procedures used to determine those outcomes.

Prior to Moorman’s study (1991), very little research was conducted on organizational justice and perceived fairness. Such studies include Dittrich and Carroll (1979) which focused on the relationship between perceptions of job equity and pay equity; Scholl, Cooper and McKenna (1987) which worked on the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior; and Farh, Podsakoff and Organ (1990) which measured leader fairness from the leader’s behavior, support and participation.

Moorman (1991) found an important relationship between organizational justice and the behavior of an employee. Whether an employee is committed to an organization depends on his or her perception of the degree of fairness of treatment by the organization. If conditions of unfairness arise, these will create tension within a person and he or she will have to resolve on it. Moorman has further identified three
dimensions of fairness – distributive justice, formal procedures and interactional justice. Only interactional justice has been found to be significantly related to the behavior of an employee. Distributive justice and procedural justice are not directly related to the behavior of an employee. This implies that if an employee believes his or her supervisor treats him or her fairly, he or she will be more likely to exhibit support to the organization.

In fact, Moorman was able to draw on support from previous studies. For example, Greenberg (1988) suggested that supervisors are likely to be perceived as fair if they interact with their subordinates in a fair way. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) posited that trust in leaders is related to an employee’s behavior and mediates the relationship between transformational leader behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. Moorman (Moorman 1991, p.853) further suggested that the employee’s decision to engage in organizational support behavior reflects “more a result of a general positive evaluation of the organizational system, institution and authorities evoked by procedural justice than an evaluation of the fairness of specific outcomes”.

In essence, as one of the pioneers on the studies between justice and employee behavior, Moorman (1991) found differential effects of distributive procedural and interactional justice, and identified the importance of supervisory interaction or supervisory trust in the interaction. Given interactional justice was the only dimension used in Moorman’s study related to employee behavior, further tests are required to find out whether distributive and procedural justice could also relate to citizenship behavior through trust. Since job satisfaction was found to be the only mediator between justice and organizational citizenship in Moorman’s (1991) model, more studies are required because of the limitations of his study.

In the literature on marketing, there are a number of studies examining the direct effect of fairness in reward allocation on job satisfaction and its indirect effect on employee performance through job satisfaction (Dubinsky and Levy 1989; Livingstone et al. 1995). Unfortunately, these studies focused on only a number of constructs and to broaden the theoretical framework, Netemeyer, Boles, McKee and McMurrian (1997) examined the role of job satisfaction as a mediator on the
relationship between organizational fit, leader support, distributive justice and
citizenship behavior. Two separate studies using different samples were conducted
and the findings were not consistent. While the inconsistency might be attributed to
the difference in age and background, other mediating variables such as trust in
leader might have existed. Our study on the marketing executives in foreign
securities firms might shed light on the leader/subordinate relationships in a sales
setting.

The previous section indicates that some variables might mediate the relationship
between perceived fairness and the behavior of an employee (Netemeyer et al. 1997;
Podsakoff et al. 1990). Moorman and Blakely (Moorman and Blakely 1998) focused
on the role of perceived organizational support as a mediator of the effects of
procedural justice on organizational citizenship. They found that the perception on
how an organization values the employee may prompt him or her to reciprocate with
increased commitment to the organization.

Podsakoff (1990) posited that trust in and loyalty to the leader mediates the
relationship between transformational leader and the behaviors of the subordinates.
Furthermore, Konovsky and Pugh (1994) found that an employee's trust in a
supervisor mediates the relationship between procedural fairness in the supervisor's
decision making and employee behavior. Deluga (1994) also suggested that
supervisory trust building behavior, particularly perception of fairness, is the
connecting thread between social exchange theory and employee behavior.

In short, there are a number of studies on how trust works as a mediator between
perceived leader support, perceived fairness and employee behavior. Perceptions of
fairness are a job-related motivational base that can influence the behavioral and
affective responses of job performers (Janssen 2001).

Discussions about leadership and trust have been conducted across all types of
literature for ages. In the last few years, we have seen a significant increase in
interest in trust as a construct (Currall and Judge 1995; Mayer et al. 1995; McAllister
1995; Sitkin and Roth 1993).
The research on dyadic relationships, commonly referred to as leader-member exchange (LMX) differs from other theories of leadership that address generalized leader behaviors and traits to all followers. In essence, LMX refers to the dyadic relationships on the assumption that leaders differentiate among subordinates in the establishment of these relationships and describes a role-making process that leads to the development of the relationships (Dienesch and Liden 1986; Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995; House and Aditya 1997). LMX focuses on the outcomes of these relationships for individuals and the organization. Most researchers would assert that the assumptions and interests of LMX theory are closely aligned with theories of interpersonal trust.

LMX theory could be traced back to the vertical dyad linkage theory (VDL) developed by Graen, Dansereau, Graen and Haga (Cashman et al. 1976; Dansereau et al. 1975; Graen 1976; Graen and Cashman 1975). The VDL theory postulated that leaders differentiate between subordinates in such a way that the leader develops a closer relationship with some subordinates (in-group) and gives them more “negotiating latitude” than other subordinates (out-group) (Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995). This view of leadership contrasts sharply with the behavioral and situational approaches to leadership that generally assume that leaders treat all subordinates equally (House and Aditya 1989; Schriesheim et al. 1999; Yukl 1994). The research on LMX can be leveraged to help us understand better how trust develops between leaders and their subordinates. According to Uhl-Bien, Graen and Scandura (1997), LMX develops quickly and remains stable over time (Bauer and Green 1996). A high LMX relationship is characterized by mutual trust, loyalty and behaviors that extend beyond the employment contract. A low LMX relationship is one that is within the bounds of the employment contract such that the employee performs his or her job, but contributes nothing “extra”.

Reciprocity is central to both LMX and trust, although it does not mean the same in both research. LMX refers to the exchange theory of leadership. In other words, both parties bring some value to the table and the parties interact with each other. Over time, an equilibrium is reached and the quality of the relationship is mutually perceived with balanced reciprocity. Theoretically, the dyad constitutes the unit of analysis, and there is no differentiation between a subordinate’s and a supervisor’s
measure of the change. In this context, LMX is defined as a measure of the quality of the exchange. Thus, the theory assumes that the quality of the exchange is something that can be established.

Trust needs not to be mutual (Mayer et al. 1995). Thus, it is possible for a leader to trust a subordinate, and at the same time, the subordinate does not trust the leader. In this context, trust is different from LMX because it does not call for reciprocity. A consistent aspect of various conceptualization of trust is that it is a perception held by the trustor, rather than an objective reality (Mayer et al. 1995). In a dyadic leadership context, the leader is the only one who can assess how he or she can trust a certain subordinate. While subordinates do not have the luxury of finding out how much trust a leader has in them, their perception of leader’s trust in them, based upon attributes of the leader’s behavior, will affect their attitudes and behavior.

There are two important issues that have caused some confusion in the study of LMX. These include the clarity of the construct and the perspective from which it is to be measured. Most of the literature on LMX has been focusing on the way of operationalizing LMX in terms of leader behaviors in connection with the supervision of subordinates (Bauer and Green 1996; Gerstner and Day 1997; Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995; Liden and Maslyn 1998; Liden et al. 1997; Schriesheim et al. 1999). Moreover, the measurement of LMX has generally been from the subordinate’s perspective. When studies have compared the perspective of the leader with that of subordinate, there has been little agreement (Gerstner and Day 1997; Graen and Sandura 1987). In fact, if the exchange relationship reaches an equilibrium, both parties in the relationship should converge in terms of their assessment of relationship. If trust is used as the relational construct in the leadership context, there will be two constructs, leader’s trust in subordinate and subordinate’s trust in leader, each measured from either the leader’s perspective or the subordinate’s perspective. In general, the leader is likely to make a judgment on how much the subordinate trusts him or her. It is each individual’s perception that affects his or her behavior. A leader who believes that a subordinate trusts him or her may feel more confident about asking the subordinate to engage in behaviors that make the subordinate more vulnerable.
According to DiNesich and Liden (1986), LMX forms through a role-making process. At the beginning of the process, individual characteristics influence the initial attraction between the leader and the member. The leader will then assign a number of tasks to the subordinates where the relationship continues to grow. Graen and Scandura (1987) suggest that the relationship revolves around role taking, role making and finally role routinization. This process is essentially a trust building one.

From a trust perspective, the supervisor may test the leader/subordinate relationship by sharing information or delegating task that involve little risk for the supervisor. If the subordinate proves to be trustworthy in these preliminary tests, the supervisor will then share more sensitive information and delegate more responsibilities to the subordinate (McKnight et al. 1998; Whitener et al. 1998).

In LMX theory, a leader is predisposed to a number of high LMX relationships and some leaders may be predisposed to develop more relationships than other leaders. Studies have suggested that characteristics of both the leader and the subordinates influence their initial relationship (DiNesich and Liden 1986; House and Aditya 1997). These characteristics include attitudes, experiences, and values. Nevertheless, Day and Crain (Day and Crain 1992) showed that a leader's positive affectivity had limited influence on LMX and further research is required to find out how propensity for LMX relationships develops and whether individual traits have differential effects on the relationship.

Brower, Schoorman and Tan (2000) suggested that similarity between leader and member has been found to be an important antecedent of LMX. This variable has also been regarded as central to the trust research. For example, research has indicated that shared values (Hart et al. 1986) and value congruence (Sitkin and Roth 1993) predict trust. It has been proved that establishing bases of similarity between parties will affect trust building early in the relationship (Lewicki et al. 1994). McAllister (McAllister 1995) also found that gender similarity correlated with affect-based trust. This also implies that when a leader is considerate, demonstrating concern towards the group members, he will win the support of the subordinates. Consequently, we would expect that similarity between supervisor and subordinate would increase trust in both parties.
Delegation, which is a direct reflection of the leader initiating structure, has been shown to lead to high LMX (Bauer and Green 1996; Schriesheim et al. 1998). It is also a significant part of the role-making process in LMX (Dienesch and Liden 1986). Delegation would more readily be explained as an outcome of trust, as a form of risk-taking behavior on the part of the leader. In particular, it is important to note that both performance and delegation are characterized as antecedents in the LMX literature and as outcomes in the trust literature. As with performance, however, there is a feedback loop between the outcomes such as delegation and the antecedents of trust. Thus, successful and effective delegation would lead to an increase in the perception of the subordinate’s ability, and therefore, an increase in trust, in much the same way that delegation operates in the role-making process in LMX.

When trust has been established between a leader and a subordinate, the leader will likely delegate tasks that involve a higher degree of risks (Bauer and Green, 1996; Lewicki and Bunker 1996). Schriesheim, Neider and Scandura also found that (Schriesheim et al. 1998) leaders were more likely to delegate subordinates in high LMX relationships. In fact, the amount of risk to be taken is a direct reflection of the level of trust. For example, in the case of a marketing executive, the leader will probably start with simple delegation such as execution of trades before he will allow the subordinate to talk directly to clients on investment advice.

In addition to assessing the trustworthiness of the subordinate, the leader must assess the extent of the potential risk involved in delegating the particular task. If the leader has enough faith in the subordinate, then the leader will delegate, thereby exhibiting risk taking in relationship. For example, if a leader must assign responsibility for planning and coordinating management meetings to a subordinate, he or she may be willing to assign the task to a new hire who has little knowledge about the organization. The risk involved is perceived to be minimal. On the other hand, if one of the upcoming meetings is the annual meeting of the board of directors of the company, the leader may perceive great risk and the job has to be delegated to somebody whom the leader has more trust and faith. It is interesting to note that delegation is based on the perceived risk associated with the action. Misperception of risk will be associated with the success or failure of the delegation.
Through all these delegations and the various degree of consideration demonstrated by the leader, there will be various outcomes for the subordinate which include higher levels of satisfaction and performance, and lower rates of absenteeism and turnover. In the context of LMX, the five most widely studied outcomes are satisfaction with supervisor and overall satisfaction (Dansereau et al. 1975; Duchon et al. 1986; Green et al. 1996; Liden and Graen 1980; Liden and Maslyn 1998; Seers 1989), turnover (Dansereau, Graen, and Haga 1975; Liden and Maslyn 1998; Sparrowe 1994), performance (Duarte et al. 1993, 1994; Liden and Graen 1980; Liden and Maslyn 1998; Scandura and Schriesheim 1994; Dienesch and Liden 1986; Settoon et al. 1996), commitment (Duchon et al. 1986; Green et al. 1996; Liden and Maslyn, 1998), and citizen behaviors (Anderson and Williams 1996; Wayne and Green 1993).

If the leader’s calculation of the perceived risk of the action is correct, then the subordinate is likely to perform the delegated task successfully. On the other hand, if the leader underestimates the risk, then the subordinate is less likely in performing his task. Consequently, if one makes a mistake in calculating the actual risk, it creates a false expectation about the vulnerability of the leader in delegating the task. In fact, if the leader overestimates the subordinate’s ability, then the leader’s trust is misplaced and the leader becomes very vulnerable. In essence, when a leader delegates authority and responsibility to a subordinate, he is taking risk and making himself or herself vulnerable. As such, the subordinate will likely value this behavior, recognizing the leader’s trust and faith in him. It follows that the subordinate will become more committed, more satisfied and likely to stay with the organization.

Owing to the fact that a subordinate may trust in his or her leader as a supervisor more than the leader trusts the subordinate as an employee, these perceptions are not required to converge. In fact, the majority of the research on LMX exhibits little convergence between the leader’s and the subordinate’s estimation of the relationship. In other words, the two members in the dyad relationship may not necessarily trust each other equally and usually do not perceive the relationship in the same way. In the LMX literature, a high LMX relationship between a leader and a
subordinate is expected to affect all aspects of the relationship. Since the LMX model is confined to work, the scope of this effect has not been a major issue. However, once outside the context of work, it is interesting to ask whether a high LMX subordinate would enjoy the same favored relationship with the same leader in a social context that is totally unrelated to work.

In case of betrayal, the leader must evaluate if the cause was a breach of ability, integrity or benevolence and reevaluate the level of trust. Meanwhile, the subordinate who fails to perform will also form perceptions about the degree of damage that was done to the relationship. Thus, the whole situation should be perceived as dynamic in nature, albeit stable on a long-term basis.

There has been little research on the implication of leader-member exchange for empowerment and other organizational behavior outside the work of Keller and Dansereau (1995) who examined 20 managers, 30 professionals and 42 hourly workers, which resulted in 92 dyads consisting of matched supervisors and subordinate reports. In this study, empowerment has been broadened to become an important tool of management to improve staff’s organizational commitment and to reduce turnover. This represents an important step forward from the available literature.

2.3.6.2 Leader Communication

It has often been suggested that two groups of people who have equal training and supplies may hold very different beliefs about their ability to perform on the same job (Gibson 1999). These beliefs may differ because among other things, the groups differ in the amount of information they have about their task or because they have different processes for sharing information and communicating with their leaders. The way in which leader communicates with his group will affect group efficacy which is the group’s belief in its ability to perform effectively (Campion et al. 1993; Lindsley et al. 1995). Because group efficacy indicates what a group thinks it can do, the level of group efficiency is found to be a determinant of group effectiveness. In other words, the higher the level of self-efficacy, the better an individual performs (Bandura 1997)
Theoretically, it is likely that group efficacy is quite different from the individual beliefs group members have about themselves or their group. Group efficacy forms as leaders communicate to group members various information which will be stored, manipulated and exchanged to form vision on their task, context, process and prior performance. Through processes of interaction especially with leaders/supervisors, the information is combined, weighted and integrated to form group efficacy.

One of the major elements of group efficacy is interdependence. Interestingly, interdependence in groups can take different forms: group members may rely on each other to obtain resources, receive rewards, or perform their task effectively (Saavedra et al. 1993). It has been found that when task interdependence is low, leader communication with the rest of the group occurs less frequently and knowledge about what is necessary for task completion may never be shared and integrated within a group (Wageman 1995). When task interdependence is high, information integration through effective leader communication occurs more frequently and group interaction about capabilities is important for task performance.

Despite increasing attention to the role of interdependence in management theory and practice, the understanding of the construct in the literature remains limited and confusion. Management theorists have only focused on interdependence as a set of management techniques rather than its unique nature or the process underlying the construct (Honold 1997; Wilkinson 1998). This study aims to bridge the literature gap by asking questions on how interdependence can impact on the organizational behavior of individual employee and hopefully sheds some light on how future studies can be conducted.

It is equally interesting to note that employees who identify favorably with their organizations are likely to show strong support for them (Ashforth and Mael 1989) and to make decisions that are consistent with organizational objectives (Simon 1997). One area that has been neglected for engendering identification is leader communication to employees. In fact, Cheney (1983) proposed that the content of leader communication may facilitate the corporate identification process because everybody shares the goals, values and achievements of an organization.
Furthermore, not only is positive communication climate rewarding in itself but it may also provide information on whether an employee is accepted as a valued member in an organization (Smidts et al. 2001).

Leader communication is defined as the communication transactions between individuals and/or groups at various levels and in different areas of specialization that are intended to design and redesign organizations, to implement designs and to co-ordinate day-to-day activities (Frank and Brownell 1989). In the leader communication process, employees are not just satisfied or dissatisfied with the communication, but are expected to express varying degrees of satisfaction about the communication process (Clampitt and Downs 1993). Two special components are of great importance here: (1) the content of organizational messages as it concerns members’ satisfaction with what is being communicated and (2) the communication climate, or how information is communicated within an organization.

With regard to the content of communication, employees definitely look forward to useful information about their roles in organizations. Such information will provide a basis for self-categorization (Turner 1987) and will enhance employees’ sense of involvement with the organization (Lawler 1989). In the organizational climate literature, a distinction is made between psychological and organizational climate (Kozlowski and Klein 2000). Psychological climate refers to individual’s perceptions and interpretations of their work environment in terms of psychological meaning and significance (Jones and James 1979). Organizational climate is defined as the shared psychological climate. In other words, organizational climate is the shared homogeneous perceptions that organization members have on the psychological climate. Communication climate includes only communicative elements of a work environment, such as judgments on the receptivity of management to leader communication or the trustworthiness of information being disseminated in the organization (Guzley 1992). An organizational communication climate can reflect organization members’ shared perceptions of openness, voice, and being taken seriously. Only if members take a concerted view on these issues can we classify the communication climate as a homogeneous one. A positive communication climate will then strengthen organizational identification because it is rewarding and serves a
member’s self-enhancement. Moreover, openness in communicating with supervisors may further escalate the employee’s self-esteem.

Recent studies by Pratt (1998) and Tyler (1999) confirm that the feeling of being respected by one’s supervisors and colleagues strongly affects self-esteem, commitment to a group, and co-operative behavior. Managers should therefore promote a conducive internal communication climate by providing each employee with adequate information and the opportunities to speak up, get involved, be listened to, and actively participate. It follows that leaders should make special communication efforts to reach and influence those employees with relatively negative perceptions of their company’s prestige (Farmer et al. 1998).

There has been relatively little research examining the relationship between leader-member exchange and employee motivation, and organizational behavior outside the works of Deluga (1998), Settoon, Bennett and Liden (1996) and Wayne and Green (1993). This study aims to bridge the literature gap by examining the impact of leader-member exchange on the turnover intention of each individual employee.

2.3.6.3 Leader Participation

According to Scandura, Graen and Novak (Scandura et al. 1986, p.28), leader-member exchange is defined as “(a) a system of components and their relationships (b) involving both members of a dyad (c) interdependent patterns of behavior (d) sharing mutual outcome instrumentality and (e) producing concepts of environments, cause maps and values”. With the revival of research interest on participation (Wagner 1994), interest in the study of leader participation and delegation resurfaced over 15 years ago (Leana 1986, 1987; Schweiger and Leana 1986). As Bass (1990) noted, delegation remains a relatively unexplored management option yet. Studies of the delegation process are likely to be important in future research on leadership. It is further noted that delegation implies that one has been empowered by one’s superior to take responsibility for certain activities.

Whether managers delegate and let subordinates participate depends in part on whether the managers are willing to undertake risk and let subordinates succeed.
They also need to feel confident in the subordinates (Hollingsworth and Al-Jafary 1983). Similarly, Leana (1987) found that managers were reluctant to delegate for one of the following reasons: a lack of confidence in subordinates’ capabilities, tasks being seen too important to be left to subordinates, or task being perceived as too difficult. Leana further postulated that managers are likely to delegate when their workloads are increasing suggesting that delegation is employed when assistance is required from subordinates.

In other words, delegation is likely to occur when managers see subordinates as competent relative to task demands and as sufficiently trustworthy to allow managers to be confident undertaking the risks associated with delegation. Also experience as a manager and being willing to allow a subordinate access to information is related to delegation. High quality leader-member exchange should be positively related to increased supervisory delegation.

Graen (1989) identified good-quality leader-member relations as involving giving subordinates enough authority to complete important assignments, preparing subordinates for difficult assignments and providing special information to help subordinates accomplish task. Also, Graen and Uhl-Bien noted that good-quality LMX results from resource constraints on those managers that required them to develop a cadre of trusted assistants to help in the functioning of the work unit (Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995). Subordinates who enjoy high-quality exchange relationships with their supervisors are very likely, almost by definition, to be receiving the trust, information and positional resources, training and preparation and authority that are prerequisites of delegation.

However, for delegation and participation to be effective, subordinates need to have sufficient authority to make decisions, possess adequate resources, and enough capability to do the work being delegated. Conversely, delegation under conditions of poor leader-member exchange may be seen as related to decreased extrinsic satisfaction.

In essence, delegating authority to subordinates is perhaps no substitute for a high quality leader-follower relationship in terms of performance and satisfaction with
perceived links to external rewards. In general, the supportive leader utilizes socio-emotional appeals to subordinates which involves (1) specific consideration for subordinates - the leader considers the needs and preferences of his subordinates, whom he trusts with dignity and kindness, and is not punitive in his dealings with them. Such a leader is frequently referred to as “employee centered” as opposed to “work centered” or “task centered”; (2) consultative decision making - the leader asks his subordinates for their opinions before he makes decisions. Such a leader is consultative, participative or democratic (as opposed to unilateral, autocratic or arbitrary) in his decision-making; and (3) general supervision - the leader supervises in a general rather than a close manner, delegates authority to his subordinates and permits them freedom to exercise discretion in their work rather than imposing tight controls and close (frequently over-bearing) supervision.

Leadership behavior is expected to be most effective when (1) decisions are not routine in nature; (2) the information required for effective decision making cannot be standardized or centralized; (3) decisions need not be made rapidly, allowing time to involve subordinates in a participative decision-making process and when subordinates feel a strong need for independence, regard their participation in decision making as legitimate, see themselves as able to contribute to the decision-making process and are confident of their ability to work without the reassurance of close supervision.

Fiedler and Garcia (1987) find that in stable and structured situations, a stricter, more autocratic form of leadership is more likely to be successful, whereas in a situation of change, external threat and ambiguity, the more lenient, participative form of supervision would work better. It has been argued that it would be good, from an individual or a societal perspective, if all personnel were self-motivating and desirous of participating in decision-making and that the organization would be healthy if it were constantly innovating and engaging in continual interaction with its environment. But the facts suggest that neither conditions exists in practice and it is up to the individual leader to exercise his discretion in achieving optimal efficiency.

Agreement between supervisor's and subordinates' implicit theories may be critical determinants of liking and exchange processes. These produce greater liking and
higher-quality LMX where congruence exists. Subordinates who are aware of and able to exhibit behaviors consistent with a supervisor’s implicit performance theories are likely to be evaluated favorably by that supervisor. A number of texts have appeared in recent years suggesting the use of high-involvement or participation, a system of human resources practices that will enhance employees’ levels of skill and motivation (Lawler 1992; Levine 1995; Pfeffer 1998). Other studies (Arthur 1994; Huselid 1995; Shaw 1998) suggest that high-involvement work practices will enhance employee retention. However, this raises the possibility that greater use of these practices may increase the firms’ exposure to disruptions associated with the loss of employees since information and decision making power are dispersed throughout the organization, with employees at all levels taking on greater responsibility for efficiency and success. This simply implies that as firms make greater use of participative work practices, turnover becomes increasingly detrimental to organizational performance.

2.3.7 Chinese culture
2.3.7.1 Social Rank and Ethics

While culture is not expected to be the focus of this study, the literature review will not be complete if elements of the Chinese culture are not briefly discussed. One of the basic principles underlying Confucianism is the emphasis on social rank and ethics which works as a strong anchor for the centralized monarchy. In turn, the centralized monarchy, which dominated China for over 2,000 years, has created an articulated hierarchical system where everyone is expected to behave according to his rank or position. As a result, social harmony is achieved (Jacobs et al. 1995). Similarly, in a business organization, everyone holds a specified position and is expected to perform his role accordingly. For example, if one is a salesman, one is not expected to interfere in the work of the technician even if one likes to make a suggestion to improve the workflow or the product. This is contrary to the Western practice that emphasizes on active participation from all levels of the organization. Again, in the Western culture, suggestions and innovations, which are essential in improving the competitiveness of a business, are expected to come from the staff from time to time.
The emphasis on hierarchy has given rise to another problem: communication between the senior and the subordinates is unilateral rather than bilateral. New ideas are never passed from the subordinates to the supervisors. Instead, democratic supervisors will throw out ideas to the subordinates for discussion and solicit their feedback. Unfortunately, during most of the times, consultation is seldom carried out and orders are passed from the supervisors to the subordinates without being questioned. In fact, according to Chinese traditions, the authority and decisions of supervisors should never be questioned. Everybody is expected to behave according to his rank. Under this scenario, subordinates are reluctant to present new ideas because they are supposed to come from their supervisors. If everybody behaves that way, new ideas will never be generated because everybody is waiting for his supervisor to come up with innovative thoughts. This also explains a lot of the inertia in the state-owned enterprises of China that observe strictly the rules of hierarchy (Oh 1992). In this study, part of the objectives is to find out whether the traditional Confucian principle on the supervisor-subordinate relationship is going to impact on the behavior of the securities marketing officers in their relationship with their supervisors.

The strict hierarchical system, however, brings with it one major advantage: decision-making is probably the fastest in the world. The chief executive can seize almost every opportunity because he can make decision himself, mostly by intuition rather than by consultation (Montagu-Pollock 1991). This has important implications. On one hand, the chief executive will be fully responsible for the credits and mistakes. He has to be versatile and energetic and be ready to make many decisions everyday. On the other hand, there is always a limit on how much he can achieve. Once the chief executive cannot cope with the problems and issues that are presented to him, he will be drowned with details which can bring down the entire business empire.

Closely associated with the strict hierarchical system in the Confucian principle is the respect paid to age and seniority. Researchers who have conducted studies in China have come away with the impression that the basic principle governing Chinese management is "respect for age" (Nevis 1983). Discussions with Chinese contacts and findings from field work also support the view that although decisions
may appear to be made from the “bottom-up”, there is an apparent influence from the executive from the top. In fact, Western negotiators should be fully aware of the fact that the Chinese are very conscious of rank, age and seniority. In a formal meeting, only people of the same rank, age and seniority should talk directly to each other. Junior executives will spoil the meeting if they try to be too aggressive and overshadow their bosses. Ferraro (Ferraro 1998) suggests how people use personal space in their interaction with others as a silent language that must be understood to achieve clear communication within an international business setting. The Chinese, in particular, pay special attention to the personal distance in negotiations and age and seniority play an extremely important role in this respect. A common Chinese saying further supports this: “People from houses with bamboo doors will only talk to people from the same social standing”. This shows how rank-conscious the Chinese are. Baker (Baker 1979, p.130) notes the importance of seniority within a family by saying that “theoretically...any one person should know precisely where he stands in the family by referring to this order: there is a watertight chain of relationships which make clear to whom each owes respect and obedience.”

Having said that, the respect for age and seniority is gradually breaking down as individuals receive more Western education and exposure. The young generation feels that the seniors, who have more experience, may not necessarily be making the right decisions all the times. As a result, the younger generation has become more rebellious and challenged the hierarchy system by throwing questions to their supervisors. Young executives also feel that to make progress, new and innovative ideas have to come from the bottom, not from the top. The beauty of this evolution is that a lot of the inertia in the old hierarchy system has been cleaned up but the bad thing is the collapse of authority in the system, be they seniors, teachers, or parents. In turn, this has created a lot of social problems that the Western countries have experienced for decades. Most of the Chinese do not know how to handle these challenges and would have to seek advice from experts to make sure that the Chinese can sail through the rough waters in front of them.
2.3.7.2 Family System

Prior to the Chin Dynasty, the Chinese agricultural production system was based on the nine-square pattern. In this system, a large piece of land was divided equally into nine smaller squares. With the exception of the central square, all other squares were allotted to the serfs who jointly cultivated the central square for the landlord. The village was built on the central square. Following the disintegration of the nine-square system, the village was no longer the basic unit of production and its dominance was taken over by family. Each family rented land from the landlord and worked on it to make a living. One major difference between Chinese families and Western families was the fact that all Chinese sons had equal rights of inheritance and it was imperative for members of the same family to stay close to each other. Consequently, Chinese people paid due respect to other people who had the same last name because they believed that they originated from the same ancestor long time ago. This concept of extended family grew into a clan which in turn developed into a large social organization with close blood relations. As Kwok (Kwok 1989) has said, the clan played a very important role in ancient China as kings and rulers understood that policies and strategies could be disseminated and implemented much more effectively through the clans. The net result was that family discipline and regulations had a more binding effect on people than the laws of the state.

This was very different from the ancient European system in which wealth was passed to the eldest son of the family. Other members of the family, who were deprived of the right of inheritance, had to move elsewhere and worked on their livelihoods. This prompted the Europeans to become very independent, self-centered and could be over-aggressive. To them, family was only a breeding ground and children were expected to leave the family once they became independent. Whiteley (1999) remarked that in the Chinese business setting, the family system is very important. Owing to the fact that sons of the Chinese family have equal inheritance rights, they are entitled to the family property. This inheritance system strengthens filial piety and bondage among members of the family. At the same time, we should also remember that in the Chinese culture, a family can include close friends and business associates and the family system is often preferred as a model for adaptive behaviors within organizations. In essence, Confucius has developed a set of
teachings based on absolute respect for tradition on a carefully ranked hierarchy founded on primary relationships between members of families and between the people and their rulers. The major teachings of Confucius were summarized in two ideas: Ren or human heartedness as the highest virtue and Li being the social norms, obligations and behavioral ritual. The emphasis on Li has led to the development of a management style in China known as rule by man. In fact, during the last two thousand years, there has been a long debate between the advocators on “rule by man” against those scholars who support “rule by law”. Apparently, the domination of Confucianism means that “the rule by man” has got the upper hand. In business, rule by man simply suggests that top decision-makers, apart from having unlimited powers, will have the final authority.

While the “rule by man” assumes that top decision-makers are usually smart and ethical, there is no guarantee that such authority will not be abused. In fact, if the top decision-maker is a mediocre, he can bring down the entire organization easily which is one of the obstacles for China’s modernization (Brunner et al. 1990). Having said all that, the doctrine of Li and rule by man provide a work ethic which is characterized by hard work, conscientiousness, responsibility, thrift and co-operation (Oh 1992). The Chinese can boast to have a labor force which is so dedicated and obedient that is second to none.

The Confucian “Doctrine of the Mean” asks people to avoid confrontation and conflict to achieve inner harmony, thus giving rise to social harmony (Hsu 1947). Researchers have found that the Chinese hold a negative attitude towards civil law. They are very reluctant to go to court to settle a dispute. A common Chinese saying is “Chi Guansi” – pains from getting involved in a lawsuit. Western people should understand that when they deal with Chinese businessmen, resorting to litigation is not necessarily the best solution to resolve any dispute. The Chinese prefer to meet and discuss the possible solutions (Brunner et al. 1990). In fact, even in the Western setting, it is frequently reported that judges have advised both parties of a case to settle the dispute out of the court partly because it can save a lot of costs and partly because of the possibility of arriving at a win-win situation for both parties. While an increasing number of Western companies have been penetrating into the Chinese market, they are lagging behind firms from Taiwan, Hong Kong and other parts of
South East Asia. Part of the reason is that overseas Chinese share the common Chinese cultural values and they understand the importance of maintaining inner and social harmony, thus reducing conflicts and confrontations with mainland Chinese partners. The other possible reason is that the entrepreneurs from Taiwan and Hong Kong seldom bring the Chinese counterparts to court to resolve disputes because settlement by court will only create antagonism and negative repercussions in the business relations. As Kirkbride (1991) has said, traditional Chinese values have prompted the Chinese to achieve harmony by avoiding confrontation by adopting a "non-assertive approach" in conflict management. Though Chinese business people start to realize the adverse consequences of adopting a non-assertive attitude in conflict management, it will probably take the Chinese a much longer time to become more aggressive in resolving confrontations (Wu 1995).

2.3.7.3 Face

Closely connected with social harmony is the issue of "face". In China, even when one is right, one should not treat the other party so harshly as to make him lose face (Wu and Yong 1996). Much of the training and education as a child involves acquiring an understanding of this concept and its implications with regard to interpersonal relations. According to Hu (Hu 1944, p.12), face in the terminology of the Chinese can be classified into two types: lian and mian-zi. Lian to a person represents "the confidence of society in the integrity of ego's moral character, loss of which makes it impossible for him to function properly within the community." On the other hand, "mian-zi stands for the kind of prestige that is emphasized... a reputation achieved through getting on in life, through success and ostentation." The loss of lian in the Chinese community implies that a person will no longer be trusted and he cannot survive in his own social network. Scarborough (1998) has drawn the distinction between the Chinese lian and the Western so-called honor. Owing to the emphasis on "face", when researchers want to conduct studies in China, they have to take into consideration activities and plans to avoid disharmonious behaviors. In contrast to this, Western researchers have much less to worry about since their focus is on the respondents as individuals or groups of individuals.
2.3.7.4 Guanxi

Closely connected to family, social harmony and face is the concept of guanxi. As Hui and Graen (1997) have said, the guanxi relationship network of China is governed by the five fundamental relationships – individual-government, father-son, husband-wife, brothers-sisters and friends-friends. Each is expected to abide by a fixed set of role requirements. Guanxi then connects different people by focusing on the interwoven relationships between these different people. Guanxi highlights the special relationships between two persons. It generally implies friendship which is supported by regular exchange of favors (Chen 1995). Each is conscious of the commitment and binds each other through the exchange of favors. Consequently, business dealings are based more on individual relationships than on abstract legal bindings such as fairness, justice and equality. This is widely supported by a number of studies in which majority of the respondents affirmed the importance of guanxi (Chu 1993; Redding 1980; Saner-Yui 1984).

What are the business implications of guanxi? Fock and Woo (1998) have made a very interesting observation. For individuals without family ties or other guanxi, they can build up “instrumental ties” with reciprocal obligation through guanxi. In today’s context, the communist set-up does not provide enough incentives for people to work hard. Guanxi provides the media through which benefits and business opportunities can be distributed to the relevant individuals. Davies, Leung, Luk and Wong (1995) suggest that guanxi can save time and money spent on legal work. Without guanxi, the range of transactions will be dramatically cut down. In addition, guanxi is a lubricant to increase the efficiency of firms doing business in China.

While guanxi seems to be a useful catalyst in expediting business negotiations, Western managers have difficulties in identifying the real decision-makers. The Western managers might have to spend more time and effort in establishing guanxi before anything can be concluded. The unfortunate thing is that in a vast number of cases, by the time guanxi has been established, the decision-maker is going to be transferred and the whole process will have to be re-started again. Consequently, the whole process could be slow and costly. One other demerit that is frequently quoted is the emphasis on reciprocity which leads to the fact that business decisions are
being made on the basis of earlier favors rather than on the fundamentals of a proposal.

2.3.7.5 Paternalism and Personalism

Support to the argument that the Chinese society is characterized by distinct role definitions and relationships can easily be found in most organizations in the form of paternalism and personalism (Redding 1990). Distinct features of paternalism include personalized loyalty, reliance of subordinates on immediate supervisors and benevolent authoritarianism and personalism includes such elements as emphasis on interpersonal trust and harmonious relations (Tan and Syed 1998). Chao (1990) suggested that the values of loyalty, cohesion, paternalistic authority and altruism exercise strong impact on the role relationships in the modern Chinese context. These basic values form the foundation of an individual’s working relationship with his supervisor and the organization. As such, in-depth study of these relationships should shed light on the turnover intention and behavior of an employee, which is supported by a number of studies (Becker 1992; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Reichers 1986).

According to Tsui and Farh (1997), relationship between different individuals is highly selective and differentiated. This is especially true in the case of members within the same group where people are usually divided into different categories and being treated differently. This practice is quite similar to the leader-member exchange in which employees with high quality exchange relationships will enjoy greater freedom, better support from supervisors, higher respect from peers and greater rewards compared to those employees who have low quality exchange relationships. Consequently, incorporating the leader-member exchange into our study will be helpful in understanding its role in the overall turnover behavior of employees.

In this study, the focus will be on organizational withdrawal that is composed of turnover intentions and desires to retire (Hanisch and Hulin 1990). Turnover intention has been singled out for an in-depth study partly because of its impact on employee turnover and partly because of the fact that people might have different standards on when they should retire. Other specific behaviors such as absenteeism,
lateness, jockeying in the office, etc., are classified as work withdrawal behaviors that are excluded in this study.

2.4 Turnover Intention

This literature review will not be complete without discussing turnover intention which is the dependent variable in the study. Over the last two decades, considerable effort has been spent on developing predictive models of voluntary turnover, with organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention among the most commonly proposed antecedents. The findings generally support the hypothesized linkages among turnover and some key variables such as job satisfaction and commitment. For example, Bluedorn (1982) and Hollenbeck and Williams (1986) have shown that satisfaction and organizational commitment are negatively related to turnover intention. Equally interesting is the finding that turnover intention is the strongest cognitive precursor of turnover (Lee and Mowday 1987; O'Reilly and Caldwell 1981).

Turnover intention is defined as one's conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization (Tett and Meyer 1993). To measure turnover intention correctly, a specific interval such as over the next six or twelve months has to be set up. Turnover intention is believed to be the last in a sequence of withdrawal cognition, a set to which thinking of quitting and intent to look for alternative employment opportunities also belong. Mobley (1977) suggested that the job satisfaction-turnover intention linkage is mediated by thoughts of quitting and intent to search for opportunities. For the sake of parsimony, most researchers try to combine different variables related to withdrawal with turnover intention to form an index of withdrawal cognition (Blau and Boal 1989; Mitchel 1981).

The discussion on turnover intention is always linked to organizational commitment and job satisfaction and three main theoretical perspectives in this area may be identified, each carrying different conceptual and research implications. One school of thought suggests that commitment to the company develops from job satisfaction and such commitment mediates the effects of satisfaction on withdrawal variables. This so-called satisfaction-to-commitment mediation model reflects Porter et al.'s
(1974) claim that since organizational commitment takes a much longer time to develop, it is usually more stable than job satisfaction. As a result, job satisfaction is expected to have an indirect and weaker influence on turnover intention.

The second view is diametrically opposite to the first one and could be called the commitment-to-satisfaction mediation model. Under this model, commitment to the organization will bring about positive feeling towards the job and employees will leave or stay with the organization based on how they feel about their jobs (Salancik and Pfeffer 1978). This model suggests that changes in organizational commitment will have only indirect effects on turnover intention. It is interesting to note that the findings from past research are quite controversial because some studies lend support to the hypothesis (BateMan and Strasser 1984; Dossett and Suszko 1989) whereas others do not (Curry et al. 1986; Meyer and Allen 1988).

The final school of thought suggests that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment play their own distinctive role in the turnover process. This independent-effects model proposes that job satisfaction and organizational commitment, albeit related, are absolutely unique constructs. According to the proponents (Farkas and Tetrick 1989), any study should focus on how attitudes toward the job and company combine and interact to influence the turnover intention.

The three models described above are marked with different contributions in the understanding of the turnover process and no conclusive observation can be made yet. One of the reasons why a study on the turnover process has been conducted is to determine whether organizational commitment plays a unique role in affecting the turnover intention of marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong and what recommendations can be put forth to management to address the employee turnover issue.

2.5 Theories of turnover

Over the years, proponents of various models of turnover have made significant contribution towards the study of quitting behavior. Some of the most renowned social scientists have contributed to this literature (March 1958; Sorokin 1932). In
fact, the literature is so voluminous that some researchers have been conducting reviews on literature (Mobley 1979; Mowday 1979; Wanous 1980).

To highlight the determinants of turnover in a more systematic way, the following review is organized into sections on economics, psychological and sociological theory.

2.5.1 Theories from economics

The basic principle of demand and supply determines the behavior of individuals. From there, researchers have set up various models of employee turnover which are basically derived from utility maximization, dual labor market and human capital theories. Utility maximization models of employee turnover are based on the assumption that workers are rational human beings who would maximize their utility or satisfaction through the earnings of wages in the labor market. Instead of creating the working environment, workers are believed to be reacting to the economic conditions of employment. As such, changes in the working conditions and environment help explain turnover (Utgoff 1983). One natural conclusion is that the turnover rates of the economy tend to move with the cycle (Price 1977). In other words, when job opportunities are abundant during economic booms, workers can look for better packages, leading to higher turnover. When economies go into downturns, employers get the upper hand and turnover rates tend to decrease. The shortcoming of this model is the lack of explanation on why some quit and some stay on jobs under similar economic conditions.

Dual labor market theory posits that the economy is divided into two labor markets – the primary and secondary (Averitt 1968). The primary labor market offers employees nice working environment, attractive pays, excellent promotion opportunities and reasonable job security. The opposite prevails in the secondary labor market. It is interesting to see how dual labor market theory helps explain phenomenon such as gender and race income differentials (Howell and Reese 1986), industry wage differentials (Krueger and Summers 1987), employee loyalty (Doeringer and Piore 1971) and quit rates (Armknecht 1972; Cornfield 1985). Apparently, employees have found work conditions in the primary sector more
encouraging (Braverman 1974; Hodson 1985). In particular, employees are open to a vast number of opportunities within the organization (DiPrete 1987) – a condition that will induce them to stay on the job (March and Simon 1958; Todor 1986). These findings suggest that factors other than pay and compensation affect the quitting decisions of employees.

One of the major contributions of dual labor market theory is the proposition that employees in jobs with poor work conditions and low wages tend to have higher voluntary quit rates than employees in primary sector organizations. Their findings also suggest that pay scale for the same job could vary across sectors (Ippolito 1987; Leonard 1987; Perloff 1971; Utgoff 1983).

While dual labor market models offer valid explanations on turnover within the structure of organizations or industries, they fail to link up how employee attributes or job characteristics common to firms across sectors affect employees’ decisions to leave organizations or transfer within organizations. In addition, dual labor market theory offers no valid explanation on the timing of turnover among individuals and they also do not provide a valid description of the types of employees who are at risk of quitting (Mobley 1982).

The other version of the economic model of employee turnover is the human capital theory (Becker 1975). Human capital refers to employees’ skills, education, training, experience, exposure, etc. Workers will then trade their “human capital” with employers for pay, benefits, working conditions and career. Employees who are better equipped in their human capital will be more capable and obtain better employment opportunities. While there are conflicting evidence on the validity of the human capital model (Distefano Jr. 1982; Greenhalgh 1980), employees who are well equipped on human capital tend to invest more in their jobs and become more specialized. Since specialized skills are less transferable, employees who invest more in their jobs tend to stay longer (Farrell and Rusbult 1981).

Utility maximization, dual labor market and human capital models of turnover highlight that economic conditions, economic structures and the human capital owned by workers affect their decisions to stay or quit. These models hint that
differences in pay and compensation packages are the primary determinants of employee turnover. Other things being equal, the higher the wages, the less likely will the employees quit.

It is interesting to note that individual worker usually assesses his contributions to the work, the rewards in both financial and qualitative terms from the organization and how the overall package compares to other individuals both inside and outside the organization. Frustration will arise when an individual perceives significant deviation in his package which includes pay, promotion, fringe benefits and promotion prospects relative to his background and effort in comparison with others in similar organizations. This will lead to job dissatisfaction (Miner 1980) that will prompt an individual to look for ways to reduce the inequity. Such measures may include modifying the inputs and outcomes to narrow the deviations.

In summary, the major contribution of economic models is in identifying how economic conditions distribute opportunities among workers. Employees with more opportunities are usually more mobile. The shortcoming of economic models is the failure in explaining how individuals perceive and capitalize on employment opportunities. Research shows that some employees have been able to change jobs even under very depressed market conditions (Granovetter 1973), suggesting that non-economic factors such as personal contacts, market awareness and opportunity, may affect quitting decisions.

2.5.2 Theories from psychology

The basic assumption of the turnover theories from psychology anchors on the arguments that individuals attribute positive and negative qualities to work conditions. The development of attitude and value formation, of course, is based on experience which in turn will affect the quitting behavior (Berger 1968; Hall 1970; Hill 1981; Shaw 1970).

In the study of turnover, reinforcements refer to the work conditions that either increase or decrease the probability that individuals will stay on the job, depending on whether they are positive or negative reinforcements. Positive performance
appraisals, pay raises and additional fringe benefits are usually construed as positive reinforcements. On the other hand, public reprimands, demotions and pay reductions are regarded as negative reinforcements. However, it should be noted that the same work conditions do not reinforce all individuals uniformly and organizations that offer more positive reinforcements are likely to have lower quit rates (Berger 1968; Shaw 1970).

One of the basic assumptions underlying the psychology models is that the formulation of work attitudes is consistent with the principles of learning theory (Doob 1967; Lott 1985; Rhine 1967; Rosenberg 1967; Smith 1967; Staats 1967). Although evidence of the exact nature of their relationship is inconclusive, findings generally support that attitudes affect behavior that in turn modifies attitudes.

Two major models have been derived from the behavior school of thought. The first one deals with the correlation between job satisfaction and turnover. The general assumption is that the higher the job satisfaction, the lower will be the turnover (Koch 1978; Mobley 1979; Rusbult 1983). However, the degree of correlation between satisfaction and turnover is generally low (Lock 1976; Mobley 1979; Waters 1976). Related studies which consider how employee commitment to the organization affects their turnover, have led to inconclusive findings (Koch 1978; Mobley 1979; Mowday 1979; Price 1981; O'Reilly 1986). A more comprehensive review on the literature on organizational commitment will be conducted in a separate section.

Another school of thought examines the relationship between behavioral intentions and turnover (Mobley 1982; Spector 1986; Weisberg 1993). While research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and turnover generally favor the argument that behavioral intentions are the best predictors of behavior, the results are not compelling (Steel 1984; Youngblood 1983).

2.5.3 Theories from sociology

Sociological theory on employee turnover focuses on the impact of the work situation on the turnover intention of employees. Under this approach, job or
organizational characteristics are expected to be better predictors of job satisfaction and commitment than individual factors (Agho 1993; Glisson 1988; Graham 1992; Koch 1978; Kohn 1981; Kohn 1989; Mueller 1992; Mueller 1994; Price 1977; Saunders 1992). In fact, the study of the relationship between situational variables and turnover is exactly where psychology and sociology merge. The classic sociological explanation of employee turnover comes from Price's (1977) model which describes the relationship between several characteristics of jobs, satisfaction, opportunity and turnover. Price (1977) suggests that while situational variables affect the level of employee satisfaction, employee turnover is generally negatively correlated with satisfaction. One important variable is the level of opportunity which modifies the relationship between satisfaction and turnover.

One of the interesting features of the theory from sociology is that the relationships are not quantifiable and the contributions or sacrifices made today are expected to be compensated at some unspecified points in the future. These relationships, which have been referred by Blau (1964) as the social exchange theory, are based on mutual trust and support (Keller 1995; Konovsky 1994; Rousseau 1993). Blau (1964) further commented that "only social exchange tends to engender feelings of personal obligation, gratitude, and trust; purely economic exchange as such does not" (p.94). Central to the theory of social exchange is the concept of reciprocity which forces people to reciprocate on favorable treatments received from others (Blau 1964; Cotterall 1992).

As Gouldner (1960) said, the norm of reciprocity is based on two assumptions: a) people should help those who have helped them and b) people should not injure those who have helped them. In fact, the concept of social exchange and the norm of reciprocity have been used extensively to account for employees' loyalty to organizations (Eisenberger 1986; Scholl 1981). It has been found that in some cases, subordinates value reciprocity so much that they strive to perform duties which are beyond the requirements in the normal employment contract (Honold 1997).

According to Setton, Bennett and Liden (1996), there are two major ways that the social exchange theory has been conceptualized. At the corporate level, there is a global exchange relationship between employees and the organization. Employees
will form a basic perception on how the organization values their contribution and forms the basis of compensation. Simultaneously, depending on how employees value the compensation, a sense of obligation will be developed to repay the organization whenever the needs arise. This forms the basis of organizational commitment which is defined as the bondage between the organization and the individuals.

At the individual level, there is a direct bilateral relationship between supervisors and subordinates which could form the basis for leader-member exchange (Sparrowe and Liden 1997). It has been shown that positive actions by the organization and supervisor will always create the sense of obligations on the part of the subordinates in terms of reciprocal actions (Eisenberger 1986; Settoon 1996; Shore 1993).

One of the drawbacks of psychological research on employee turnover is the failure to analyze how employees and work conditions interact to modify work attitudes and quitting behavior. This arises from the fact that employees have different attitudes about the same work conditions and it is important to study how employees and work conditions interact to impact on work attitudes and quitting behavior. Studies of interaction effects show that opportunity (Carsten 1987), behavioral intentions (Steel 1984; Youngblood 1983), performance (Orpen 1986), tenure (Werbel 1984), and personality variables moderate the relationship between satisfaction and turnover and between commitment and turnover (Archer 1979; Krecker 1994; Mobley 1979; O'Reilly III 1986; Sims 1976; Spector 1986; Tziner 1984; Werbel 1984).

While it has been found that each set of theory has its own shortcoming, the economic models are most restrictive in its application. Observations that workers are rational economic actors are not enough to explain why some workers react differently under the same working conditions. Knowledge of work attitudes and values which form the foundation of psychological theory offers better prediction of employee turnover than economic theories. In other words, attitudes of individuals prompt them to look at work conditions to decide whether they will change job or not.
Although the literature on sociological theory is relatively scant, sociological and situational models offer interesting observations on job characteristics that may promote turnover. Findings suggest that situational models are useful in predicting satisfaction while disposition models are more related to commitment (Colarelli 1987; Glisson 1988; Koch 1978). In essence, the major difference between economic, psychological and sociological theory on organizational behavior seems to be the nature of the question that each theory of turnover addresses. Economic theories focus on the interaction between economic conditions, organizational structure and employee skills and how the employees maximize profit in the labor market. On the other hand, psychologists are more concerned with the impact of job characteristics on the employee’s behavior and how personality acts as a moderator. Sociological proponents study how the bureaucratization of work constrains individual initiative and creativity and eventually their decision to stay or leave a firm.

Economic, psychological and sociological theories are all very unique and their answers require both conceptual and methodological overlap across various disciplines. Nevertheless, all of the assumptions underlying the economic, psychological and sociological models are well covered in a refined theory of social exchange behavior.

According to Miller (1996), social exchange theory suggests that every individual, in conformity with rational economic behavior, trades resources which they own for products and services they desire through formal and informal transactions. Such exchanges are mandatory in helping individuals to survive. Predicting turnover and the termination of other exchange relationships requires a thorough understanding of attitudes and values, and their relationship to behavior. The economic, psychological and sociological models all play their important role and each should not be examined just in isolation.

2.6 Summary

Many service-oriented behaviors are forms of organizational behavior because they cannot be fully specified in advance and thus are difficult to be acquired through
traditional training techniques. Organizational commitment and turnover intentions have an important linkage as the former typically exceeds formal role requirements and often in different ways exert considerable influence on the latter. Despite the various studies on organizational commitment, the relationship between group/leader relations, one of the important antecedents of organizational commitment, and turnover intentions has never been explored to any large extent. This study aims to bridge this gap by highlighting on the possible direction of research in this area.

In this chapter, a comprehensive review of the turnover literature which starts with the basic theories of turnover and the employee turnover models has been made. This is then followed by a discussion on organizational commitment and its antecedents. One of the antecedents of organizational commitment - group/leader relations has been selected for further discussion and the review is completed with the discussion on turnover intention. In the next chapter, a detailed discussion on the research model which includes all the factors, variables and links will be discussed. This will then be followed by the discussion on the development of hypotheses.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

3.1 Introduction

Chapter two introduces the social exchange theory as one of the basic theories explaining why individual worker has to look for jobs and compensation. From its initial conceptualization, employee turnover has been grounded in social exchange theory (Chan 2001). Blau (Blau 1964, p.91) referred to social exchange “as voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others.” These returns, to some extent, reflect the importance of reciprocity in social exchange. Blau (1964) further remarked that such exchange could be the result of conformity to social pressure as one seeks to earn the approval of one’s peers.

Unlike economic exchange in which individual worker behaves as a rational economic unit, social exchange envisages unspecified obligations which “cannot be bargained but must be left to the discretion of the one who makes it” (Blau 1964, p.93). In that exchange process, since there is no guarantee that return for a favor is definite or forthcoming, social exchange “requires trusting others to discharge their obligations” (Blau 1964, p.94). Again, contrary to economic exchange, Blau (1964) suggested that social exchange produces feelings of personal obligation, gratitude, and trust and that the benefits do not command a quantifiable price as a medium of exchange. These benefits are “sometimes primarily valued as symbols of the supportiveness and friendliness they express, and it is the exchange of the underlying mutual support that is the main concern of the participants” (Blau 1964, p.95).

Closely related to the social exchange theory is the concept of organizational commitment. Over the past decade or so, the study of organizational commitment has grown dramatically in the literature of industrial/organizational psychology and organizational behavior. Interestingly, organizational commitment has been studied both as a consequence and an antecedent of other work-related variables. In fact, organizational commitment is so popular that it has been linked to several personal variables, role status and aspects of the work environment ranging from job characteristics to dimensions of organizational structure. At the same time,
organizational commitment has also been used to explain employees' absenteeism, performance, turnover and other behaviors. Several other variables, often referred to as correlates such as job satisfaction and job involvement, have also shown close relationships with organizational commitment (Morrow 1983; Mowday et al. 1982; Reichers 1985; Steers 1977).

In particular, Mowday et al. (1982) have advocated that a better understanding of organizational commitment has significant implications for employees, organizations and society as a whole. For example, employees' level of commitment to an organization will help them gain both tangible (pay and promotion) and intangible (job satisfaction) rewards associated with membership to a particular organization. At the same time, organizations will also value strong commitment among those employees who will work to reduce absenteeism and employee withdrawal. In addition, it has also been shown that for those employees who have shown a high level of commitment to the organization, they will demonstrate high degree of innovation and creativity which are mandatory in keeping an organization competitive (Katz and Kahn 1978). All these tend to suggest that on a macro basis, a society as a whole tends to benefit from employees' organizational commitment in terms of lower rates of job movement and perhaps higher national productivity or work quality or both.

In view of the large amount of effort and research devoted to organizational commitment, it is important to find out what is known about this concept and most important of all, how this concept can be leveraged in the basic model of research used in this study. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) have conducted a very comprehensive review of the literature on organizational commitment, summarizing previous empirical studies that examined antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment using meta-analysis. In total, 48 meta-analyses were conducted, including 26 variables being classified as antecedents, 8 as consequences and 14 as correlates. In particular, the type of organizational commitment (attitudinal vs. calculative) was proposed as a mediating variable and was found to account for significant between-study variance in 9 of the 18 comparisons. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) also discussed about the theoretical and methodological issues pertaining to the measurement of various forms of organizational commitment, its interrelations
with other forms of attachments and its role in casual models of behavior in organizations reviewed.

It is interesting to note that meta-analysis has started to gain its acceptability lately when researchers are satisfied that findings from previous research on a certain topic have been consistent and when they are inconsistent, suggesting the likelihood of moderated relationships (Rosenthal 1984). Meta-analysis techniques have been used to test certain hypotheses on the relationship between several variables and different types of organizational commitment. In other words, meta-analysis is used not only as a summary device but also as a hypothesis-testing technique.

3.2 Mathieu and Zajac’s meta-analytical model of organizational commitment

The backbone of the model used in this study is the Mathieu and Zajac’s meta-analytical model of organizational commitment. It was developed by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) and was used to study the relationships between the various antecedents of organizational commitment and various behavioral outcomes which included performance ratings, productivity, quit intentions, attendance, lateness and turnover.

The basis of Mathieu and Zajac’s meta-analytical model of organizational commitment is derived from the procedures used by Hunter et al. (1984). In essence, Hunter et al. proposed that researchers should first consider the extent to which differences among study outcomes are attributable to statistical artifacts. In other words, the impact of measurement unreliability and sampling error due to relative sampling sizes on correlations between organizational commitment and other variables are taken out to ensure that true relationships from the population can be established. At the same time, it is important to find out whether sufficient variance between different studies is due to some other factors, prompting the need to look for mediating variables. Where significant variances continue to exist between different studies, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) propose different hypotheses to determine whether the findings differ as a result of the type of organizational commitment used in different studies.
Before the Mathieu and Zajac’s model is spelt out in greater details, it is interesting to find out how the fundamentals have been established. According to Mathieu and Zajac, both computer and manual searches were used to find out the published studies on empirical findings involving organizational commitment. This search process yielded over 200 articles on empirical findings that could be used in the meta-analyses. No specific restrictions were placed on each individual article except that they must have measured and analyzed organizational commitment at the individual level of analysis. These research criteria yielded meta-analyses of correlations between 48 variables and organizational commitment drawn from 174 independent samples presented in 124 studies. Data were coded separately to ensure that more detailed analyses could be carried out on the potential moderator variables.

In terms of the sample characteristics, the average sample size ranged from a low of 23 to a high of 1935 (M = 294, SD = 333). The average reported sample demographics were as follow: age (M = 34.84, SD = 4.99), sex (50% male, SD = 37%), and education (M = 2.42, SD = 1.04, on a scale coded 1 = high school, 2 = some college, 3 = bachelor’s degree, 4 = master’s degree and 5 > master’s degree).

The type of organizational commitment used in each study (the manner in which organizational commitment was operationalized) was also coded for use as a mediating variable. Out of the total samples of 174, one hundred thirty-two assessed attitudinal commitment, 28 assessed calculative commitment and 14 either combined the two types or assessed organizational commitment. To ensure that the coding system was robust, 30 studies were selected at random and coded separately. The result was satisfactory since the second set of coding agreed with the original coding completely. To provide further insight on research, several other sample characteristics were considered for coding as moderators (e.g. the type of job and organization sampled).

Scale reliabilities were recorded for use in the meta-analysis procedure. Ninety samples used the 15-item Porter et al. (1974) scale, with 80 (N = 24,258) reporting an average internal consistency reliability of .882 (SD = .038). Thirteen samples used the 9-item version of the Porter et al. scale which includes only positively worded items. The average reliability across 9 samples (N = 1,831) that reported information
was .857 (SD = .047). Fifteen (N = 4,980) of the 23 samples that assessed organizational commitment with the Hrebiniaik and Alato (1972) scale reported an average reliability of .881 (SD = .044). Forty-eight samples used other measures of organizational commitment, with 26 (N = 10,963) reporting an average reliability of .787 (SD = .140).

The meta-analyses were then conducted using the procedures proposed by Hunter et al. (1982). First of all, each correlation was corrected for attenuation using the reliabilities reported for each sample. In those cases where no reliability was recorded, the average reliability for the variable across all samples was used. For example, where no reliability information was reported for organizational commitment, the average reliability for the type of measure used in the study was substituted. Second, the estimated true correlation between each variable and organizational commitment was calculated by summing the corrected correlations multiplied by sample size, and then dividing the total by the sum of all individual across the samples. Third, the estimated population standard deviation was computed based on Hunter et al.’s formula. Finally, the percentage of variance across studies attributable to the artifacts of sampling error and measurement unreliability was then calculated.

The results of Mathieu and Zajac’s analysis were discussed in three board categories: antecedents, correlates and consequences. The variables used in each of these categories are shown in Figure 3.1. Personal characteristics, job characteristics, group-leader relations, organizational characteristics and role states have generally been classified as antecedents of commitment (Mowday et al. 1982). On the other hand, affective responses such as motivation and job satisfaction represent a category of variables that, like commitment, described individuals’ psychological reactions to the work environment. Owing to the fact that it is difficult to specify the casual precedence of different affective responses, these variables are being labeled as correlates of commitment. Finally, behavioral intentions and actual behaviors are generally considered to be consequences of organizational commitment.
Figure 3.1: Classification of antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment

**ANTECEDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Organizational Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>Organizational Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Task Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Status</td>
<td>Job Scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td><strong>Group/Leader Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Personal Competence</td>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Leader Initiating Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Leader Consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Work Ethic</td>
<td>Leader Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Level</td>
<td>Participative Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORRELATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Occupational Commitment</th>
<th>Union Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Work Itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CONSEQUENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others’ Ratings</th>
<th>Output Measures</th>
<th>Perceived Job Alternatives</th>
<th>Intention to Search</th>
<th>Intention to Leave</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Lateness</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

*Source: Adapted from Mathieu and Zajac (1990)*
3.3 Job Characteristics

While numerous studies on the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment have been conducted, no theoretical models have been proposed to explain the relationship, if one does exist. Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggested that enriched jobs are likely to yield higher organizational commitment (Steers 1977). This is supported by the later research (Spector 1985) which may provide a useful framework for examining relationships between aspects of jobs and organizational commitment.

3.4 Organizational Characteristics

In Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) study, three samples presented correlations between organizational size (i.e. total number of organizational members) and commitment and four included correlations with organizational centralization. In general, larger organizations are perceived as less personal and could be difficult to attach oneself to it. However, Stevens et al. (1978) suggested that larger organizations may increase the chances of promotion and other forms of side bets and increase the opportunities for interpersonal interactions, thereby increasing commitment levels. Unfortunately, neither explanation was supported by the meta-analysis results because of the low correlation ($r = -.001$)

Bateman and Strasser (1984) and Morris and Steers (1980) presented correlations between organizational centralization and organizational commitment. In particular, Morris and Steers suggested that perceived decentralization is likely to be associated with participative decision-making and increased commitment levels through greater employee involvement. The meta-analysis results, however, were not supportive.

3.4.1 Role States

Mowday et al. (1982) proposed to include role states as one of the four categories of antecedents of organizational commitment. Mathieu and Zajac’s study only supported three specific role states: role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload. However, little theoretical work has been devoted to how role states relate to commitment. Normally, researchers assume that role states result from perceptions of the work environment and then influence affective responses. It is still unclear whether the relationship between role states and organizational commitment is direct or mediated by other variables such as stress or job satisfaction. The
only thing that is clear is that employees who report greater levels of role strain also tend to report lower levels of organizational commitment. In the meantime, it also illustrates the importance of mediation in the studies on organizational behaviors.

3.5 Theoretical Model

Based on Mathieu and Zajac’s meta-analytical model of organizational commitment, the literature review and the research gaps that have been identified, a theoretical model of employee withdrawal is proposed. With reference to Fig. 3.2, two groups of factors have been identified, namely, the “group” factors and the “leadership” factors. The “group” factors refer to those that are connected with the group’s behavior in terms of cohesiveness, commitment, homogeneity and task interdependence. The “leadership” factors include such elements as initiating structure, consideration, communication and participation.

From the various group factors, employees are expected to derive a certain degree of organizational trust and perceived organizational support – the perception on the organization. At the same time, interaction among the various leadership factors will produce perception on trust in supervisor and perceived supervisory support. These two sets of perceptions on the organization and the supervisor will lead to organizational commitment which in turn will determine whether employees are going to stay with a firm or will actively seek for opportunities elsewhere. The final outcome is usually referred to as turnover intention.

This model postulates that there are specific relationships between the different “group” and “leadership” factors with turnover intention which will form the basis of this study. However, the theoretical framework suggests that prior to the establishment of hypotheses between the various group and leadership factors and turnover intention, special attention has to be paid to the role played by organization trust and trust in supervisor and above all, how organizational commitment can affect the overall interaction in the entire process under investigation or study.
Figure 3.2: Schematic Diagram of the Theoretical Framework

- Group Factors
  - Group Cohesiveness
  - Group Commitment
  - Group Homogeneity
  - Task Interdependence

- Leadership Factors
  - Leader Initiating Structure
  - Leader Consideration
  - Leader Communication
  - Leader Participation

- Organizational Trust
- Perceived Organizational Support
- Trust in Supervisor
- Perceived Supervisory Support

- Organizational Commitment
- Withdrawal/Stay
3.5.1 Organizational trust and perceived organizational support

The relationship between organizational trust and employees’ working attitude has been found to be positive (Konovsky and Cropanzo 1991). Employees’ faith and trust in management has proven to be an important element in the development of organizational commitment (Kao and Ng 1993). In fact, organizational commitment is the value driver in prompting employees to identify themselves with organizational goals and vision, to associate themselves with organizational logos and image and above all, to accept responsibilities and mission for the organization. It is generally expected that the higher the organizational trust, the greater will be the organizational commitment (Becker 1996).

A natural extension of organizational trust is perceived organizational support (POS) which is defined as the employees’ perception of the organization’s commitment to them (Eisenberger et al. 1986). It is argued that employees who have a high level of POS are more likely to develop a higher degree of organizational commitment because there is an obligation to reciprocate the commitment of the organization through the attainment of organizational goals (Wayne et al. 1997). As such, organizational commitment is being perceived as the result of a series of social exchange dealings through which the organization demonstrates its willingness to reward increased work efforts and meet needs for approval and affirmation on the part of employees.

3.5.2 Trust in supervisor and perceived supervisory support

Trust between supervisors and subordinates is an important element in the overall dyadic organizational relationship. Driscoll (1978) examined the impact of trust in leader on job satisfaction and decision-making and arrived at the conclusion that trust in leader was the only useful predictor of overall satisfaction attitude. Trust building requires creation of a relationship in which supervisors treat employees fairly and employees are expected to reciprocate in due course (McAllister 1995). When effective leaders earn the trust of their followers, the followers are motivated to perform beyond normal requirements because of trust in and respect for the leaders. When subordinates admire and identify themselves with a leader, they are more likely to strive for higher level of excellence.
With regard to perceived supervisory support, this is best viewed in the context of an organization. Since supervisors represent the organizations, subordinates tend to generalize their perceptions of supervisors to their organizations at large (Kozlowski and Doherty 1989). Subordinates believe that their supervisors will take care of them as long as they perform and achieve the organizations’ mission (Eisenberger et al 1986). In general, subordinates who have received positive reinforcements from their supervisors will develop affective commitment to their leaders. Naturally, perceived supervisory support is expected to exert significant influence on how subordinates evaluate their jobs and job satisfaction.

3.5.3 Direct determinants of withdrawal – organizational commitment

As discussed in the previous chapter, organizational commitment indicates the extent to which an individual employee is involved with the organization in terms of the organization’s goals and missions, degree of readiness to spend extra time and effort with the organization and most important of all, the determination to stay or withdraw from that organization. In essence, this is a reflection of the individual employee’s perception on the organization. In this respect, organizational commitment is quite different from job satisfaction which represents an individual employee’s response to the specific aspects of the job.

It is interesting to point out that there are three major types of organizational commitment – affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment. Affective commitment identifies the employees’ attachment and involvement with the organization (Allen and Meyer 1990). On the other hand, normative commitment refers to the moral belief that an employee should not change his or her job too often. Otherwise, he or she will be looked down by friends and relatives as job hoppers. This is particularly true in Japan where fathers and elder brothers are supposed to exercise close surveillance on the normative commitment of the younger generation. Finally, continuance commitment is associated with the belief that an individual employee has to stay with an organization because any withdrawal is going to raise the operating cost. Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) made an excellent summary on this - “Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to, those with a strong continuance commitment remain because they need to, and those with a strong normative commitment remain because they feel they ought to do so” (p.539).
In the chapter on literature review, organizational commitment has found to be negatively correlated to employee turnover (Mathieu and Zajac 1990) and employees' turnover intention (Johnston et al. 1990). Tett and Meyer (1993) suggested that there are high correlations between organizational commitment and employees' absence, lateness and other withdrawal behaviors. Furthermore, organizational commitment is found to exercise clear and direct influence on withdrawal cognitions (Mayer and Schoorman 1992). Consequently, it is mandatory to study the relationship between the "group" and the "leadership" factors of employees with their turnover intention.

3.6 Research Model

In the theoretical model, it is suggested that the various group factors will lead to the development of organizational trust and perceived organizational support and similarly from the leadership factors to trust in supervisor and perceived supervisory support. From the interaction of these four variables – organizational trust, perceived organizational support, trust in supervisor and supervisory support, organizational commitment is derived which in turn will impact on the employee's turnover intention. Intuitively, it seems logical to design questions to measure organizational trust, perceived organizational support, trust in supervisor and supervisory support once the exogeneous variables on the group factors and the leadership factors have been identified and measured. For practical purposes, this is construed as redundant because the impact of organizational trust, perceived organizational support, trust in supervisor and perceived supervisory support can be assumed to be subsumed in the exogeneous variables which in turn will lead to the development of organizational commitment and ultimately the employee's turnover intention. The other interesting question that follows is the role played by organizational commitment. Instead of being the link between the exogeneous variables and turnover intention, organizational commitment may play the role of a mediating variable on the regression between turnover intention and the exogeneous variables. On top of that, the research model would also like to find out the direct relationship between the exogeneous variables and turnover intention, without the mediating effect of organizational commitment. To summarize, the research model focuses on the following relationships:

1) relationship between the exogeneous variables and organizational commitment;
2) relationship between the exogeneous variables and turnover intention; and
3) mediating effect by organizational commitment on the relationship between the exogeneous variables and turnover intention.

Figure 3.3 is the research model which summarizes the schematic relationship of the variables to be examined in this study.
Figure 3.3: Schematic Diagram of the Research Model
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3.7 Hypothesis development

While most of the variables included in the study are mentioned in Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) study, other variables including group commitment and group homogeneity have been added to the model since they were left out in Mathieu and Zajac’s study. Each of the “group” factors and “leadership” factors will be examined in details.

3.7.1 “Group” factors

3.7.1.1 Group cohesiveness

As explained in the section on literature review, group cohesiveness is considered central to the study of group dynamics (Zander 1979). Whether there is a direct relationship between group cohesiveness and group performance is still subject to verification from research. What is clear is that while cohesive groups are often more enjoyable, they are not necessarily more productive.

The cohesiveness of a group can be construed as the extent to which members of the group like each other and would like to remain within the group (Shaw 1981). A more cohesive group influences its members in whatever direction the norms are oriented (Goodman et al. 1988). It has been suggested that group cohesiveness alone is not sufficient for high group effectiveness unless combined with task-oriented norms (Levine 1980).

Stone and Porter (1975) and Welsch and LaVan (1981) reported positive correlations between group cohesiveness and organizational commitment, although Howell and Dorfman (1981) got a negative relationship. The three studies included in Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) study showed a correlation of \( r = .149 \). The studies sampled different populations, all assessed attitudinal commitment, and none offered any clear explanation for its findings.

While the previous studies selected by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) present no conclusive evidence, Langfred (1998) suggested that the effectiveness of groups with high cohesiveness is very dependent on the orientation of norms in the group. If the norms are task oriented, the highly cohesive groups will outperform others. But if the norms are not, then the high cohesiveness of a group can be detrimental to group performance. In other words, groups with high cohesiveness and task norms were effective than other groups and that the combination
of high cohesiveness and non-task norms was associated with poor performance. Individuals with strong identification tend to strive towards group objectives much harder and engage in more pro-social activities (Kirkman and Shapiro 2001).

With this in mind, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis I: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group cohesiveness is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the group cohesiveness, the lower will be turnover intention.

3.7.1.2 Group commitment

This is not an item reviewed by Mathieu and Zajac (1990). This item has been included because of the growing importance of perceived organizational support and group commitment which are closely connected. In the literature review section, it was mentioned that perceived organizational support refers to the process in which employees form an opinion on how an organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. While actions by supervisors and managers are being construed as actions of the organization itself, there is increasing evidence that subordinates pay attention to the actions of the supervisors. The more important thing is that when one member quits to take a new job elsewhere, others may re-assess their own jobs (Dess and Shaw 2001). Recent studies (Lee 1999; Mollica 2000; Shah 2000) suggest that this kind of shock may lead to potential turnover even if an individual is satisfied with his or her current position. Moreover, a member’s decision to stay or quit could from time to time be a function of the quality and pattern of interaction with other group members. To that extent, it is important to examine the impact of group commitment on the turnover decision of individuals within an organization.

Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis II: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group commitment is negatively related to turnover, that is, the higher the group commitment, the lower will be turnover intention.
3.7.1.3 Group homogeneity

Closely connected to group commitment is group homogeneity. This is an item not included by Mathieu and Zajac (1990). Group homogeneity is linked to the difference in culture among members of the group. Prior research has suggested significantly higher turnover rates in demographically diverse work groups (Jackson et al. 1993). O’Reilly et al. (O’Reilly et al. 1989) proposed that disagreement within heterogeneous groups triggers the departure of members. In general, communication is faster and smoother among individuals who share the same social experiences and culture. Hofstede (1980b) has suggested that many differences in individual motivation and group behavior could be traced back to the basic differences in culture. The interesting question that follows is whether one should lead differently in different cultural settings.

In the context of the Group-Leader relations as defined by Mathieu and Zajac (1990), the types of leadership should be further studied. In the section on literature review, distinction between transactional and transformational has been made. Theoretically, the main focus of transactional leaders is on setting goals, clarifying the link between performance and rewards and providing constructive feedback to keep followers on task (Bass 1985). Transformational leadership, on the other hand, involves the development of a closer relationship between leaders and followers, with its anchorage in trust and commitment than on contractual agreements. In other words, transformational leaders help their followers see the importance of accomplishing their own personal goals without losing sight on the mission and vision of the group and the organization.

With all these in mind, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis III: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group homogeneity is negatively related to turnover intention, in other words, the higher the group homogeneity, the lower will be turnover intention.

3.7.1.4 Task interdependence

According to Mathieu and Zajac (1990), only four studies in their meta-analysis presented task interdependence, yielding an average corrected correlation of $r = .220$. Morris and Steers
(1980) suggested that when employees get high functional dependence, they become more aware of their own contribution to the organization and to the work group to which they belong. This may then raise employees’ ego involvement and thereby increase their attitudinal commitment to the organization.

While an individual is supposed to focus on his or her own job, it has been found that worker’s involvement in other tasks increased self-motivation that produced strong business and other benefits (Rose 1978; Legge 1995). Task interdependence has proven to be a structural feature of work: the instructions and materials that define a task create a level of interdependence that in turn influences how much members interact in executing the task (Wageman 1995) It has also been argued that some degree of task interdependence is a necessary condition for semi-autonomous work groups (Cummings 1978; Klein 1991). Supporting this view, it has been found that providing more autonomy and control over group decisions through more task interdependence results in better performance. Meanwhile, when groups are low in task interdependence, performance may suffer.

Task interdependence has been included in the model for study partly because of Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) inclusion in their model but partly because of the growth in interest in this construct. Studies on leadership and management skills suggest that the practice of creating task interdependence and empowerment is mandatory for managerial and organizational effectiveness (Bennis and Nanus 1985). Second, the effectiveness of organizational power grows with the sharing of power and control with subordinates. As Kanter (1979) has pointed out, effective leaders are more ready to delegate, promote task interdependence and reward talents.

Based on the above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis IV: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on task interdependence is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the task interdependence, the lower will be turnover intention.
3.7.2 “Leadership” factors

3.7.2.1 Leader initiating structure and leader consideration

In Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) study, correlations between organizational commitment and leader initiating structure and leader consideration were available from 14 and 12 samples respectively. The results of the meta-analyses showed medium positive correlations for each behavior (initiating structure: \( r = .289, \) SD = .210; consideration: \( r = .335, \) SD = .178). Many of the zero-order correlations included in the meta-analyses were obtained from studies designed explicitly to test moderated relationships. The results of these studies (Howell and Dorfman 1981; Jermier and Berkes 1979) and the substantial between-study variance observed in the meta-analyses suggest that a continued search for moderators is required.

Followers would perform beyond expectations because they trust and respect their leaders (Yukl 1989). Effective leaders change the values, beliefs and attitudes of their followers so that they are willing to perform functions and duties beyond those stipulated by the organization (Podsakoff et al. 1990). Apart from trust in the supervisor, perceived fairness, which deals with the perception on whether employees have been treated fairly in their jobs and how those determinants impact on other work-related variables, is also important (Moorman 1991). The way that leaders take initiatives in indoctrinating their subordinates and how the leaders pay attention to the personal life of their followers has also found to be an important factor affecting the morale of the workers (Netemeyer et al. 1997).

In view of the above, the following hypotheses have been proposed:

Hypothesis V: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader initiating structure is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the leader initiating structure, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis VI: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader consideration is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the leader consideration, the lower will be turnover intention.
3.7.2.2 Leader communication

The relationship between leader communication and organizational commitment was assessed across four samples and yielded a large corrected correlation of $r = .454$. Supervisor who provides more accurate and timely communication enhances the work environment and is likely to increase employees' commitment to the organization.

Gibson (Gibson 1999) suggested that two groups of people who have equal training and supplies may hold very different beliefs about their ability to perform on the same job. These beliefs may differ, among other things, because the amount of information they have received with regard to their job from their leaders is different. The way in which leader communicates with his group will affect group efficacy which is the group’s belief in its ability to perform effectively (Campion et al. 1993; Lindsley et al. 1995). The group’s efficacy will therefore impact on its organizational commitment which might be linked to the turnover intention of the group members.

One important element in group efficacy is interdependence which can take different forms. For example, group members may rely on each other to obtain resources, receive rewards, or perform their task effectively (Saavedra et al. 1993). It has been found that when task interdependence is low, leader communication with the rest of the group occurs less frequently and knowledge about what is necessary for task completion may never be shared and integrated within a group (Wageman 1995).

Recent studies by Pratt (Pratt 1998) and Tyler (Tyler 1999) confirm that the feeling of being respected by one’s supervisors and colleagues strongly affects self-esteem, commitment to a group and co-operative behavior. Managers are expected to promote a conducive internal communication climate by providing each employee with adequate information and the opportunities to speak up and get involved.

Bearing this in mind, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis VII: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader communication is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the better the leader communication, the lower will be turnover intention.
3.7.2.3 Leader participation

Relations between participatory leadership and organizational commitment were reported in Jermier and Berkes (1979) and for two samples in Rhodes and Steers (1981) that yielded a correlation of $r = .386$. Both studies examined the moderated relations between various leader behaviors and organizational commitment and found that they were contingent on other factors in the work environment.

Whether leaders participate in subordinates' activities depend on how likely leaders delegate their tasks to subordinates. However, for delegation and participation to be effective, subordinates need to have sufficient authority to make decisions, possess adequate resources and enough capability to do the work being delegated. Conversely, delegation under conditions of poor leader-member exchange may be seen as related to decreased extrinsic satisfaction.

In general, the supportive leader utilizes socio-emotional appeals to subordinates which involves (1) specific consideration for subordinates – the leader considers the needs and preferences of his subordinates, whom he trusts with dignity and kindness and is not punitive in his dealings with them.; (2) consultative decision making – the leader asks his subordinates for their opinions before he makes decisions. Such a leader is consultative, participative or democratic (as opposed to unilateral, autocratic or arbitrary) in his decision making; and (3) general supervision – the leader supervises in a general rather than a close manner, delegates authority to his subordinates and permits them freedom to exercise discretion in their work rather than imposing tight controls and close (frequently over-bearing) supervision. The degree of leader participation, being one of the elements of organizational commitment, has found to impact on turnover intention which gives rise to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis VIII: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader participation is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the leader participation, the lower will be turnover intention.
3.7.2.4 Organizational Commitment

The study by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) on the relationships between the various antecedents of organizational commitment and various behavioural outcomes such as performance ratings, turnover intention, productivity, attendance, lateness, etc. shows the influence that organizational commitment exercises over various organizational behaviour. While turnover intention is regressed against the exogenous variables under study – group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity, task independence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation to find out their relationship, the more interesting question is the role played by organizational commitment.

Instead of being the link between the various exogeneous variables and turnover intention, organizational commitment can be perceived as the mediating variable in the process. According to Baron and Kenny (Baron and Kenny 1986), the central idea in a mediational model is that an active organism intervenes between stimulus and response. In other words, “the effects of stimuli on behavior are mediated by various transformation processes internal to the organism” (Baron and Kenny, p.1176). A given variable is said to function as a mediator if it accounts for the relation between the independent variable and the outcome variable. To clarify the meaning of mediation, a path diagram is introduced as a model for depicting the causal chain.

With reference to Figure 3.4, there are two causal paths feeding into the outcome variable: the direct impact of the independent variable (Path C) and the impact of the mediator (Path B). At the same time, there is also a path from the independent variable to the mediator (Path A). A variable will be accepted as a mediator if it meets the following three conditions: (1) variations in levels of the independent variable significantly account for variations in the presumed mediator (i.e. Path A). (2) variations in the mediator significantly account for variations in the dependent variable (i.e. Path B) and (3) when Paths A and B are controlled, a previously significant relation between the independent and dependent variables is no longer significant (Baron and Kenny 1986). Mediation is best done in the case of a strong relation between the independent variable and the dependent variable.
Figure 3.4 Meditational Model
The major benefit of identifying a mediating variable is that instead of making numerous changes to the various exogeneous variables which can be both tedious and exorbitant, practitioners can implement changes to the mediating variable to bring along the desired impact on the dependent variable. If a hypothesis can be established on the possible mediation effect of organizational commitment in the regression of turnover intention on the exogeneous variables, practitioners can save time and effort in trimming down their employees’ turnover intention by bringing changes to organizational commitment. This, coupled with the fact that previous studies have supported mediating studies on organizational commitment and some of its antecedents (Mowday et al. 1982), supports testing of the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis IX: The impacts of the exogeneous variables on turnover intention mediate through organizational commitment.

3.8 Proposed Hypotheses

The following is a summary of the hypotheses proposed in the study:

Hypothesis I: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group cohesiveness is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the group cohesiveness, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis II: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group commitment is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the group commitment, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis III: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group homogeneity is negatively related to turnover intention, in other words, the higher the group homogeneity, the lower will be the turnover intention.

Hypothesis IV: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on task interdependence is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the task interdependence, the lower will be turnover intention.
Hypothesis V: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader initiating structure is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the leader initiating structure, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis VI: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader consideration is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the leader consideration, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis VII: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader communication is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the better the leader communication, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis VIII: The perception of the marketing executive of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader participation is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the leader participation, the lower will be turnover intention.

Hypothesis IX: The impacts of the exogeneous variables on turnover intention mediate through organizational commitment.

3.9 Summary

In this chapter, Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) meta-analytical model on organizational commitment has been examined in details because the research model of the current study is based on this study. In particular, all the factors, variables and links related to the Mathieu and Zajac model have also been discussed. This is then followed by a discussion on the theoretical and research models and the hypotheses to be studied.

In the next chapter, the method and research design will be discussed. The paradigm of research related to qualitative/quantitative research debate will be presented. Issues such as the questionnaire design and report reliability and validity measures will also be discussed.
CHAPTER 4: METHOD AND DESIGN

4.1 Introduction

Before any study can be carried out, it is important to discuss the nature of paradigms which will be based on the answers to three important questions on the ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions. This will be followed by a discussion on the qualitative versus quantitative debate, leading to the conclusion why the positivist research method has been chosen. In the meantime, various research methods will be briefly discussed and explanation will be made on why the survey method has been used as the primary data collection method. There will be a separate section on the questionnaire design, the report on reliability and validity measures. The selection of sample and the research design will also be reported.

4.2 The nature of paradigms

According to Guba and Lincoln (Guba and Lincoln 1994, p.107), a paradigm may be viewed "as a set of basic beliefs (or metaphysics) that deals with ultimates or first principles. It represents worldview that defines, for its holder, the nature of the "world," the individual's place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts, as for example, cosmologies and theologies do". The more important thing is that the beliefs are basic and must be accepted simply on faith because there is no way to establish their ultimate truthfulness.

The basic beliefs that define the inquiry paradigms can be drawn up from the responses given by proponents of any given paradigm to three fundamental questions which are interconnected in such a way that the answer given to any one of the three questions, irrespective of the order in which the questions are taken, governs the answers to be given to the other two questions. The following is a logical flow of how the three questions are posted to researchers:

1. The ontological question – This deals with the form and nature of reality and what is there that can be known about it. In other words, if a "real" world is assumed, then what can be known about it is "how things really are" and "how things really work." Only those questions that relate to matters of "real"
existence and "real" action are acceptable. All others would have to be rejected. In the current study, the assumption is that there is an established relationship between one of the antecedents of organizational commitment – Group/Leader relations and turnover intentions of local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. As a result, from an ontological perspective, the study is going to be positivist in nature – acceptance of truth (Guba and Lincoln 1994).

2. The epistemological question – This deals with nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known? The answer that can be given to this question is governed by the answer to the ontological question. In the current study, if a "real" reality is assumed, then the posture of the knower must be one of the objective detachment or value freedom to discover how things really work. In other words, the approach has to be objective.

3. The methodological question – This deals with how the inquirer can go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known? Like the answer to the epistemological question, the answer that can be given to this question is constrained by answers already given to the first two questions. In other words, the choice of methodology is governed by the answers given to question 1 and 2. In the current study, a "real" reality pursued by an "objective" inquirer suggests control of possible confounding factors, whether the methods are qualitative (observational) or quantitative (analysis of variance).

4.3 Qualitative versus Quantitative

The quantitative paradigm of research emphasizes on accepted and precise meanings. In quantitative analysis, one uses theory deductively and places it toward the beginning of the plan for a study. The objective is to test the theory, rather than develop it. As a matter of definition, Kerlinger (Kerlinger 1979, p.649) defined theory “as a set of interrelated constructs (variables), definitions and propositions
that presents a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining natural phenomena”.

One therefore begins a study by advancing a theory, collects data to test it and concludes on whether the theory is confirmed or not confirmed by the results of the study. The theory is therefore a framework for the entire study, an organizing model for the research questions or hypotheses and for the data collection procedure.

In the case of qualitative study, the use of theory is less clear. The term used for theory varies by type of design. Contrary to the deductive form found in quantitative studies, these pattern of theories in qualitative analysis represent a “pattern” of interconnected thoughts or facts linked to a whole. Pattern theory does not emphasize on logical deductive reasoning. Like causal theory, it contains an interconnected set of concepts and relationships but it does not require casual statements. Instead, pattern theory which is often used in qualitative analysis uses metaphor or analogic so that relationship makes sense. Pattern theories are systems of ideas that work together. The concepts and relations within them form a mutually reinforcing closed system. They specify a sequence of phases or linked parts to a whole.

According to Guba and Lincoln (1994), both qualitative and quantitative methods may be used appropriately with any research paradigm. Questions of method are supposed to be secondary to questions of paradigm which is defined as the basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigator, not only in choices of method but in ontologically and epistemologically fundamental ways.

Historically, there has been a heavy emphasis on quantification in science and soft sciences such as social sciences are usually construed as not impressive and any observations from them are not expected to be dependable. Positivism, referred to above, focuses on efforts to verify or falsify a priori hypotheses not usually stated as mathematical (quantitative) proponents or propositions that can be expressed in exact terms. Precision is important when the discussion is on the control of natural phenomena. Moreover, there is already in existence a full array of statistical and mathematical models and there is also the growing conviction that only quantitative data are ultimately valid (Sechrest 1992).
While quantitative analysis might have received a lot of support from researchers who vote for precision and mathematical exactness, over the last ten years, a number of arguments have been put up to address the shortcomings of quantitative analysis. Some of these arguments include the following:

1. **Context stripping** – Precise quantitative approaches might have stripped other variables which, if allowed to exert their effects, could have greatly altered findings. There is also the question whether the findings, which are applicable only in other similarly truncated or contextually stripped situations, can actually be generalized in their applications. It is argued that qualitative data can address that imbalance by providing contextual information.

2. **Exclusion of meaning and purpose** – Human behaviour, unlike that of physical objects, cannot be easily quantified without reference to the purposes and meanings attached to human activities. On the other hand, qualitative data can fill in the gap.

3. **Disjunction of grand theories with local contexts** – This is the etic/emic dilemma. The etic (outsider) theory on an enquiry may have little bearing on the emic (insider) view. Qualitative data, it is asserted, would be useful for unfolding emic views. To that extent, it is argued that for theories to be valid, they should be qualitatively grounded (Strauss and Corbin 1990).

4. **Inapplicability of general data to individual cases** – It is often said that generalizations, albeit statistically meaningful, have no applicability in the individual case. Qualitative data is expected to avoid such ambiguities.

5. **Exclusion of the discovery dimension in inquiry** – In quantitative research, the inquirers only focus on the verification of the a priori hypotheses, with due neglect on the source of those hypotheses. The insights of creative and divergent thinkers may find no place at all in quantitative research. Proponents of qualitative approach assert that they can redress this imbalance.
While due attention has been paid to this debate on the use of qualitative method versus quantitative method, the model to be used in this study seems to suggest that the theory is supported by a vast number of past research, the different parts of the theory can be put together in an interconnected way which lends support to direct testing, the hypotheses can be drawn up through inductive reasoning which can be put to statistical tests and most important of all, observations can be drawn up at the end of the study. In view of all these, it is concluded that this study is positivist in nature from an ontological perspective, is direct from an epistemological perspective and is quantitative from a methodological perspective.

4.4 Research design
4.4.1 Data collection

Once the three basic questions on the nature of paradigms have been answered, the next step is to decide how the data should be collected and why the survey method was selected. In particular, review will also be made on some of the problems that were encountered during the pilot study, issues raised during design of the questionnaire, and operationalizations of study variables which include both the organizational factors and the leadership factors.

4.4.2 The Survey Method
4.4.2.1 Advantages of the survey method

The survey method was used in this research because it provided quick, efficient and accurate means of assessing information about a relatively large population given the time constraint. Most questionnaires can reach a geographically dispersed sample almost simultaneously at a competitive cost provided that interviewers are not strictly required. While mail questionnaires are relatively low in cost in principle compared with personal interviews and telephone surveys, they sometimes may not end up with the lowest cost. For example, in the current study, it was necessary to follow up with a second mailing which required additional management time and effort, postage and the printing of questionnaires. Meanwhile, it is interesting to point out that questionnaires that are duplicated on poor-quality paper have a greater likelihood of being thrown in the wastebasket than a more expensive high-quality printing job.
Mail and self-administered questionnaires can be filled out whenever the respondent has time. Thus, there is a better chance that respondents will take time to think about their replies. In some cases, the respondents might want to re-collect the facts and refer to their own records before answering the questions. Checking information by verifying records, or in the case of organization surveys, consulting with group members should provide more valid, factual information than either personal or telephone interviews. In other situations, there might be respondents who are difficult to reach for various reasons and these people, who place a high value on responding to surveys at their own convenience, are best contacted by mail. In the study, this drawback is mitigated as much as possible by conducting a close follow up with the organizations from time to time and assistance is offered to anybody on any queries that they might have in connection with the questionnaire.

4.4.2.2 Disadvantages of the survey method

While the absence of an interviewer induces respondents to reveal sensitive information and personal feeling which are particularly relevant in this case, it can also be a disadvantage. Once the respondent receives the questionnaire, the questioning process is beyond the researcher’s control because each respondent will interpret the questions differently. Since the respondent does not have the opportunity to ask questions, problems that might be clarified in an interview remain misunderstood in a mail survey. In addition, there is no interviewer who can probe for additional information or clarification of an answer, and the recorded answers have to be taken literally. Experienced interviewers always capitalize on the facial expressions and tone of the speech from the respondents to probe further into the answers. This throws light on where and how relevant studies should be conducted in the future.

Mail questionnaires are highly standardized, and the questions are quite structured. Questions and instructions must be clear-cut and straightforward. If questions or instructions are difficult to understand, respondents will use their own interpretations, which may be wrong. Interviewing, on the other hand, provides the opportunity for the respondents to ask questions so that the interviewer can clarify the issues. To ensure that the questionnaires were fully understood by the respondents, a pilot study
was conducted among ten different marketing executives from different companies to scrutinize the questionnaires to confirm their applicability in the context of securities firms and relevancy for marketing executives. They were given copy of the questionnaires and were invited to write down issues that they would like to clarify and in particular, those questions that were not comprehended by them. The responses were timed to make sure that completion of the questionnaire was done within a reasonable span of time. After collecting the feedback from the pilot survey, the various respondents were contacted and queries were clarified with them over the phone. Due consideration was given to all the issues raised in the pilot survey and the questions were modified accordingly. The pilot study confirmed that the construct definitions and items were found to be appropriate within the securities firms context, that the length of the questionnaires was acceptable to the respondents and that the questions were clear and comprehensible.

4.4.2.3 Why English questionnaires

English questionnaires were used in this study for three reasons: First of all, English is the language of business and the common language of daily parlance in Hong Kong. Second, the professional training of securities executives in Hong Kong is conducted in English. Third, organizations in Hong Kong frequently conduct attitude surveys and these are always in English and are typically instruments developed in Western contexts (Cheng 1989). In addition, in Hong Kong, most marketing executives in foreign securities firms are university graduates or above which suggest that they should have no problem in communicating in English. In fact, proficient English communication skills (both written and spoken) are required since English forms an integral part of the daily activities of a typical marketing executive. In the pilot study, the relevancy of using English questionnaires was discussed and the respondents indicated that they would not anticipate any problem in answering the questionnaires in English.

4.4.2.4 Other considerations in administering the survey

Time was a special factor in this particular survey. While it was understood that the attitudes of the respondents might not change rapidly through time, it was important
to compare the results from all respondents at more or less the same time. Furthermore, it took time to follow up on the second mailing that was required to enhance the response rate. In the current study, the time lag between the first mailing and the cut-off date (when questionnaires were no longer accepted) was around twelve weeks. Although some might have suggested that in a local study like this, personal interviews could be conducted more quickly, difficulties in arranging appointments with the respondents at a time that was convenient to both of the interviewer and the interviewee eventually prompted the use of mail questionnaires.

Another important consideration is length of the questionnaires. Mail questionnaires vary considerably in length, ranging from extremely short postcard questionnaires to lengthy, multi-paged booklets requiring respondents to fill in thousands of answers. A general rule of thumb is that a mail questionnaire should not exceed six pages in length (Bean and Roszkowski 1995). When a questionnaire requires a respondent to spend a great deal of time and effort, an incentive is generally required to induce the respondent to return the questionnaire. Initially, there was the idea of giving the respondents souvenirs such as golf balls or ball pens as a token way of appreciating their support. But one of the respondents in the pilot study suggested that to link the study with charity could be more appealing to the respondents. That was an excellent recommendation. Not only was the job of sending souvenirs to the respective respondents who might not want to be identified could be cut out but more money could also be put to some meaningful projects. In this study, the respondents were told in the covering letter that for every single completed questionnaire mailed back, a donation of HK$20 to ORBIS which is a non-profit making global organization whose mission is to preserve and restore eye-sight in their efforts to prevent and treat blindness through close collaboration with local partners (Appendix 1), would be made. Consequently, responding to the questionnaire could become a piece of charity work.

4.4.2.5 Non-response error

The other interesting issue in this survey is the non-response error which is always a potential problem in mail surveys. Individuals who are interested in the subject matter of the survey tend to respond at a higher rate than those with less interest or
experience. Thus people who hold extreme positions on an issue are more likely to respond than individuals who are largely indifferent. To minimize this bias, a number of mechanisms suggested by researchers have been built in to increase the response rate among the sampling units.

First of all, a covering letter (Appendix 2) was attached. Reportedly, the covering letter, that accompanies the questionnaire or printed on the first page of the questionnaire booklet, is an integral part of the survey process. It is an important means of inducing the reader to develop an interest in the study which in turn prompts him or her to complete and return the questionnaire. In the current study, the covering letter was used to explain why the study was important, how the opinion from the respondents would help the inquirer and most important of all, what kind of observations and recommendations will be relayed to management in the respective organizations. All these prompted them to develop a keen interest in the project because it was going to impact on their future as well.

Secondly, the respondent's motivation for returning a questionnaire had also been raised by the monetary incentives. Although HK$20 was a token amount, respondents were motivated by the fact that their effort in answering a questionnaire could turn out to be a piece of charity work. ORBIS was chosen for couple of reasons. First of all, ORBIS is a worldwide charity organization with special focus on China. It was suggested in the pilot study that if the charity mission is connected to China, people would feel more enthusiastic about it. Secondly, it appeared to most people that ORBIS is not a charity organization with huge infrastructure and other bureaucratic set-up that will waste resources. In addition, some interesting questions were inserted at the beginning of each section so that the respondents would have greater interest in answering the questions. To ensure that the return process was smooth, pre-paid envelopes were also inserted so that the respondents did not need to bother about what envelopes to use, whether stamps were necessary, etc.

As suggested by Zikmund (1997), after responses from the first wave of mailings begin to trickle in, most studies utilize follow-ups – letter or postcard reminders. The follow-up letter should specify that a 100% response rate is important for the survey’s purposes. In fact, a second questionnaire was sent to remind the respondents
to fill out the questionnaire that was initially mailed to them. Other than that, telephone calls were used to solicit support and assistance from the supervisors.

To facilitate follow-up, each questionnaire was coded according to the firm to which the respondents belonged. Not only would this help tally the responses from each firm but time would also be saved in avoiding contacting those respondents who had already returned the questionnaires. In addition, the expense of mailing questionnaires to those who had responded could also be saved.

Questionnaires were directly mailed to the supervisors of the thirty-six institutions that were identified from the Securities Futures Commission Registry as the population. In terms of how the sample has been selected, the following procedures should be noted. First of all, the list of securities firms registered with the Securities Futures Commissioner, be they local or foreign firms, will be printed and subject to scrutiny. Secondly, the criteria that the securities firm under study must be more than 51% owned by foreign interests. Foreign interests are defined as corporations, partnerships or sole proprietors that are classified as non-residents of Hong Kong. By applying this standard to all the securities firms registered with the Securities Futures Commission, thirty-six securities firms were identified as foreign securities firms (Appendix 3).

Individual phone calls were made to ensure that the questionnaires were delivered to the appropriate personnel of each institution so that follow-up could be carried out effectively. The number of marketing executives and the respective gender in each institution, which totaled 475 with 290 male and 185 female executives, were identified for collation and control purposes. The questionnaires were pre-coded to identify the individual organizations but not on the individual respondent. A covering letter to each respondent describing the purpose of the research, the importance of their participation and assurance that all responses would be treated with complete confidentiality and anonymity, was also sent with the questionnaires. The respondents were requested to fill in the questionnaires and return them directly to the mail box using the attached stamped self-addressed envelopes.
A follow-up reminder was sent to every institution that had not reverted with a 100% response rate. The reminder requested the supervisor to notify the inquirer if he or she had not received the package on questionnaires yet and the entire set would be “couriered” to them immediately. There was no deadline imposed on the replies of questionnaires yet. If the supervisors were reluctant to participate in the survey, they were requested to confirm the salient data that included the total number of investment professionals involved in the activities defined in the research and their breakdown on gender. The information was used to compile the demographic characteristics of the sampling frame so that the representation of the final sample to that of the sampling frame could be worked out. A final reminder was sent to all supervisors after another four weeks and deadline for the receipt of all responses was set at four weeks later. In other words, the entire survey process was completed in 12 weeks.

4.5 Questionnaire design

Appendix 4 is a true copy of the questionnaire. All variables under study were measured using multiple-item scales drawn from previous research. The beauty of this was that the questionnaire design would then be based on past research which had been subject to various testing and challenges and proven to be robust. Effort would also be saved in defending the structure of questionnaire which could be subject to different interpretations and criticisms. In the study, predictor variables comprised of both the organizational factors and supervisory factors. Organizational factors included group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence. Supervisory factors included leader initiating structure, leader communication, leader participation and leader consideration. Mediating variable included organizational commitment.

As Schriesheim, Eisenbach, and Hill (1991) and Magazine, Williams, and Williams (1996) pointed out, positively-worded items in the questionnaires should be encouraged because reverse-coded items may weaken the validity and reliability of a measure. In fact, negatively-worded items have been found to be responsible for inconsistent results on the Job Diagnostic Survey (Cordery and Sevastos 1993). Nevertheless, the questionnaires from previous research were maintained in its
original form as much as possible because there were few negatively-worded questions. While the exact value of the Cronbach’s alpha for each variable will be reported in the main text, they have been carefully scrutinized to ensure that the appropriate questions were included in the survey and the data was consistent.

Details on the operationalizations and measures for these variables are described below:

4.5.1 Organizational Factors

4.5.1.1 Organizational commitment

To measure organizational commitment, the 15-item measure of organizational commitment adapted by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the 15 items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the six negatively-worded items were revised to bring them in conformity with the positively-worded questions. Appendix 5 shows the questionnaire items corresponding to organizational commitment. Questions 4, 7, 9, 11 and 12 were deleted to bring the Cronbach’s alpha to 0.8396.

4.5.1.2 Group cohesiveness

Closely connected with organizational commitment is group cohesiveness which is measured by the 6-item questionnaire adapted from Kerr and Jermier (1978). All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the 6 items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the questions were recorded and there was no need to make any revision on the scores because none of the question was negatively-worded. No question was deleted and the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.8985. Please refer to Appendix 6 for the questionnaire items corresponding to group cohesiveness.
4.5.1.3 Group commitment

To measure group commitment, the 6-item measure of group commitment adapted by Mohr (1971) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the six items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the two negatively-worded items were revised to bring them in conformity with the positively-worded questions. Questions 3, 4, 5 and 6 were dropped to bring the Cronbach’s alpha to 0.7432. Please refer to Appendix 7 for the questionnaire items corresponding to group commitment.

4.5.1.4 Group homogeneity

To measure group homogeneity, the primary focus was on culture which could best be reflected in the difference in race (Hofstede 1980b). Question 3 on the section measuring demographic data serves to gather information on the race of each respondent. Since the Cronbach’s alpha was reported at 0.51, caution must be exercised in interpreting the results on group homogeneity. Please refer to Appendix 8 for details.

4.5.1.5 Task interdependence

To measure task interdependence, the 6-item measure of task interdependence adapted by Kerr and Jermier (1978) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the six items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the two negatively-worded items were revised to bring them in conformity with the positively-worded questions. Questions 1, 2, 5 and 6 were deleted and the Cronbach’s alpha was reported at 0.5528. Caution should be exercised in interpreting the results on task interdependence. Please refer to Appendix 9 for the questionnaire items corresponding to task interdependence.
4.5.2 Leadership Factors

4.5.2.1 Leader initiating structure

To measure leader initiating structure, the 14-item measure of leader initiating structure adapted by Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) was used. All the questions, like other sections, were adopted in the original form and all the 14 items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the two negatively-worded items were revised to bring them in line with the positively-worded questions. Questions 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 13 and 14 were deleted to bring the Cronbach’s alpha to 0.8223. Please refer to Appendix 10 for the questionnaire items corresponding to leader initiating structure.

4.5.2.2 Leader consideration

To measure leader consideration, the 20-item measure of leader consideration adapted by Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the 20 items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the eight negatively-worded items were revised to bring them in line with the positively-worded questions. Questions 1, 10, 11, 12, 18 and 19 were deleted to bring the Cronbach’s alpha to 0.8797. Please refer to Appendix 11 for the questionnaire items corresponding to leader consideration.

4.5.2.3 Leader participation

To measure leader participation, the 5-item measure of leader participation adapted by Mohr (1971) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the six items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Scores for the three negatively-worded items were revised to bring them in conformity with the positively-worded questions. Question 3 was deleted to bring the Cronbach’s alpha to 0.7177. Please refer to Appendix 12 for the questionnaire items corresponding to leader participation.
4.5.2.4 Leader communication

To measure leader communication, the 7-item measure of leader communication adapted by Olmstead and Christensen (1973) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the seven items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). There was no negatively-worded question. Question 6 was deleted to bring the Cronbach’s alpha to 0.8305. Please refer to Appendix 13 for the questionnaire items corresponding to leader communication.

4.6 Turnover Intention

To measure turnover intention, the 8-item measure of turnover intention adapted by Bluedorn (1982) was used. All the questions were adopted in the original form and all the eight items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree). The questions on turnover intention, which were eight in total, were not put under a distinct section. As suggested by Bluedorn, these questions were embedded into other sections of the questionnaire randomly. With reference to Appendix 4, four questions were embedded into Section III on leader consideration and the other four were embedded into Section VI on leader participation. The Cronbach’s alpha was reported at 0.88. Please refer to Appendix 14 for the questionnaire items corresponding to turnover intention.

4.7 Demographic Factors

To collect information on the respondents’ age, gender, race, education, tenure with the company, working experience in this particular field, and working hours, a separate section with the heading “Demographic Information about yourself” was used. Please refer to Appendix 15 for the questionnaire items corresponding to demographic information.
4.8 Research design – other considerations

As explained in the research model under Section 3.6, while both organizational commitment and the exogenous variables including group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation are going to influence the employee’s turnover intention directly, the relationship between organizational commitment and various organizational behaviours such as lateness, absenteeism, etc. has led to the hypothesis that organizational commitment may mediate the effects between the eight exogenous variables under study and the dependent variable – turnover intention. To find out whether this is true, a research design to test the mediating effects has been adopted. This involves a three-step procedure as suggested by Grapentine (2000):

i) Regress organizational commitment (the mediating variable) on group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation (the exogenous variables);

ii) Regress turnover intention (the dependent variable) on the same set of exogenous variables of (i) and;

iii) Regress turnover intention on all the exogenous variables of (i) and organizational commitment.

All regressions are based on multiple linear regressions and the results will be discussed in the chapter on analysis of results.

4.9 Summary

In this chapter, the paradigm of research, the ontological, the epistemological and the methodological questions and the choice of qualitative versus quantitative method were discussed. The logic for choosing the survey method as the basic method in the collection of data for analysis was explained. Definitions of the different constructs
were described and design of the questionnaire items were explained. Furthermore, the internal consistency reliability estimates of different constructs in this study were noted and a brief discussion was made on the research design in the current study.

In the next chapter, results of the research will be tabulated and analysed.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the results collected from the survey are tabulated and analyzed. The information is divided into sections that basically follow the sequence of hypotheses outlined in Chapter 3 on research model and hypotheses. Before any formal analysis could be conducted, the collected data was checked for normality. Then the values of the Cronbach’s alphas of different constructs obtained from the study were examined to make sure that a high degree of internal consistency was obtained.

Since the measures for the organizational factors and supervisory factors have been adopted from the literature which had been subjected to intensive reliability and validity tests, only the validity of the data was checked to make sure that it was good for statistical analysis. Regression analytical techniques were employed to test the set of hypotheses proposed in Chapter 3.

5.2 Demographic Statistics

Out of the 36 institutions under this study, there were 475 professionals working as marketing executives who were broken down into 290 male and 185 female. A total of 176 questionnaires were received, giving rise to a response rate of 37%. Unfortunately, 10 of the 176 questionnaires turned out to be invalid due to missing data. Out of the remaining 166 valid questionnaires, there were 100 (60.2%) male respondents and 66 (39.8%) female respondents.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents who participated in the survey are shown in Table 5.1. Over half of the respondents (57.8%) were below the age of 35 with only 7.8% of the respondents being 46 and above. In terms of education background, almost three-quarters of the respondents (74.4%) had university or postgraduate qualifications. Close to 40% (39.2%) of the respondents was with their own firms for less than 2 years and around two-thirds (65.1%) spent less than 5.1 years with the companies. The average tenure with their firms was around 5.1 years compared to an average tenure of 8.7 years with the industry.
Marketing executives generally work long hours since they cover global markets that operate on a 24-hour basis. Table 5.1 shows that 21.1% of the respondents worked between 46-50 hours a week, 21.7% worked between 51-55 hours a week, 22.3% between 56-60 hours a week and 10.2% worked more than 60 hours a week. Assuming a 5-day workweek and a normal 8 working hours a day, 81.4% of the respondents worked more than 40 hours a week with a mean of 52.8 hours.

To find out whether there is non-respondent bias, the gender breakdown of those who responded was compared to those who did not participate in the survey. Table 5.2 shows the gender breakdown of 166 marketing executives who participated in the survey – 60.2% was male and 39.8% female. This compared favorably to 63.1% male and 36.9% female compositions of those institutions that did not participate and to the 62.1% male and 37.9% female compositions in the sampling frame surveyed. To further check on the non-response bias, the number of responding institutions across the countries of incorporation (Table 5.3) was closely examined and no significant concentration of response in any specific firm was found that deserved attention. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the responses from all the U.S. firms under study accounted for about half of the 166 valid questionnaires. The impact of this will be discussed in Chapter 6 on discussion and implications.
Table 5.1: Demographic Statistics of Marketing Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>% (N = 166)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 25</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 45</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 50</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Graduate</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years &amp; Below</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 years</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 8 years</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years &amp; Below</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 year</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20 years</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Hours per Week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 45</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 50</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 55</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 60</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Working Hours</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Comparative Data on Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding Firms</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participating Firms</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sampling Frame</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Ownership</td>
<td>Population Count</td>
<td>Sample Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>No. of Marketing Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Test for Normality

As Hair et al. pointed out, “the most fundamental assumption in multivariate analysis is normality... If the variation from the normal distribution is sufficiently large, all resulting statistical tests are invalid, as normality is required to use the F and t statistics” (Hair et al. 1998, p.70). The first step in checking for normality of data was to find out the shape of the distribution of data by looking at the means and standard deviations of all variables. Then the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to get the scatter plot and normal probability plot and the results were compared to the cumulative distributions of the data with the cumulative distribution of a normal distribution.

The comparisons showed that responses falling outside the normal data range occurred only on task interdependence and group homogeneity. Since there was no demonstrable proof that they were truly aberrant and not representative of any observations in the population, it was decided that they should be retained to ensure generalizability to the entire population. All threshold value of standard scores ranging from 3 to 4, which would have detected the existence of outliers, were closely examined to ensure that the data could be retained for subsequent analysis with p<0.01. Otherwise, all the actual data distributions closely followed the diagonal line of a normal distribution. Furthermore, the value of kurtosis and skewness of all variables under study, with the exception of task interdependence, fell between −1 and +1, thus supporting the normality of the observed data value.

5.3.1 Reliability of measures

It is generally accepted that when a concept has been operationally defined, in that a measure of it has been proposed, the ensuing measurement device should be both reliable and valid. The reliability of a measure refers to its consistency. This notion generally includes two important aspects – external and internal reliability. External reliability is the more common of the two meanings and refers to the degree of consistency of a measure over time. In terms of its administration, external reliability simply means the administering of a test on two occasions to the same group of subject – test/retest reliability is being examined. In general, people who scored high
on the test initially will also do so when retested; in other words, the relative position of each person's score will remain relatively constant. The problem with such a procedure is that intervening events between the test and the retest will result in discrepancy between the two sets of results. For example, if the job satisfaction of a group of workers is gauged and three months later is reassessed, it might be found that in general respondents exhibit higher levels of satisfaction than previously. It may be that in the intervening period they have received a pay increase or a change to their working practices or some other factors that are beyond the control of the inquirer. Also, if the test and retest are too close in time, subjects may recollect earlier answers so that an artificial consistency between the two tests is created. However, test-retest reliability is one of the main ways of checking external reliability.

Internal reliability is particularly important in connection with multiple-item scales. It raises the question of whether each scale is measuring a single idea and hence whether the items that make up the scale are internally consistent. A number of procedures for estimating internal reliability exist and the one that has found to receive the widest acceptance is Cronbach's alpha which essentially calculates the average of all possible split-half reliability coefficients. The rule of thumb is that the result should be 0.7 or above. This rule of thumb is also generally used in relation to test-retest reliability. When a concept and its associated measure are deemed to comprise underlying dimensions, it is normal to calculate reliability estimates for each of the constituent dimensions rather than for the measure as a whole. Indeed, if a factor analysis confirms that a measure comprises a number of dimensions, the overall scale will probably exhibit a low level of internal reliability, since the split-half reliability estimates may be lower as a result.

5.3.2 Validity of measures

The question of validity draws attention to how far a measure really measures the concept that it purports to measure. In other words, how does the inquirer know that the measure of job satisfaction is really getting at job satisfaction and not at something else? At the very minimum, an inquirer who develops a new measure
should establish that it has face validity – that is, that the measure apparently reflects the content of the concept in question.

Irrespective of the approaches in the investigation of validity, all of them aim at establishing what Campbell and Fiske (1959) refer to as convergent validity. In each case, the inquirer is concerned to demonstrate that the measure harmonizes with another measure. Campbell and Fiske (1959) further argue that this process usually does not go far enough in that the inquirer should really be using different measures of the same concept to see how far there is convergence. For example, in addition to devising a questionnaire-based measure of job routine, a researcher could use observers to rate the characteristics of jobs in order to distinguish between degrees of routines in jobs in an organization (Jenkins et al. 1975). In the current study, for example, different ways of gauging the turnover intention of the respondents in the survey were used and were embedded in different sections of the questionnaire to ensure that a construct really measured the concept that it purported to measure.

In this study, the organizational factors which included group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence, supervisory factors which included leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication, and leader participation and mediating factor such as organizational commitment and dependent variable such as turnover intention were all self-report measures. In Table 5.4, the means, standard deviations, correlations and internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach’s alphas) of all independent variables, mediating variable and dependent variable are listed. Observations with missing values were omitted in the computations. Cronbach’s alphas of all multi-item scales exceeded Nunnally and Berstein's (1994) recommended level of 0.70 except for group homogeneity and task interdependence. The Cronbach’s alpha of the subscale on group homogeneity and task interdependence reported in this study were 0.51 and 0.55 respectively. Caution should therefore be exercised in interpreting the results on group homogeneity and task interdependence.
Table 5.4: Variable Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations and Cronbach’s Alphas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Commitment</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task Interdependence</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leader Initiating Structure</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leader Consideration</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leader Communication</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leader Participation</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Group Homogeneity</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Coefficient alphas indicating estimated internal consistency reliabilities are in parentheses.
5.4 Data analyses

In this study, responses on all measures were collected on a single questionnaire from all the respondents in the sample. According to Dorfman (1996), attitudinal and behavioral measures are best measured this way because this is the most appropriate source of information from an operational perspective. However, single-source response bias arises when both the independent and dependent variables are measured by the same survey instrument, collecting data from the same source. This problem is referred to as the common method bias. When data on perceptions is collected from self-reports such as questionnaires, it is often difficult to determine whether observed correlations among the various variables under study are due to valid relationships or they are the results of common method bias. According to Avollio, Yammarino and Bass (1991), common method bias may inflate the relationships. In view of all these, different measures must be implemented to avoid possible common method bias that could inflate observed relationships between variables. In the current study, a number of measures were instituted to avoid possible common method bias.

First of all, the independent variables and dependent variables were mixed with one another in the questionnaire. Also, most of the scales used in this study have been adopted from the literature which had been subjected to intensive reliability and validity tests. Consequently, no separate reliability and validity tests were conducted except the Cronbach’s alpha (Table 5.4) and face validity for statistical tests discussed on pages 122-124. Secondly, as suggested by Podsakoff and Organ (1986), the Harman single factor test should be used to test for any common factor bias. According to Harman (1967), if a substantial amount of common method variance occurs, either one single factor will emerge from the factor analysis or one general factor will explain most of the covariance in the independent and dependent variables. Consequently, a principal components factor analysis was conducted on all the independent variables in the model. No single factor was found to account for the majority of the variance in the study. All these suggest that common method variance is not a concern that should affect the conclusion in this study.
5.4.1 Effects of Organizational Factors and Supervisory Factors on Organizational Commitment

With reference to Figure 3.3 which summarizes the research model in this study, the exogenous variables are broadly classified into two categories – the group factors and the supervisory factors. The group factors include such organizational constructs as group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence. On the other hand, human factors such as leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation are put under leadership factors. The group factors are expected to generate organizational trust and perceived organizational support, the measurement of which is subsumed within the exogeneous or independent variables. Similarly, the leadership factors will give rise to trust in supervision and perceived supervisory support where measurements are subsumed within the leadership factors.

While organizational commitment is perceived to exercise direct impact on the employee’s decision to look for outside opportunities, it was pointed out in the section on “Hypothesis Development” that direct relationship between the individual group and supervisory factors and organizational commitment deserves special attention. Such an exercise was important for two reasons: (1) this was the first question to be answered in the research model and (2) it would provide a good basis for comparing the regression results when turnover intention was regressed against the organizational factors and supervisory factors with organizational commitment as the mediating variable.

Multiple regression was selected because it was “the appropriate method of analysis when the research problem involves a single metric dependent variable presumed to be related to two or more independent variables.” (Hair et al. 1998, p. 14).

Significance of the statistical results was reported in three different ways as suggested by Coolican (1999). Based on the p value, the result would be regarded as significant if p<.05, highly significant if p<.01, or very highly significant if p<.001.
Table 5.5: Regression Results for Organizational Commitment on Organizational Constructs and Leadership Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Organizational Constructs</th>
<th>Leadership Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>Group Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.204*</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>4.972***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***P<.001  
N=166 for all statistics
Regression results of organizational commitment against the organizational factors and the supervisory factors are presented in Table 5.5. In drawing up the relationship between organizational commitment and the exogeneous variables, information on coefficients is mandatory in building up the regression equation and highlighting predictions. As far as the organizational factors were concerned, only group cohesiveness (\(\beta=0.204, p<.05\)) served as a predictor of organizational commitment. Since the regression coefficient of group cohesiveness was positive, the marketing executive’s perception of organizational commitment was positively related to group cohesiveness. In other words, the higher the group cohesiveness, the higher was the organizational commitment. On the other hand, the standardized regression coefficients of group commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence were not significant and no specific conclusion could be made as far as their relationship with organizational commitment was concerned. The only valid observation could be the following - the standardized regression coefficient of both group homogeneity and task interdependence carried a negative sign which implied that the relationship between organizational commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence, if any, could be negative. Nevertheless, it was not a significant one.

With regard to the supervisory factors, all the four independent variables, leader initiating structure (\(\beta=0.105\)), leader consideration (\(\beta=0.117\)), leader communication (\(\beta=0.148\)) and leader participation (\(\beta=0.101\)) offered no good prediction on organizational commitment since their standardized regression coefficients were not significant. The only interesting observation was that all the four supervisory factors were positively related to organizational commitment. In other words, the marketing executive’s perception of organizational commitment was positively related to all the supervisory factors, namely, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation. It also implied that the higher the level of leader initiating structure, the higher the level of leader consideration, the better the level of leader communication and the higher the level of leader participation, the higher was the level of organizational commitment.
The overall F value was closely examined to determine whether it was legitimate to use regression to study the relationships. It should be noted that the F test is used to examine whether the amount of variance explained in the dependent variable is likely due to chance or not (Shannon and Davenport 2001). The overall F value (F value=4.972, df=165, p<.001) was found to be statistically significant which suggested that it was legitimate to use regression in the study. \( R^2 \) was reported at 0.202 which implied that the exogeneous factors under study only explained 20% of the unique variance in organizational commitment. The results are interesting because while the theoretical model suggests that the organizational factors and the leadership factors are expected to interact to lead to organizational commitment, the low correlations could be an area of concern. This might be due to the fact that in the case of securities marketing officers in foreign securities firms, there are so many factors affecting the employees' perception of organizational commitment that each factor may only account for a relatively small share of the pie. In other words, the securities industry may be quite different from other industries since the securities industry is usually very dynamic and employees are expected to adapt to the changing environment very quickly. This is especially true after 1999 when internet was introduced. Everybody is so busy with the retrieval of information from the “net” that he or she does not have enough time to assess the organizational factors closely.

Having said all that, this is in line with the results from the meta-analysis carried out by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) where \( R^2 \)'s are low. Again, discussion will be made in Chapter 6 and 7 to shed light on where more research should be carried out to improve the low \( R^2 \)'s as other factors are being brought into the picture.

5.4.2 Effects of Organizational Factors and Supervisory Factors on Turnover Intention

The second question in the research model was to find out the relationship between the organizational factors and the supervisory factors and turnover intention. This was mandatory for the following reasons: (1) it formed the statistical base for the testing of the nine hypotheses detailed in Chapter 3 and (2) it highlighted the observation that could be drawn up from the standardized regression coefficients.
Direct effects of the organizational factors and the supervisory factors on turnover intention are shown in Table 5.6.
Table 5.6: Regression Results for Turnover Intention on Organizational Constructs and Leadership Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Group Cohesiveness</th>
<th>Group Commitment</th>
<th>Group Homogeneity</th>
<th>Task Interdependence</th>
<th>Leader Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Leader Consideration</th>
<th>Leader Communication</th>
<th>Leader Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-0.233***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>3.357***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

**p<.01

***P<.001

N=166 for all statistics
None of the organizational factors served as a predictor of turnover intention because the standardized regression coefficients were not significant. The only observation that could be made was that since the standardized regression coefficients of all the group factors carried a positive sign, it could suggest that the relationship between turnover intention and group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence, if any, could be positive but the relationships were weak.

Turning to the supervisory factors, only leader participation ($\beta = -0.233$, $p < 0.01$) was a good predictor of turnover intention. In other words, the marketing executive's perception of turnover intention was negatively related to leader participation, namely, the higher the level of leader participation, the lower would be turnover intention. The only other observation that could be made was that the regression coefficients of all leadership factors carried a negative sign which could suggest that the higher the leader initiating structure, the higher the leader consideration, the better the leader communication and the higher the leader participation, the lower will be turnover intention.

The overall F value was closely examined to determine whether it was legitimate to use regression to study the relationships. The overall F value ($F = 3.357$, df = 165, $p < 0.001$) was found to be statistically significant which suggested that it was legitimate to use regression to conduct the study. $R^2$ was reported at 0.146 which implied that the exogenous factors under study only explained around 15% of the unique variance in turnover intention. The results are rather interesting which might suggest that the securities industry could be a unique industry and the findings are different from other industries. These will be further discussed in Chapter 6 – discussions and implications.

5.4.3 Direct Effects of Organizational Factors and Supervisory Factors on Turnover Intention with Organizational Commitment as a Mediator

The third question in the research model was to find out the effects of the organizational factors and the supervisory factors on turnover intention with organizational commitment as a mediating variable. While the direct regression of turnover intention on the organizational factors and supervisory factors did produce some interesting results, the basic question was to
find out whether the introduction of organizational commitment as a mediator into the regression equation would change the results based on the general perception that there are close relationships between organizational commitment and the organizational factors and the supervisory factors. Direct effects of the organizational factors and the supervisory factors on turnover intention with organizational commitment as a mediator are presented in Table 5.7.

With regard to the organizational factors, only group cohesiveness ($\beta=-0.216$, $p<.01$) continued to be a predictor of turnover intention with the introduction of organizational commitment as a mediator. While the regression coefficients of group commitment, group homogeneity and task interdependence were not significant in terms of its predictability on turnover intention, they remained so even with the introduction of organizational commitment as a mediator. The only other observation that could be drawn up was the negative sign of the regression coefficient of group homogeneity which suggested that the relationship between turnover intention and group homogeneity was negative. Nevertheless, it was not a significant one.

On the supervisory factors, only leader participation ($\beta=-0.190$, $p<.05$) remained significant in the new regression with organizational commitment being introduced as a mediator though it must be noted that the standardized regression coefficient dropped from $-0.233$ to $-0.190$, suggesting that part of the explanation between leader participation and turnover intention was attributed to organizational commitment. The only other interesting observation was that while the standardized regression coefficients of the other supervisory factors were not statistically significant, all of these regression coefficients carried a negative sign. This could mean that the higher the leader initiating structure, the higher the leader communication and the higher the leader consideration, the lower will be turnover intention, other things being equal.
Table 5.7: Regression Results for Turnover Intention on Organizational Constructs and Leadership Constructs with Organizational Commitment as Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Organizational Constructs</th>
<th>Leadership Constructs</th>
<th>Mediator Organisational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>Group Commitment</td>
<td>Group Homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.216**</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001  

N=166 for all statistics  
With standardized regression coefficients on organizational commitment in parentheses
It would be equally interesting to note that the regression coefficients of organizational commitment on turnover intention was highly significant ($\beta=0.423$, p<0.001). This suggested that the higher the organizational commitment, the lower will be the turnover intention which is in conformity with previous studies (Mathieu and Zajac 1990).

The overall F value, (F value=7.043, df=165, p<.001), was highly significant which supported the use of regression in the study. $R^2$ was reported at 0.289 which suggested that around 30% of the variance in turnover intention was explained by the exogeneous variables and the mediating variable. When these results are compared to those under Section 5.4.2 where the relationship between organizational factors and supervisory factors with turnover intention was examined, and where $R^2$ was 0.15, it is natural to conclude that the interaction of organizational commitment with the organizational and supervisory factors has made interesting and significant impact on turnover intention.

5.5 Test of Hypotheses

Now that answers to the three basic questions raised in the research model have been obtained, the data can be collated and the results on the test of hypotheses can be presented.

With reference to the findings from Section 5.4.2, the initial results of the test of hypotheses were presented in Table 5.8. With the introduction of organizational commitment as a mediating variable, the hypotheses were tested again and the results were presented in Table 5.9. It is important to note that without introducing organizational commitment as a mediating variable, only Hypothesis VIII, that is for the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level of leadership participation, the lower will be the turnover intention, was accepted. With the introduction of organizational commitment into the regression, only Hypothesis I which states that for the marketing executives as a group, the higher the group cohesiveness, the lower will be the turnover intention and Hypothesis VIII were supported.

Results of the test on Hypothesis IX will be discussed under a separate section – test for mediating effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.  For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the group</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesiveness, the lower will be turnover intention</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level of</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group commitment, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. For the marketing executives as a group, the more homogeneous the</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the task</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdependence, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.  For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the leader</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiating structure, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the leader</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consideration, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level of</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leader communication, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of leadership participation, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. The impacts of the exogeneous variables on turnover intention</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediate through organizational commitment.</td>
<td>Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.9. Results of Hypotheses Testing with organizational commitment as the mediating variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.  For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the group cohesiveness, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level of group commitment, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. For the marketing executives as a group, the more homogeneous the group, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the task interdependence, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.  For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the leader initiating structure, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the leader consideration, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level of leader communication, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. For the marketing executives as a group, the higher the level of leadership participation, the lower will be turnover intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.  The impacts of the exogenous variables on turnover intention mediate through organizational commitment.</td>
<td>Not Supported except group cohesiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Test for Mediating Effect

In basic and applied psychology, it is common to find mediational processes (MacKinnon 2000). Mediational models try to explain how an effect occurs by hypothesizing a causal sequence. The basic mediation model starts with the assumption that there is a causal sequence in which the independent variable (X) causes the mediator (M) which in turn causes the dependent variable (Y), therefore explaining how X has its effect on Y (Baron and Kenny 1986).

Examination of the mediation issue is important because in a number of prevention programmes, if the assumption that the mediating variables (M) are causally related to the outcome (Y) is valid, a prevention programme (X) that substantially changes the mediating variable will, in turn, change the outcome.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), the procedures for testing the statistical significance of mediator variables involve the following steps:

- **Step 1:** Regress the mediator variable – organizational commitment in this study on the exogeneous variables – group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation in this study.

- **Step 2:** Regress the dependent variable – turnover intention in this study on the same set of exogeneous variables in Step 1.

- **Step 3:** Regress the dependent variable – turnover intention in this study on the same set of exogeneous variables in Step 1 and the mediator variable, organizational commitment in the current study.

Figure 5.10 summarized the results on the test for mediation effects. First of all, it is interesting to note that the standardized regression coefficient of turnover intention against organizational commitment was statistically significant ($\beta=-0.423$, $p<0.001$). In fact, it was highly significant and as described above, the relationship was a negative one – the higher the organizational commitment, the lower will be turnover intention. As far as the exogeneous
**Figure 5.10. Testing for Mediation Effects**

Standardized Regression Coefficients  
(given significant at 0.05 or less)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1 Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Step 2 Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Step 3 Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>Partial mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Commitment</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Homogeneity</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Initiating Structure</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Consideration</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Communication</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Participation</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
<td>No mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS – Not significant
variables are concerned, there are three mediator outcomes — no mediation, partial mediation and full mediation in the context of the test of Hypothesis IX.

No mediation occurs if the regression coefficient for an exogeneous variable is insignificant in Step 1 or if the regression coefficient for organizational commitment in Step 3 is insignificant (which it is not in Figure 5.10). Partial mediation exists if the regression coefficient for an exogeneous variable is significant in Step 1 and 3 (as is the case with group cohesiveness). Full mediation exists if the regression coefficient for an exogeneous variable is significant in Step 1 but not in Step 3. Exogeneous variables that have partial mediation (i.e. a direct and indirect linkage to a dependent variable) are expected to be more important predictors of a dependent variable than other exogeneous variables that have full mediation.

In this case, group cohesiveness stood out as the single variable that has partial mediation. While leader participation was significant in both Step 2 and 3, it did not establish a significant relationship with the mediator in Step 1 to warrant any conclusion on mediation. As far as Hypothesis IX is concerned, only partial mediation occurs with one of the exogeneous variable — group cohesiveness.

5.7 Summary

In this chapter, the results of the study were tabulated and analyzed. In addition, the direct effects of the independent variables and the effects of the mediating variable and the explanatory power of organizational commitment and the various organizational and supervisory factors were summarized. In the ensuing chapter, the results will be discussed, future research directions will be offered and recommendations for practitioners will be drawn up. In particular, it must be pointed out that if mediating effects are not examined thoroughly, practitioners can be misled on the relative importance of different factors affecting a dependent variable.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction

The primary objective of this study is to understand the employee withdrawal process of the local marketing officers at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong and to find out whether one of the antecedents of organizational commitment - group/leader relations plays an important role in affecting the turnover intention of these marketing officers.

In this chapter, the results and tests of the hypotheses detailed in Chapter 5 will be summarized and reported and their implications in the context of Hong Kong will be discussed.

6.2 Testing of Hypotheses

6.2.1 Organizational Factors

6.2.1.1 Hypothesis I

With reference to Chapter 3 in which the hypotheses are listed, Hypothesis I states that the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group cohesiveness is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the group cohesiveness, the lower will be turnover intention. In Chapter 5, it has been found that this hypothesis is not supported.

6.2.1.2 Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II states that the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group commitment is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the group commitment, the lower will be turnover intention. In Chapter 5, it has been shown that this hypothesis is not supported.
6.2.1.3 Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III states that the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on group homogeneity is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the more homogeneous the group, the lower will be turnover intention. In Chapter 5, it has been found that this hypothesis is not supported.

6.2.1.4 Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV states that the perception of local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on task interdependence is negatively related to turnover intention, that is, the higher the task interdependence, the lower will be turnover intention. In Chapter 5, it has been found that this hypothesis is not supported.

6.2.2 Group cohesiveness and group homogeneity

Focus of the discussion will be on the hypotheses that have been rejected through the study. Out of those four, group cohesiveness is expected to be closely related to group homogeneity. Thus, it is not surprising to see that the rejection of the hypothesis on group cohesiveness could also lead to the rejection of the hypothesis on group homogeneity as well.

As Hofstede (1980b) has suggested, differences in groups can best be judged from their differences in culture which is closely connected to their race. In this study, the respondents were divided into Chinese and non-Chinese to reflect the degree of group homogeneity to facilitate the testing of hypotheses.

It is interesting to note that O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett (1989) found that disagreement within heterogeneous groups accelerates the departure of members. Communication is expected to be easier between individuals with shared social experience and background (Zenger and Lawrence 1989). The traditional view suggests that the presence of socially different members of an otherwise heterogeneous group may make other members of the group uncomfortable.
In a place like Hong Kong where group homogeneity is quite high, it is surprising to see that group homogeneity does not play an important role in the development and determination of turnover intention. More studies should be conducted to find out how group homogeneity can affect the group's turnover intention.

6.2.3 Task interdependence

While the weak correlation between task interdependence and turnover intention may not deserve any special action, the interesting result has to be explained in the following context. In the case of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong, the jobs are usually quite independent. In fact, most securities salesmen perceive their jobs as a unique part of the overall securities sales and distribution process. The salesman does not require a lot of interaction or interfacing with people from other departments. While co-operation across boundaries such as functional areas, divisions and management is mandatory, people often run into other individuals over whom they have no hierarchical control. These individuals from other groups are often perceived as potential adversaries with conflicting goals, beliefs or action. When people do not belong to a particular group, say, Group A, they often believe that members of Group A are less trustworthy than members of their own group (Kramer 1994). In the case of a Chinese setting such as that of Hong Kong, the need of being recognized as member of a particular group cannot be over-emphasized. Once an individual has established group commitment through task related activities, he or she will start to expand the perception of commitment to an organization level. Therefore, to promote organizational commitment, the first step is to enhance task interdependence which can improve group commitment and ultimately organizational commitment.

6.2.4 Group commitment, organizational commitment and turnover intention

It is interesting to note that the correlation which occurs between group commitment and turnover intention is not statistically significant. Similarly, the relationship between group commitment and organizational commitment is not a close one. Normally, one would expect that the way in which trust develops between members of dissimilar groups is more difficult than the development of trust between members of similar groups. People's perceptions of their own interdependence with other
groups affect their beliefs on other group members’ trustworthiness. Interpersonal trust is an important social resource that facilitates co-operation and enhances social interactions. It cuts down the effort on monitoring others’ behavior (Powell 1990). In view of the fact that trust facilitates informal co-operation and reduces operating costs, trust is indispensable to all types of organizations (Creed and Miles 1996). To promote organizational commitment, one of the important steps is therefore to raise group commitment which will also reduce turnover intention. More research has to be done to confirm this observation.

6.2.5 Leadership Factors
6.2.5.1 Hypothesis V

With reference to Chapter 3, the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader initiating structure is negatively related to turnover intention, in other words, the higher the level of leader initiating structure, the lower will be turnover intention. Results of the study summarized in Chapter 5 suggest that Hypothesis V is not supported.

6.2.5.2 Hypothesis VI

Hypothesis VI states that the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader consideration is negatively related to turnover intention, in other words, the higher the leader consideration, the lower will be turnover intention. Results of the study summarized in Chapter 5 suggest that Hypothesis VI is not supported.

6.2.5.3 Hypothesis VII

Hypothesis VII states that the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader communication is negatively related to turnover intention, in other words, the higher the leader communication, the lower will be turnover intention. Results of the study summarized in Chapter 5 suggest that Hypothesis VII is not supported.
6.2.5.4 Hypothesis VIII

Hypothesis VIII states that the perception of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on leader participation is negatively related to turnover intention, in other words, the higher the leader participation, the lower will be turnover intention. Results of the study summarized in Chapter 5 confirm that Hypothesis VIII is supported.

While there is no significant correlation between all the supervisory factors and turnover intention with the exception of leader participation, a number of interesting implications for both researchers and practitioners can still be drawn up. These findings will be discussed in the context of Hong Kong which is described as the meeting point between Eastern and Western culture.

6.2.6 Delegation

The relationships between organizational commitment and leader consideration and leader communication echo the importance of leader-member exchange (LMX) which can be exemplified in the form of delegation. As a partial reaction to increasing disillusionment with participation as a research topic, interest in the study of delegation began about a decade ago (Leana 1986). In fact, managers use delegation almost as frequently as participation and delegation may have stronger relationships with satisfaction and performance than does participation (Wagner 1994). Bass (1990) noted that delegation implies that one has been empowered by one's supervisor to take on some responsibilities for certain activities. Even an autocrat has to delegate because he has no time to handle all the problems directly. A transactional leader may delegate in exchange for subordinate support and a transformational leader will use delegation to develop his or her subordinates. A consultative leader may also delegate responsibilities to his subordinates if he is impressed by his subordinates' competence. A liberal leader may delegate to avoid criticism for possible failure. Whether a supervisor is ready to delegate depends entirely on how willing the supervisor will undertake risk and wait for the subordinates to succeed.
Managers are usually reluctant to delegate either because there is a lack of confidence in subordinates' capabilities, or the tasks are perceived as too important to fail or the jobs are technically too difficult. In other words, the supervisors' perceptions of the subordinates' capability, trustworthiness, and motivation to assume greater responsibility are important indicators of delegation levels. It follows that the degree of willingness to allow subordinates access to information is also related to delegation. To carry this one step further, increasing reliance by the supervisor on assistance from subordinates will be perceived as increased leader delegation. All this suggests that good quality leader-member exchange is positively related to increased supervisory delegation. Subordinates who enjoy high-quality exchange relationships with their supervisors are likely to be receiving the trust, informational and positional resources that are mandatory to delegation.

6.2.7 Involvement

The positive results from the testing of leadership participation, namely, Hypothesis VIII, brings up one important subject – the use of high involvement practices. The advantages of using high-involvement or high-commitment human resources practices, which usually enhance employee's levels of skill, motivation, information and empowerment, are well understood (Kochan and Osterman 1994; Levine 1995; Pfeffer 1998). It is clear that the extensive use of high-involvement work practices requires significant investment in human capital. Such investment, of course, is justified by the long-term benefits brought to employees in the form of higher productivity. At the same time, organizations are more ready to invest in those employees who are being perceived as key or vital to the firm's success (MacDuffie 1995). Having said that, the increasing use of high-involvement work practices carries with it two important implications. First of all, previous research (Huselid 1995; Shaw et al. 1998) indicates that high-involvement work practices will improve employee retention. On the other hand, greater use of high-involvement practices increases the organization's exposure to possible disruptions from the loss of key employees who are pivotal to an organization's success.

With increasing use of high-involvement practices, organizations become more employee-centered and information and decision-making authorities are dispersed.
throughout the organization. Employees at all levels will take on greater responsibility for its operation and success. At the same time, organizations also become more reliant on these human assets rather than the capital assets. This is quite different from the orthodox control-oriented approach where "in essence, the thinking and controlling part of the work is separated from doing of the work" (Lawler 1992, p.12). With the dynamic changes in information and technology, the control-oriented approach, which emphasizes on narrow, well-defined jobs, centralized decision making, lower skill demands and little training, is no longer applicable to today's world.

The view that the greater use of high-involvement management practices could increase the cost of employee turnover is in conformity with the resource based view of organization (Barney 1991) which has often been suggested as the most direct way of understanding how management can build up an organization's competitive advantage. According to Becker and Gerhart (1996), organizations can create value in a rare and inimitable manner by building up a work force that is unique and productive. Through the setting up of value-adding employment system, high-involvement work practices can contribute to creation of competitive advantage. But it should be noted that because of such processes, employees become more unique which will increase the cost of losing these employees. At the same time, the practice of high-involvement will place more emphasis on skill requirements, which demand greater levels of experience and tenure. Arthur (1994) supported that the type of human resources system an organization uses interacts with turnover to impact on the productivity of employees. Very high correlation was found between employee retention and productivity in high commitment human resources systems.

6.2.8 Organizational Commitment

6.2.8.1 Hypothesis IX

Hypothesis IX states that the impacts of the exogeneous variables, namely group cohesiveness, group commitment, group homogeneity, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and leader participation on turnover intention mediate through organizational commitment. In
Chapter 5, it has been shown that with the exception of group cohesiveness which shows partial mediation, this hypothesis is not supported.

6.3 Organizational commitment as a mediating variable

While the regression coefficient of organizational commitment was highly significant against turnover intention, it was interesting to report that only group cohesiveness showed partial mediation.

Previous research suggested that organizational commitment has been associated with influencing many organizational and behavioral outcomes. Most frequently, organizational commitment has been used to explain withdrawal behavior associated with workplace attendance. It is found that an individual who is committed to an organization is more likely to remain at work. Owing to the negative relationship between organizational commitment and withdrawal behaviors, workers with lower commitment levels may be expected to work fewer hours, on average, than their more committed counterparts in another organization. Others have made the observation that organizationally committed individuals are likely to exhibit organizational serving behaviors. These behaviors can directly or indirectly benefit the organization, the work unit or other workers in the organization. For example, if an employee spends more hours on the job, this action is important and beneficial to the organization, work group or peers. The logic is that if a supervisor stays late in the office, though he or she is not producing any measurable work units, he or she is available to other workers for consultation and advice. Moreover, his or her presence could be a motivating factor to other workers. Thus, by spending extra hours in the office, the manager is helping the organization, the work group and the subordinates.

With the introduction of organizational commitment as a mediating variable, the regression coefficients of the various organizational and supervisory constructs on turnover intention remained insignificant because there might be many factors at play and each of them was not significant enough to warrant the establishment of any hypothesis. In fact, as elaborated in Chapter 5, with the introduction of internet since 1999, marketing executives in the securities industry have to be so responsive to market changes that they focus mostly on how to digest and make use of new information with due neglect on developments in their organizations. Thus, the
hypothesis that the exogeneous variables cause organizational commitment which causes turnover intention needs further research.

The strong causal relationship between group cohesiveness, organizational commitment and turnover intention in the form of mediation suggests that practitioners can reduce turnover intention of their employees by raising both their group cohesiveness and organizational commitment. Detailed investigation on the questions raised in the section on group cohesiveness in the questionnaire has led to strong emphasis on various measures related to group cohesiveness such as perception of group performance, sharing of information among group members, feedback on quality and quantity of one's work from group members, etc. All these would help manager focus on those areas for improvement with the primary objective of reducing the turnover intention of employees. The other implication from the study is that instead of designing various measures to raise group cohesiveness to cut down turnover intention, managers can raise the group's organizational commitment to achieve the same result.

6.4 Organizational commitment and turnover intention

Khatri, Chong and Budhwa (2001) found that organizational commitment is the most important factor influencing turnover intention. However, not too many Asian companies take it seriously because of the over-reliance on control-based management philosophy (Khatri 2000). In the control-based management philosophy, emphasis on compliance/obedience over commitment and standard written rules over informal practices and authority over participation will prevail. To cut down turnover intention and to promote organizational commitment, it has been suggested that management should adopt a more proactive attitude and advocate socialization of employees, moving away from a control-based to a commitment-based philosophy so that management can be applying the organizational culture in an organizational way.

In terms of the behaviors associated with high organizational commitment, the most important category is the extra effort by supervisors and managers who are being perceived as symbols of the organizations. Once supervisors and managers can set good precedents, subordinates will follow their examples and put in extra working
hours and efforts that are not stipulated in the organizations' work codes or perform functions that are not associated with the jobs in question. If one is highly committed to the organization, one will always stay late to finish the job assignment. If everybody does the same, staff morale will undoubtedly be high and the results will be encouraging and rewarding (2002).

6.5 Organizational commitment and congruence

Whether an individual will put in a lot of extra effort depends on the congruence or fit between an organization and the individual. Researchers have examined the interaction of individual characteristics and organizational constructs, as well as the fit between organizational characteristics and individual members (O'Reilly et al. 1991). It is important to note that both the characteristics of the individual and the organization are likely to affect an individual's behavior and performance at work and interaction of the two sets of variables will explain greater variance than either set.

A better understanding of the relationship between organizational and individual ethical values may prove useful in the study of organizational commitment and turnover intention. The impact of ethics on job-related outcomes and the role of ethics in person-organization fit theory should always be clearly comprehended. Given the high costs of negative turnover in the form of recruitment, selection and training, a better understanding of factors affecting negative turnover is mandatory.

Chatman (1989) defines person-organization fit "as the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons". When an individual worker fits into the working environment, positive responses will occur and high productivity is expected to follow. However, when an individual finds that the organizational and individual values are not compatible, disharmony occurs and will result in psychological, physiological and behavioral strains. It has been pointed out that harmonious person-organization fit is associated with greater organizational commitment and lower turnover (O'Reilly et al. 1991). A study of managers by Posner and Schmidt (Posner and Schmidt 1993) found that those who had clear conceptions on their personal values and organization values showed greater
organizational commitment than those who were less clear on either their personal or organizational goals.

According to Liedtka's (1989) model of value congruence, an employee's decision on value judgement is always affected by the fit between a proposed course of action (or organizational values) and the individual's self-image (or personal values). Conflict will arise when an individual is not sure whether organizational expectations are in congruence with the individual values. On an ethical decision, conflict between personal values and the values held by another person or the organization may give rise to ethical conflict. For example, a salesman's perception of his or her own ethicalness in comparison with the perception of top manager's ethicalness determines whether there is any ethical conflict. While a salesman may not know specifically the ethical values of individual top managers, top management's values may be exemplified in the form of ethical climate they create through the enforcement of ethical codes, policies, and guidelines.

Value congruence, in particular, is mandatory in the sales force and is highlighted in the area of sales force socialization. This is of special relevance to this study which focuses on the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. Grant and Bush (1996) suggest that certain socialization tactics should be used to enhance organizational value congruence. A well-planned socialization scheme will bring along positive effects on sales force motivation, job involvement, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and possibly lower turnover. Thus, in the recruitment process, managers should bring into the organization the "right kind" of individuals - those who have values and beliefs that are consistent with the organization or who can be taught the organization's values.

6.6 Empowerment

The significant result from the regression of turnover intention on leader participation indicates that more empowered teams will be more productive and proactive than less empowered teams and have higher levels of customer service, job satisfaction and organizational and team commitment. A work team is a group of individuals who work inter-dependently to achieve a common goal for the
organization (Manz and Sims 1993). Since both the use of work teams in organization and the amount of research on teams has grown tremendously, practitioners have paid more attention to employee empowerment (Argyris 1998; Spreitzer et al. 1997). By definition, empowerment refers to increased task motivation from an individual’s positive orientation to his or her work role (Spreitzer 1995). Surprisingly, most empowerment researchers devote their effort to individual-level models and more effort should be spent on team empowerment. In particular, self-managing teams have been associated with high productivity (Cohen and Ledford 1994) and organizational commitment (Cordery et al. 1991) and it is important to examine team empowerment in greater details.

Team empowerment has four dimensions: potency, meaningfulness, autonomy and impact (Kirkman and Rosen 1997). Potency refers to the collective belief of a team that it can be effective. There is a fine difference between potency and self-efficacy: (1) self-efficacy covers individual performance whereas potency refers to team performance; (2) self-efficacy experiences are private while potency experiences are group; and (3) self-efficacy relates to specific task performance but potency refers to generalized effectiveness (Guzzo et al. 1993).

Meaningfulness refers to a team’s perception of its tasks – important, worthwhile and valuable. Team members are expected to develop and share the meaningfulness of their task together.

Autonomy is the degree to which team members experience freedom, independence and discretion in their work. As a result, high levels of team autonomy may lead to lower individual autonomy because important decisions are discussed and executed jointly and responsibility is diffused rather than held by just one individual (Uhl-Bien and Graen 1998).

Impact refers to the situation when a team produces work that is significant and important for an organization (Hackman 1987). In collecting feedback, it always makes sense to jointly collect information on team impact than individuals alone could gather.
These four dimensions of team empowerment, albeit independent, are related because they are mutually reinforcing (Spreitzer 1995). Thus, the higher the level of a team’s production/service responsibility and the more team members set their own production or service goals and make important decisions such as scheduling and production/service assignments, monitor and train for quality, the more the team members will experience team empowerment.

Steers (Steers 1977) found that work-related experiences and perceptions were probably the most powerful predictors of organizational commitment. An employee’s experience of empowerment may account for more variance in her or his commitment level than more objective job or organizational characteristics. Steers further found that positive attitude from one’s peers often lead to more empowered teams. Moreover, if employees perceive that an organization is highly committed to its employees, they are likely to be committed as well. This high level of support and trust in empowered teams will therefore contribute to higher commitment levels among team members (Manz and Sims 1993).

6.7 Summary

In this chapter, the results of the testing of the nine hypotheses detailed in Chapter 5 have been reported and the implications in terms of the context of Hong Kong have been discussed. The next chapter will be the concluding chapter which focuses on the limitations and the future directions.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

7.1 Introduction

This is the concluding chapter which focuses on the important findings, the major limitations and the future directions of research. Particular reference will be made to the Hong Kong context which presents a unique meeting point for the Eastern and Western culture.

7.2 Major Findings

Based on the results in Chapter 5, it has been found that (1) turnover intention is negatively related to leader participation; (2) the relationship between turnover intention and the rest of the exogenous variables namely group cohesiveness, group homogeneity, group commitment, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration and leader communication is not clear; (3) while the introduction of organizational commitment as a mediating variable lends support to the hypothesis that partial mediation occurs with group cohesiveness, all other exogenous variables have been rejected. In other words, the impacts of all exogenous variables, with the exception of group cohesiveness, are not mediated through organizational commitment and (4) organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intention.

7.3 Limitations of this study

There are several limitations in this study which are elaborated below:

7.3.1 Common Method Variance

First of all, this study was cross-sectional in nature and cross-sectional designs usually do not lead to satisfactory assessment of causality between the predictor and the criterion variables. In other words, reasonably accurate and satisfactory causal inferences cannot be drawn up easily. In this study, the data was collected at one specific point in time and it would be quite difficult to determine whether job attitudes and perceptions lead to trust in supervisors or vice versa. Guthrie (2001) noted that self-report, cross-sectional data are usually subject to biases associated
with common method variance. This kind of bias is most troublesome in psychological or attitudinal studies with data collected from a single respondent at one time. The crust of the problem lies with the difficulty in determining whether observed variance among the constructs is attributable to valid relationships or to common method variance.

7.3.2 Causality

While this study suggests that there is a close correlation between turnover intention and group cohesiveness under the mediating effect of organizational commitment, it is not clear whether the relationships found in the survey could have resulted from a reversal of causal direction. Consequently, causality cannot be shown without further study. Some have suggested the use of structural equation modeling (SEM) which could provide a stronger argument for the hypotheses. However, the number of variables in this study may not be large enough to satisfy the requirements of the structural equation modeling techniques. Consequently, correlational studies do not support irrefutable evidence of causation and further research and longitudinal studies are mandatory in helping the inquirer understand the causal relationship that might exist.

7.3.3 Unit of analysis

Secondly, the unit of analysis was on the individual level. Data was collected from the marketing officers at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. These were the professionals who were supposed to have reporting relationship to their supervisors. The results of the study, therefore, depended a lot on the willingness of the individual to participate in the survey and most important of all, to open themselves up and disclose the true perceptions and feelings.

7.3.4 Bias from supervisors

Thirdly, the contact point in the whole survey was the supervisors who were responsible for distributing the questionnaires to the subordinates who matched with the definition in this survey. In this process, two important decisions were made. First of all, the supervisors had to decide who should fit into the definition under this
study as the target respondents and secondly, supervisors might further delegate that decision to others working for them and this could lead to further delegation, depending on the size of the operations. Throughout this entire process, bias could occur if the supervisors had included in the survey individual employees whose function did not meet with the survey criteria. What could be even worse was the inclusion of other employees who were expected to give favorable response to the survey unwittingly. At the same time, non-response bias might have occurred as the questionnaires were directed to the respondents through those supervisors who might have bias on his or her selection. Fortunately, since the average size per team in this study was around 7.5 persons, the risk of having sub-delegation was not prominent in the survey. However, this is a potential source of bias and future research should implement different measures to ensure that the final results are free from these possible biases.

7.3.5 Longitudinal study

Fourthly, owing to the fact that the data is cross-sectional in nature, it only reveals the net effect of a predictor variable on a particular criterion variable at a specific point in time. Consequently, it is possible that although task interdependence may not have significant impact on the turnover intention of the local marketing executives at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong, they may have mediating effects in the long run. Conversely, the observed mediating or dependent relationships between turnover intention and leader participation may only exist in the short run. In the longer run, the observed relationship may no longer be valid. Therefore, a longitudinal study is recommended for future research.

7.3.6 Appropriateness of focus

Fifthly, the design of this study focuses on the perception of the local marketing executives at foreign securities firms in Hong Kong on two major classes of factors - the organizational (group) factors and the supervisory factors. The insignificant results of most of the organizational factors except group cohesiveness suggest that these factors may not be the appropriate area of focus. The supervisory factors with the exception of leader participation offer similar results which suggest that more longitudinal studies should be carried out. In the meantime, it is important to point
out that the significant regression results on group cohesiveness and leader participation support the view that common method bias is not an issue in this study. To verify this issue, the Harman (1967) single factor test has been conducted. In essence, the Harman test stipulates that if common method variance dominates in a study, a single factor will account for the majority of the variances in both the independent and dependent variables. The factor analysis does not suggest that a single factor emerges as the dominant factor and no single general factor accounts for the majority of the variances. Thus, common method bias is not an issue at all in this study. Nevertheless, this is always an item that researchers should be aware of in conducting their studies.

7.3.7 Generalization

Sixthly, generalization of the results from this study to countries outside of Hong Kong could be a potential limitation. In this study, the people under survey were the local marketing executives working in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. Care should be taken in generalizing the results to other job areas, in particular to those who are working in the same capacity of selling tangible products. In other words, more research is required to test the findings from this study on other populations. Having said that, it could be argued that the general observations recorded early in this chapter could be generalized to some other service industries such as legal, insurance, marketing, accounting and audit because the professionals are all involved with intangible services.

While this research does not mean to be a study on the impact of Chinese culture on organizational commitment and the group/leader relations and the turnover intention of the local marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong, some of the observations from this study could be generalized with due caution to other marketing professionals working in other Asian countries that might have similar cultural setting. Good examples are Singapore and Taiwan.

One other interesting point is that almost 50% of the responses came from the six U.S. firms under study. While the U.S. securities houses are usually dominant in those countries where they have operations, care should be exercised in generalizing
the results to other places where the key players come from countries other than the U.S.

7.3.8 Degree of usefulness

Finally, there is the general concern on whether such a research is useful to practitioners. Dynamism in today's world raises the emphasis on useful research. As organizations react to the changing environment by implementing fundamental and rapid reforms in their relationships with employees (Rousseau 1995; Rousseau and Wade-Benzoni 1995), researchers are required to conduct studies that can bring significant impact on the organizational forms and contexts. Intuitively, the usefulness of any research cannot simply be defined as "getting practitioners to value and incorporate what academics learn" (Mohrman et al. 1999). The extent to which the views of organization members are included in the research processes and how the recommendations are incorporated into the design of employees' activities as the organization adapts to the changing environment plays a more important role. To carry this one step further, a study will be regarded as useful if there are opportunities for researchers and practitioners to consider each other's perspectives and to work closely together in interpreting the results of the research. Researchers confirm that on action research, if the academics and practitioners work closely together on the planned changes, the results are far more productive than cases whereby researchers and practitioners go their own ways. In other words, collaboration is an approach that yields understanding of organizational phenomena and should be commended (Eden and Huxham 1996).

Mohrman, Gibson and Mohrman (1999) have summarized three important antecedents of usefulness of research, namely, organization self-design informed by research, perspective taking and joint interpretive forums. As suggested by Gibson (1999), the cognitive component of self-design involves collective cognition at an organizational level. Collective cognition refers to the process used in the acquisition, storage, transmission and use of information that has been collected. Throughout that process, information is exchanged among individuals and interactions, which have been taking place at all times, will bring relevant problems to the surface and influence the cognitive processes of each group member.
Perspective taking is the recognition of knowledge, values and beliefs from a different community (Boland and Tenkasi 1995). Since different communities originate from different backgrounds, perspective taking is mandatory. Also, since both the researchers and practitioners are usually members of two different communities, practitioners will adopt the findings and recommendations only if such ideas are relevant and acceptable to the practitioner community. Thus, there is a strong need to broaden the researchers' practical paradigm so that they can interpret and communicate results effectively to the practitioners who should also expand their own thought-worlds to make practical interpretation out of the research. To make sure that perspective taking will occur, joint interpretive forums (Tenkasi and Mohrman 1999) should be created to bring together different participants from different communities to interact and interpret information. They are expected to come away with modified but enhanced interpretations and perspectives.

7.4 Suggestions for Further Research

After discussing the results and implications to practitioners, further studies on a number of areas will be highlighted in this section to ensure that limitations in this study will be addressed and substantial contributions toward the study of employee turnover can be made.

7.4.1 Generalization of Findings

In the previous section on the limitations of this study, the usefulness of this research has been discussed. While generalization to other related service industries may require further study, it can be argued that the findings from this study have generalizability in the Western world outside Hong Kong. This is probably due to the fact that the fundamental changes affecting the securities industry in Hong Kong should have also happened to the same industry elsewhere. In fact, with the internet and other technological changes, almost all kinds of industries including the securities industry have to manage different challenges. Such challenges include globalization of financial markets, privatization of government enterprises, geometric growth in the volume of financial transactions, increasing demand from customers in terms of product features and returns, compliance and accounting/reporting issues
due to de-regulation and above all, the rapid developments in information technology (Turnbull and Moustakatos 1996).

It is believed that such challenges are global since they are the results of dramatic technological innovations, relatively short product cycles, and increasing sophistication of consumers. The shift in importance from the manufacturing sector to the service sector further suggests that the human factor is probably one of the most important factors, if not the only one to ensure that a specific company can survive from all these challenges.

In addition, given the infrastructure set up by the former British Administration, Hong Kong may well rank ahead of the others in its interaction with the Western world. Consequently, Hong Kong may be the appropriate center for testing theories based on Western literature because of its proximity to the Western culture and above all, the meeting point of the East and the West. Also, the sample used in this survey was mostly educated people with over 75% of them having a bachelor degree or above qualification. Most of them were working with major financial institutions where English was the medium of communication. These people were exposed to a business setting that had more characteristics of a Western culture than the traditional Asian society. Consequently, it can be argued that this sample has more Western values and goals. Having said all these, further studies to support generalizability to the Western context and to other Asian countries will prove to be interesting and rewarding.

Future studies can also be carried out on low-level employees of organizations to find out whether substantial differences exist in the findings between this sample which is highly educated and more senior and other samples which include low-level and junior employees.

7.4.2 Context-specific (emic) dimensions

In the introductory chapter, it was stated that the impact of culture was not going to be the focus of this study. While this study takes place in the Hong Kong context, assumption has been made that Hong Kong is the meeting point between the Western
and Eastern culture and there is a unique close tie with the Western way of survey. The emphasis on individualism and contractual relationships and the Hong Kong securities industry bears a closer resemblance to the Western countries. As a result, various construct measurements based on Western theory were used to examine the different constructs under study. In other words, indigenous scales of construct have neither been developed or adopted to yield context-specific (emic) dimensions focusing on the specific Chinese cultural characteristics prevailing in Hong Kong. In fact, there is a pressing need to set up an indigenous scale to tap into the various constructs in this study. For example, Farh, Earley and Lin (1997) developed an indigenous measure of organizational behavior specifically for a sample of Chinese respondents. They developed the "Chinese Organizational Citizenship Behavior" (COCB) scale to tap into context-specific (emic) dimensions focusing on smoothing interpersonal relationships among Chinese. Thus, it is important that future research should consider context-specific (emic) dimensions to improve the understanding of the relationships proposed in this study.

7.4.3 Longitudinal Studies

In Chapter 4 which is on methodology and design, the differences between a longitudinal study and a cross-sectional study were highlighted. Robinson, Kraetz and Rousseau (1994) suggested that perceptions of psychological contract violation changed on a longitudinal basis and employment obligations as perceived by employees changed over time. In other words, longitudinal studies could highlight the dynamic and evolving nature of psychological contracts.

Since this study was a cross-sectional one, it would be useful to conduct future studies whereby impact of the variables in the model are time dependent. Longitudinal studies, which focus on the temporal dynamics of the relationships between different variables, would meet these needs aptly and the results can also be interpreted in causal terms.

The major focus in this study was on the group/leader relation. Researchers (Gerstner and Day 1997; Scandura and Schriesheim 1994) have suggested that development in the dyadic relationship between supervisor and subordinate can always be measured
by longitudinal studies because relationships between leaders and subordinates usually grow over time as they interact with each other through new experience and changes.

Furthermore, studies on trust in supervisors can also be conducted and it would be better to focus on those studies using longitudinal format since "a more complete understanding of trust would come from consideration of its evolution within relationships" (Mayer et al. 1995, p.727). It has further been pointed out that the antecedents of organizational commitment are likely to change as an individual employee advances in his career ladder with an organization. Consequently, the impact of organizational commitment on an individual's withdrawal behavior will also change, depending on the specific stages of employment with the organization. Longitudinal studies on the impact of different stages of career on an individual's organizational commitment and the changes in withdrawal behaviors should also be conducted.

7.4.4 Leader-Member Exchange: Study on Quality of Exchange

While this study on the group/leader relationship focuses on constructs including leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader commitment and leader participation, the quality of the exchange relationships between subordinates and leaders on withdrawal behaviors deserves special attention. Various studies seem to suggest that leaders usually develop and maintain different relationships with different subordinates (Dansereau et al. 1975; Graen and Scandura 1986). Employees who enjoy higher quality exchanges with their supervisors will maintain more personalized relationship that prompt them to carry out functions not required by the employment contract. The more challenging part is to find out, through future studies, the impact of the quality of leader/member exchange on the subordinates withdrawal behavior. Apparently, related studies on the antecedents of the quality of leader/member relationship such as demographic factors can also be carried out.
7.4.5 Leader-Member Exchange: Study on Trust in Supervisors

In this study, trust in supervisor was co-mingled in the study of other constructs proposed by Mathieu and Zajac (1990). No attempt was made to identify the elements that made up trust in supervisors. Current literature seems to suggest that there are a number of elements underlying a subordinate's trust in supervisors, including faith, loyalty and confidence (McAllister 1995; Podsakoff 1990). Since trust forms the basis for relational constructs, studies on the definitions, measurements and impact of trust in supervisors on employees' attitudes and their withdrawal behavior could be illuminating.

7.4.6 Leader-Member Exchange: Study on other Measures of Withdrawal

The focus in this study was on the impact of organizational factors and the supervisory factors on the turnover intention of the marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong. While turnover intention is a good measure of withdrawal, there are some other indicators which could be equally important. Current literature indicates that negative behavioral consequences such as organizational retaliatory behaviors and employee thefts are quite common when an employee develops negative perception on the organization. These behaviors are damaging and will affect the organizational efficiency of a corporation. Future studies on other measures of withdrawal are mandatory in helping the practitioners understand the complete withdrawal process.

7.4.7 Observation as a possible survey method

While the questionnaire method has been used to collect data on the turnover intention of the sample under study, future studies might consider using the observation method to draw up conclusion on the withdrawal behaviors. It is possible that collecting data on employees' work withdrawal behaviors through observation and interviews in their work places could provide more reliable readings than self-reporting. In addition, a straight approach has been adopted on the definition of "group" which simply includes all those people who work together and report to the same supervisor and have not taken into consideration the evaluation and assessment
from co-workers who might play an equally important role in the entire withdrawal process. The inconclusive findings from this study on task interdependence might suggest that due consideration should be given to the impact of co-workers on the withdrawal process if the complete picture is to be obtained.

7.4.8 Job Embeddedness

In connection with the study on organizational behavior, a new construct, called "job embeddedness" has been introduced. It includes individuals' (1) links to other people, teams and groups; (2) perceptions of their fit with job, organization and community; and (3) what they say they would have to sacrifice if they left their jobs. While research generally indicates that work attitudes do play their role in determining employee retention and leaving, their contribution seems to be surprisingly low (Horn and Griffeth 1995). Other factors besides job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job alternatives are equally important in understanding turnover (Maertz and Campion 1998). For example, Irving, Coleman and Cooper (1997) introduced a new measure of occupational commitment and Shore and Tetrick (1991) suggested an indicator of perceived organizational support.

The foundations of job embeddedness are basically from three different sets of ideas that have emerged from the growing literature. First of all, many off-the-job factors such as family attachments and conflicts between work and family roles could be important factors (Price and Mueller 1981). Secondly, a variety of organizational factors empirically associated with retention are not attitudinal in nature. For instance, many companies use "teams" to induce attachments (Cohen and Bailey 1997). Thirdly, many people who decide to leave organizations (1) are relatively satisfied with their jobs; (2) do not search for other jobs before leaving and (3) resign due to some triggering event (Lee and Mitchell 1994). All these results suggest why the attitude-search models only explain modestly well those who leave their jobs. Further research into this area is mandatory in understanding the turnover theory.
7.5 Impact of Employee Turnover

The cost of employee turnover depends on the quality of the employees who quit from the organization (Schwab 1991). Since the quality of employees has a direct bearing on their performance level (Cascio 1992), it would be interesting if studies can be conducted to determine whether the performance level of employees will have an impact on the turnover intention of the employees.

7.6 Implications for Business Practitioners

Results of this study offer interesting implications for business practitioners. The impact of one of the antecedents of organizational commitment - group/leader relations on the turnover intention of the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong has been examined. It has been found that employees derive significant benefits through their interactions with other parties in the organization. Leaders are expected to offer the mandatory support and actions to help their subordinates increase organizational commitment and job satisfaction and reduce the cost of withdrawal behaviors.

The following list of implications and strategies, while far from exhaustive, reflects some of the most salient considerations supported by the findings of this study and other related literature. It must be pointed out that the relatively weak relationship between most of the organizational and leadership constructs with organizational commitment and turnover intention with the exception of group cohesiveness and leader participation suggests that the results should be taken with caution. Due diligence must be exercised in comparing the results from this study with those in Singapore.

7.6.1 Hiring via Personal Networks

In this study, the findings support the hypothesis that the perception of group cohesiveness of local marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong, with the mediating effect of organizational commitment, is negatively related to turnover intention. In other words, the higher the group cohesiveness, the lower will
be turnover intention. This has direct link to the so-called "Pied Piper effect teams" or networks of people leaving one company for another - that is plaguing many organizations (Wysocki 2000). The trend highlights that employees who have strong social networks will be lured by other organizations, especially if they are seen by the recruiting organization as having the connection to entice a group of talent - a process referred to as "hiring via personal networks". While this practice tops the list of unappreciated practices in the new economy, the trend may be escalating. In fact, Krackhardt and Porter (1986) found evidence of turnover clusters or snowball effect in a study of fast food restaurants more than ten years ago. Business practitioners should be aware that the loss of key network members, especially when accompanied by the loss of other key network members, can be very costly to an organization's social fabric and eradicate its social capital altogether (Leana and Van Buren 1999).

The consequences of these voluntary turnover patterns and the corresponding loss of social capital in terms of organizational performance are unknown. McKinsey and Co. concluded that "the most important corporate resource over the next 20 years will be talent: smart, sophisticated business people who are technologically literate, globally astute and operationally agile" (Fishman, 1998).

Given the cost of losing key members of the organization, coupled with the significant regression results from group cohesiveness, practitioners are recommended to go through the questionnaire with special focus on the section related to group cohesiveness and leader participation to find out how marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong perceive the primary group in their organizations to which they belong. From there, practitioners can improve on the degree of cohesiveness of the group to which one belongs which in turn raises organizational commitment and redress turnover intention.

The predominant theoretical approach in examining voluntary turnover is the human capital theory. By definition, human capital is seen as the major determinant of productivity and because voluntary turnover diminishes human capital, productivity is weakened as turnover increases. Voluntary turnover may weaken organizational performance through the mediating role of lower productivity, but firms may attempt to match the costs of turnover with a corresponding level of investment in human
capital. Thus, regardless of whether or not an organization is knowledge-based, controlling replacement costs, retaining highly skilled employees and preserving social capital are important goals. As professionals are expected to be more loyal to their immediate workgroup than to their employing organization, hiring through network may not be a bad option if an organization needs to fulfill their recruitment needs within a short period of time (Capelli 2000; Feldman 2000).

7.6.2 Disaggregating the motives underlying Turnover Intention

While intention to quit an organization is one of the better predictors of actual turnover behavior, the intention-behavior relationship varies widely across studies. This is probably due to the fact that individuals have different motives for stating a high intention to quit and it is the motive that accounts in part for when the intention will manifest itself in actual turnover. The correlation between turnover intention and the act underlying it has received strong research support over the years (Greenwald et al. 1987; Sherman 1980). Although turnover intention is a much stronger predictor of turnover behavior than are other variables (e.g. job satisfaction), research shows that the strength of the relationship varies widely across studies (Steel 1990). Lee and Mowday (1987) also reported that intention to leave only explains 6% of the variance in employee turnover.

A different approach successful in identifying the sources of variance underlying various criterion-predictor relationships is through the study on motivation for or functionality underlying the cognition of interest to the attitude holder (Meyer et al. 1991; Vandenberg and Nelson 1999). Meyer, Bobocel and Allen (1991) found that organizational commitment motivated by affective reasons carried different functional relationships to a given set of variables than did commitment from continuance reasons. In other words, by identifying the motivation behind a given attitude, researchers can better understand that attitude's function to the individual and thereby more accurately specify its effects on the actual behavior. Thus, the implication is that high turnover intention does not necessarily result in voluntary turnover and it should not be assumed that turnover intention, once expressed, cannot be lowered. In fact, the recommendation for practitioners is that if the motive for expressing a high intention can be identified, and a change, either in policies or
circumstances, can be carried out, then a lowering of that intention should result as
the motive is neutralized.

7.6.3 Organizational Commitment and Mergers and Acquisitions

It is not too difficult to appreciate that individuals come to work for organizations to
fulfill certain basic needs and expectations. The level of organizational commitment
depends on whether the organization can fulfill those needs and expectations. Thus, a
basic need and expectation of many employees is, of course, organizational
perpetuity. If the organization does not remain viable, it will be unable to meet the
needs and expectations of the employees. It is also natural that a proposed merger
might heighten individual's interest in the potential viability of the organization. As a
result, it is natural to anticipate that organizational commitment will be higher among
employees who feel that the organization will continue being successful than for
employees who do not feel that the organization will continue to be successful
(Isabella 1990; Marks and Mirvis 1992; Schrader 2001). Apparently, the strategy is
to share with employees as much information as possible so that the employees will
feel being part of the merger process and raise their organizational commitment to
the organization.

7.6.4 Effective Communication

It is indisputable that effective communication between leaders and group associates
is mandatory in clarifying job requirements and avoiding misunderstanding. For new
employees, they should know their job descriptions and responsibilities before they
start. Orientation, formal and informal socialization and other training programs
would be useful in setting up the framework and enhance the understanding of the
individual employees as far as their job is concerned. Leaders and supervisors should
also conduct regular review to monitor progress and suggest effective remedial
actions to improve performance as much as possible. Rousseau (1995) further
pointed out that human resource practices, including recruitment procedures,
compensation practices and performance appraisals, all play a key role in the
interaction between leaders and subordinates.
Misunderstanding always occurs through misinterpretation of attitudes and lack of communication. Mikula, Petrik and Tanzer (1990) found that a significant percentage of employee's negative perception of organization arises from the manner in which individuals are being treated during interactions. Since the interactions between leaders and subordinates are supposed to be frequent and from time to time intimate, the way in which leaders convey the impression of the organization to the subordinates is extremely important. While leaders will try to be as impartial as possible, it is not too difficult to understand that bias will always occur in the communication process. When employees feel that they are being respected and fairly treated by their leaders, their turnover intention will drop and their impression of the organization will improve. In fact, Skarlicki and Folger (1997) even suggested that subordinates can tolerate a certain degree of unfair reward distribution and treatment provided that they are being treated fairly and their work is recognized.

7.6.5 Leader Participation

While a number of leadership behaviors which are mandatory in maintaining cordial relationship with the subordinates have been examined, leader participation stands out as one of the most important elements. It has been found that effective interaction between leaders and subordinates will bring about greater satisfaction toward supervision and consequently better performance (Liden et al. 1993). In particular, if leaders can spend more time in addressing the subordinates' issues and other problems, subordinates will appreciate the extra effort from the leaders, leading to higher commitment and better performance. In fact, some subordinates are prepared to go beyond the normal job requirements and reciprocate to their leaders at any point in time.

To be considerate, one must be a good listener. Leaders should spend more time in listening to the subordinates' specific issues, concerns, stumbling blocks in their performance and most important of all, their aspirations and expectations. This does not mean to say that leaders should try to be accommodative but at least leaders should be construed as the point where subordinates can turn to for support and enlightenment. When leaders discuss with subordinates on their concerns and issues, the supervisors should always step into the shoes of the subordinates and examine the
situation from the subordinates' perspective. This will encourage the subordinates to open themselves up and become more responsive to discussions. All these directives should be used to train and develop the leaders and supervisors for effective management. In today's context in which the emphasis is on trimming of operating costs while maximizing on individual's contribution, special emphasis on the development of leader participation will prove to be very useful.

7.7 Conclusion

With reference to the research questions and research objectives on Page 6, this study has achieved the following:

Firstly, based on a thorough review of the current literature coupled with a comprehensive review of the theoretical model on organizational factors and leadership factors with turnover intention, a research model with organizational commitment as the mediating variable has been developed.

Secondly, a field study using questionnaire as the medium of collecting information on the local marketing executives of foreign securities firms in Hong Kong has been conducted. In particular, the relationships between employee and organization and between employee and supervisors and their overall impact on turnover intention have been examined. Based on the information collected, the proposed hypotheses outlined in Chapter 3 were tested and the results analyzed. A number of steps were taken to verify reliability of the data before the findings were summarized.

Thirdly, the significant relationship between organizational commitment and a number of organizational behaviors such as lateness, absenteeism, etc. has led to the study on how organizational commitment can work as a mediating variable in the relationships between the organizational and leadership constructs and turnover intention.

Fourthly, special factors such as the importance that one would attach to being recognized as part of a group in a relationship-centered Chinese context and how that
group mentality might have prompted executives to change jobs as a group have been identified and discussed.

Fifthly, a detailed discussion on the implications for business practitioners including senior management, front line supervisors, and human resource managers was made. In addition, appropriate suggestions were put forth to the researchers on the possible areas of study that could mitigate employee withdrawals.
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Appendix 1 – ORBIS

ORBIS – An Introduction
ORBIS, which is the full name, envisions a world in which avoidable blindness is eliminated. A world of quality eye care and treatment for every human being, especially for the more than 180 million who are blind, severely visually impaired or at risk of becoming blind. Right now, 80% of those who are blind do not need to be. Millions can be cured with techniques routinely practised in many countries.

A global humanitarian organization, ORBIS works in developing countries to save sight through hands-on training, public health education, and improved access to eye care. Since 1982, ORBIS has completed more than 440 programs in 80 countries. It has trained in excess of 50,000 ophthalmologists, nurses, biomedical engineers and other health care workers who, in turn, provide treatment and training in their countries. Worldwide, more than 23,070 patients have been directly treated by ORBIS volunteer doctors and more than nine million people have received eye care from ORBIS-trained doctors.

ORBIS has developed an ambitious strategic plan outlining its efforts to eliminate avoidable blindness. The plan utilizes three programme models: Comprehensive, multi-year country programmes; short-term country programmes tailored to the need of partnering institutions and the regions they serve; and training programmes in ophthalmic subspecialties with or without the ORBIS DC-10 flying eye hospital. ORBIS also conducts surgical, nursing, biomedical engineering, and system support training at local hospitals.

Funds for the US$25 million annual budget come from a variety of sources including gifts, grants and gifts-in-kind from major corporations, foundations, government agencies and individuals around the world.

Source: from the website of ORBIS
Appendix 2: Covering Letter

October 28, 2001

Dear Colleagues,

We need your help with a project that we believe is vital in maintaining the reputation of the marketing professionals in our securities industry.

This survey is an integral part of the fact finding process to identify the important job dimensions and tasks performed by the marketing professionals. Your responses will help us learn more about the underlying factors associated with the performance and behavior of such professionals in their organizations. The value of a study like this one is directly related to the number of individuals who return the completed questionnaires. We would appreciate it if you could take the time to complete the questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed envelope to us.

This study is for my doctoral thesis and the information furnished to us will be strictly for research purposes only. All codes on the survey are for matching purposes – they cannot be used to identify anybody in any way. We can assure you that all the information will be strictly confidential and anonymous. Based on your response, we will make recommendations to the securities firms in Hong Kong to create an environment which is conducive to performance.

In appreciation of your contribution to this research, we will donate HK$20 to ORBIS for each completed set of questionnaire that we receive. In the meantime, if you have any questions about the study, please contact me at 9023-8890 or one of my supervisors, Professor Dean Tjosvold at 2467-0982.

Thank you very much for your support.

Yours sincerely,

Sit Yiu Sun
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Management
Lingnan University
Tel. No: 9023-8890
Email:kentson1@netvigator.com
### Appendix 3: List of Securities Dealers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia Securities International Ltd</td>
<td>23/F, Office Tower Convention Plaza, 1, Harbour Road, Wanchai, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2828 0288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26/F, Citibank Tower, 3, Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2593 2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Stearns Asia Ltd</td>
<td>22/F &amp; 23/F, New World Tower 1, 18, Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2825 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP Prime Peregrine Securities (HK) Ltd</td>
<td>2-3/F, Ka Wah Bank Centre, 232, Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2287 6876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargary Securities Ltd</td>
<td>3601, Two Exchange Square, 8, Connaught Place, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2526 4211/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazenove Asia Ltd</td>
<td>2001, Cheung Kong Centre, 2, Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2913 6328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF Brokerage Ltd</td>
<td>30/F, Two Pacific Place, 88, Queensway, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2530 2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Pacific Securities International Ltd</td>
<td>33/F, Tower Two, Lippo Centre, 89, Queensway, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2810 9338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Lyonnais Securities (Asia) Ltd</td>
<td>Suite 1711-14, Jardine House, 1, Connaught Place, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2845 6332/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daewoo Securities (HK) Ltd</td>
<td>Level 26, One Pacific Place, 88, Queensway, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2525 0121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiwa Securities (Asia) Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Tel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS Securities Hong Kong Ltd</td>
<td>26/F, Citic Tower, 1, Time Mei Avenue, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2526 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Securities Asia Ltd</td>
<td>55/F, Cheung Kong Centre, 2, Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2868 0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. R. Zimmern Ltd</td>
<td>1601A, One Exchange Square, 8, Connaught Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2810 0331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. K. Goh Securities (HK) Ltd</td>
<td>1805-9, Alexandra House, 16-20, Chater Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2868 0380/2532 1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBC Broking Securities Asia Ltd</td>
<td>3/F, Hutchison House, 10, Harcourt Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2521 1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBC Securities Asia Ltd</td>
<td>Level 17, 1, Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2843 9111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indosuez W.I. Carr Securities Ltd</td>
<td>43/F, One Exchange Square, 8, Connaught Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2820 7373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Barings Securities (HK) Ltd</td>
<td>34-39/F, One International Finance Centre, 1, Harbour View Street, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2848 8488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jardine Fleming Broking Ltd</td>
<td>43-47/F, Jardine House, 1, Connaught Place, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2843 8888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferies Pacific Ltd</td>
<td>Room 2805, 9, Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2822 9188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS Cresvale Securities Asia Ltd</td>
<td>701-4A, Asia Pacific Finance Tower, Citibank Plaza, 3, Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2810 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Tel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippo Securities Ltd</td>
<td>2302, Tower One, Lippo Centre, 89, Queensway, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2845 7711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Lynch (Asia Pacific) Ltd</td>
<td>18/F &amp; 22/F, Asia Pacific Finance Tower, 3, Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2509 3261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Lynch International Place</td>
<td>30/F, Three Exchange Square, 8, Connaught Place, Central, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2848 5200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Morgan Stanley Dean Witter Asia Ltd                                 | 4701, Manulife Plaza, The Lee Gardens, 33, Hysan Avenue, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong | 2844 8228/
| New Japan Securities International (HK) Ltd                         | Unit 1706-07, 17/F, Two Exchange Square, Central, Hong Kong               | 2842 1111|
| Nikko Securities Co (Asia) Ltd                                      | 20/F - 21/F, Citibank Tower, 3, Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong           | 2536 1111|
| Nomura International (HK) Ltd                                       | 6/F, Euro Trade Centre, 13-14, Connaught Road, Central, Hong Kong         | 2868 0968|
| Okachi Investments (HK) Co Ltd                                      | 1401-1402, New World Tower, 16-18, Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong       | 2526 5961|
| Okasan International (Asia) Ltd                                     | 9/F, Grand Building, 15-18, Connaught Road, Central, Hong Kong            | 2524 3127/
<p>| Prudential Brokerage Ltd                                            | 2521 3084                                                              |           |
| Prudential-Bache Securities (HK) Ltd                                | 40/F, Asia Pacific Finance Tower, 3, Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong      | 2841 2800|
| Salomon Smith Barney Hong Kong Ltd                                 | 20/F, Three Exchange Square, 8, Connaught Place, Central, Hong Kong       | 2501 2000|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan International Securities (HK) Ltd</td>
<td>Unit 1010, 10/F, Tower II, Lippon Centre, 88, Queensway, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2973 0989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4007, Tower Two, Lippon Centre, 89, Queensway, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2840 1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3413-3422, Two Pacific Place, 88, Queensway, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2801 1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19/F, Far East Finance Centre, 16, Harbour Road, Admiralty, Hong Kong</td>
<td>2820 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Securities (HK) Co Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Water House Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickers Ballas HK Securities Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Opinion Survey for Marketing Professionals

Please answer the questions in this survey by circling the number that best represents your response

Section I

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives below each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.

I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.

I feel very little loyalty to this organization.

I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.

I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.

I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.

This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.

I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.

There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.

Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees.

I really care about the fate of this organization.

For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.

Section II – Your Supervisor

He makes his attitudes clear to the group.

He rules with an iron hand.

He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.

He schedules the work to be done.

He maintains definite standards of performance.

He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.

He encourages the use of uniform procedures.

He lets group members know what is expected of them.
He sees to it that the work of group members is co-ordinated.

He offers new approaches to problems.

He insists that he be informed on decisions made by subordinates under him.

He lets others do their work the way they think best.

He encourages overtime work

He stresses being ahead of competing work groups.

**Section III – Your Supervisor**

He does personal favors for group members.

He is easy to understand.

He refuses to explain his actions.

He acts without consulting the group.

He backs up the members in their actions.

He treats all group members as his equals.

He is friendly and approachable.

He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.

He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.

He refuses to give in when people disagree with him.

He demands more than we can do.

He helps his subordinates with their personal problems.

He criticizes his subordinates in front of others.

He stands up for his subordinates even though it makes him unpopular.

He rejects suggestions for changes.

He changes the duties of people under him without first talking it over with them.

He treats people under him without considering their feelings.

He tries to keep the subordinates under him in good standing with those in higher authority.

He stresses the importance of high morale among those under him.

How do you rate your chances of still working here for
Three months from now

Six months from now

One year from now
Two years from now

**Section IV**
There is little doubt about the best way to get the work done.

I am often required to perform nonroutine tasks.

I can predict with near certainty exactly what activities I will be performing everyday.

There is really only one correct way to perform most of my tasks.

My job duties are so simple that almost anyone could perform them after a little bit of instruction and practice.

It is so hard to figure out the correct approach to most of my work problems that second-guessers would have a field day.

**Section V**
For feedback about how well I am performing, I rely on members of my work group other than my supervisor.

The quantity of work I turn out depends on the performance of members of my work group other than my superior.

The quality of work I turn out depends largely on the performance of members of my work group other than my superior.

I receive very useful information and advice from members of my work group other than my superior.

I am dependent on members of my work group other than my superior for important organizational rewards.

My job satisfaction depends to a considerable extent on members of my work group other than my superior.

**Section VI**
When some important matter comes up that concerns me, my supervisor seeks out my ideas on the question before a decision is made.

All in all, I have very little influence in supervisory decisions that affect my work group in important ways.

Our supervisor is inclined to accept the opinions of the work group in important decisions about job-related matters.

I get few opportunities, if any, to participate in the supervisory decisions that affect the significant aspects of my job.

If I had a suggestion for improvement to make, it would be difficult for me to get a real hearing on it from my supervisor.

How would you rate your chances of
Quitting in the next three months
Quitting sometime in the next six months
Quitting sometime in the next year
Quitting sometime in the next two years
Section VII
Our supervisor is highly respected by the members of the work group. 1 2 3 4 5
Our work group is not satisfied with the way our supervisor is doing his job. 1 2 3 4 5
All in all, I like our supervisor quite a lot. 1 2 3 4 5
Our group pushes hard and really turns out a lot of work. 1 2 3 4 5
The quality of work done by the group could stand a lot of improvement. 1 2 3 4 5
Our group doesn’t show much willingness to change to new and different ways of doing things. 1 2 3 4 5

Section VIII
How effective is your group in communicating the information it acquires?
(1. Not effective at all  2. Not very effective  3. Effective  4. Very effective  5. Extremely effective) 1 2 3 4

How much emphasis does your group place upon communication of the information it acquires?
1. No emphasis  2. Little emphasis  3. Some emphasis  4. Much emphasis  5. Extreme emphasis) 1 2 3 4 5

What is your responsibility for communicating information to other people in your group?
1. I do not consider this to be part of my job. 2. It is not a requirement of my job, but I sometimes pass information on to others in the group.
3. I sometimes do this if directed by others.
4. It is a necessary requirement of my job.
5. This is the most important requirement of my job.) 1 2 3 4 5

How would you rate the amount of information which is communicated within your group?
(1. Information is not passed along to others at all.
2. Most information is passed along to others, but it frequently does not get to everyone who needs it.
3. Information usually gets passed along to where it can be used.
4. Information nearly always gets to everyone who needs to use it.
5. Nearly all information gets passed along to everyone whether they need it or not.) 1 2 3 4 5

How would you rate the accuracy of the communication of information within your group?

How would you rate the timeliness of communication of information within your group?
(1. Information is seldom passed on promptly and quickly.
2. Sometimes passed on promptly and quickly.
3. Often passed on promptly and quickly.
4. Nearly always passed on promptly and quickly.
5. Always promptly and quickly passed on.) 1 2 3 4 5

To what extent are members within the group kept informed as to how well the group is accomplishing its goals?
(1. Members seldom, if ever, know whether or not the group is accomplishing its goals.
2. Members are sometimes kept informed.
3. Members are often kept informed.
4. Members are usually kept informed.
5. Members always know whether or not the group is accomplishing its goals.) 1 2 3 4 5

Section IX - Demographic Information about yourself.
( Please tick against the appropriate item)
Age  20-25 ( )  26-30 ( )  31-35 ( )  36-40 ( )  41-45 ( )  46-50 ( )  Above 50 ( )
Gender  Male ( )  Female ( )
Race  Chinese ( )  Others ( ) Please specify: __________________________

Education  Secondary ( )  University ( )
            Postgraduate ( )  Others ( ) Please specify: __________________________

Tenure with the company ________________ Year(s)

Working experience in this field __________ Year(s)

What is your daily office hour From _____ A.M. to _____ P.M.

Do you need to work on Saturdays? Yes/No

On an average, how many hours do you work each week? ________ Hours per week

Number of days absent in the past two months _________ Day(s)
Appendix 5: Questionnaire items measuring organizational commitment

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible perceptions that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own perceptions about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternative alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 6: Questionnaire items measuring group cohesiveness

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the degree of cohesiveness of the group to which one belongs. With respect to your own perceptions about the primary group in your organization to which you belong, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Cohesiveness</td>
<td>1. For feedback about how well I am performing, I rely on members of my work group other than my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The quantity of work I turn out depends on the performance of members of my work group other than my superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The quality of work I turn out depends largely on the performance of members of my work group other than my superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I receive very useful information and advice from members of my work group other than my superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I am dependent on members of my work group other than my superior for important organizational rewards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. My job satisfaction depends to a considerable extent on members of my work group other than my superior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Questionnaire items measuring group commitment

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the degree of commitment of the group to which one belongs.

With respect to your own perceptions about the primary group in your organization to which you belong, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Commitment</td>
<td>1. Our supervisor is highly respected by the members of the work group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Our work group is not satisfied with the way our supervisor is doing his/her job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. All in all, I like our supervisor quite a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Our group pushes hard and really turns out a lot of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The quality of work done by the group could stand a lot of improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Our group doesn’t show much willingness to change to new and different ways of doing things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Questionnaire items measuring demographic data

(No please tick against the appropriate item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>20-25 ( )</th>
<th>26-30 ( )</th>
<th>31-35 ( )</th>
<th>36-40 ( )</th>
<th>41-45 ( )</th>
<th>46-50 ( )</th>
<th>Above 50 ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male ( )</td>
<td>Female ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Chinese ( )</td>
<td>Others ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify: ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Secondary ( )</td>
<td>University ( )</td>
<td>Postgraduate ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify: ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure with the company ___________________________ Year(s)

Working experience in this field ___________________________ Year(s)

What is your daily office hour  From _______ A.M. to _______ P.M.

Do you need to work on Saturdays? Yes/No

On an average, how many hours do you work each week? ________ Hours per week

Number of days absent in the past two months ________ Day(s)
Appendix 9: Questionnaire items measuring task interdependence

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the nature of their jobs. With respect to your own perceptions about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td>1. There is little doubt about the best way to get the work done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I am often required to perform non-routine tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I can predict with near certainty exactly what activities I will be performing everyday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. There is really only one correct way to perform most of my tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. My job duties are so simple that almost anyone could perform them after a little bit of instruction and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. It is so hard to figure out the correct approach to most of my work problems that second-guessers would have a field day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Questionnaire items measuring leader initiating structure

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the initiating structure of the leader of the group (designated by “He/She” in the statement) to which one belongs. In the following sections, the word, “group”, should be regarded as a collective noun and interpreted as many groups as one belongs. With respect to your own perceptions about the primary group in your organization to which you belong, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>1. He/She makes his/her attitudes clear to the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. He/She rules with an iron hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. He/She speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. He/She schedules the work to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. He/She maintains definite standards of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. He/She emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. He/She encourages the use of uniform procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. He/She lets group members know what is expected of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. He/She sees to it that the work of group members is co-ordinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. He/She offers new approaches to problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. He/She insists that he/she be informed on decisions made by subordinates under him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. He/She lets others do their work the way they think best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. He/She encourages overtime work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. He/She stresses being ahead of competing work groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 11: Questionnaire items measuring leader consideration

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the degree of consideration of the leader of the group (designated by "He/She" in the statement) to which one belongs. With respect to your own perceptions about the primary group in your organization to which you belong, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Consideration</td>
<td>1. He/She does personal favors for group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. He/She is easy to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. He/She refuses to explain his/her actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. He/She acts without consulting the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. He/She backs up the members in their actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. He/She treats all group members as his/her equals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. He/She is friendly and approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. He/She makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. He/She puts suggestions made by the group into operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. He/She gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. He/She refuses to give in when people disagree with him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. He/She demands more than we can do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. He/She helps his/her subordinates with their personal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. He/She criticizes his/her subordinates in front of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. He/She stands up for his/her subordinates even though it makes him/her unpopular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. He/She rejects suggestions for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. He/She changes the duties of people under him/her without first talking it over with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. He/She treats people under him/her without considering their feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. He/She tries to keep the subordinates under him/her in good standing with those in higher authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. He/She stresses the importance of high morale among those under him/her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: Questionnaire items measuring leader participation

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the degree of participation by the leader of the group to which one belongs. With respect to your own perceptions about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Participation</td>
<td>1. When some important matter comes up that concerns me, my supervisor seeks out my ideas on the question before a decision is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. All in all, I have very little influence in supervisory decisions that affect my work group in important ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Our supervisor is inclined to accept the opinions of the work group in important decisions about job-related matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I get few opportunities, if any, to participate in the supervisory decisions that affect the significant aspects of my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. If I had a suggestion for improvement to make, it would be difficult for me to get a real hearing on it from my supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13: Questionnaire items measuring leader communication

Listed below are a series of statements that individuals may have on the degree of communication of the group to which one belongs. With respect to your own perceptions about the particular organizations for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the five alternatives alongside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Communication</td>
<td>1. How effective is your group in communicating the information it acquires?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Not effective at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Not very effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Very effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Extremely effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How much emphasis does your group place upon communication of the information it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acquires?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. No emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Little emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Some emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Much emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Extreme emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What is your responsibility for communicating information to other people in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. I do not consider this to be part of my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. It is not a requirement of my job, but I sometimes pass information on to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I sometimes do this if directed by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. It is a necessary requirement of my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. This is the most important requirement of my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How would you rate the amount of information which is communicated within your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Information is not passed along to others at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Most information is passed along to others, but it frequently does not get to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>everyone who needs it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Information usually gets passed along to where it can be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Information nearly always gets to everyone who needs to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Nearly all information gets passed along to everyone whether they need it or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 13: Questionnaire items measuring leader communication (Con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. How would you rate the accuracy of the communication of information</td>
<td>1. Seldom accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within your group?</td>
<td>2. Sometimes accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How would you rate the timeliness of communication of information</td>
<td>3. Usually accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within your group?</td>
<td>4. Very accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To what extent are members within the group kept informed as to how</td>
<td>5. Extremely accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well the group is accomplishing its goals?</td>
<td>1. Information is seldom passed on promptly and quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Members seldom, if ever, know whether or not the group is accomplishing</td>
<td>2. Sometimes passed on promptly and quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its goals?</td>
<td>3. Often passed on promptly and quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Members are sometimes kept informed.</td>
<td>4. Nearly always passed on promptly and quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Members are often kept informed.</td>
<td>5. Always promptly and quickly passed on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Members are usually kept informed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Members always know whether or not the group is accomplishing its goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 14: Questionnaire items measuring turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>How do you rate your chances of still working here for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.         Three months from now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.         Six months from now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.         One year from now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.         Two years from now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your chances of quitting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.         Quitting in the next three months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.         Quitting sometime in the next six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.         Quitting sometime in the next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.         Quitting sometime in the next two years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 15: Questionnaire items measuring demographic data

(Please tick against the appropriate item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>20-25 ( )</th>
<th>26-30 ( )</th>
<th>31-35 ( )</th>
<th>36-40 ( )</th>
<th>41-45( )</th>
<th>46-50 ( )</th>
<th>Above 50 ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male ( )</td>
<td>Female ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Chinese ( )</td>
<td>Others ( )</td>
<td>Please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Secondary ( )</td>
<td>University ( )</td>
<td>Postgraduate( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others ( )</td>
<td>Please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure with the company ________________ Year(s)

Working experience in this field __________ Year(s)

What is your daily office hour From _______ A.M. to _______ P.M.

Do you need to work on Saturdays? Yes/No

On an average, how many hours do you work each week? _______ Hours per week

Number of days absent in the past two months __________ Day(s)