Organizational Commitment, Supervisory Commitment, and Employee Outcomes in the Chinese Context: Proximal Hypothesis or Global Hypothesis?

Author(s): Bor-Shiuan Cheng, Ding-Yu Jiang, Jean H. Riley

Source: *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (May, 2003), pp. 313-334

Published by: John Wiley & Sons

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4093772>

Accessed: 01/10/2009 04:32

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jwiley>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

John Wiley & Sons is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and employee outcomes in the Chinese context: proximal hypothesis or global hypothesis?

BOR-SHIUAN CHENG^{1*}, DING-YU JIANG¹ AND JEAN H. RILEY²

¹*Department of Psychology, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan*

²*Department of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Alliant International University, San Diego, CA, U.S.A.*

Summary

This study examines the relationship between organizational commitment and supervisory commitment (commitment to supervisor) in terms of their effects on employee outcomes in the Chinese context. Based on the principle of compatibility, we hypothesized that organizational commitment and supervisory commitment served as logical mediators (global hypothesis and proximal hypothesis) for predicting organization-relevant and leader-relevant outcomes respectively. Moreover, because of the impact of personalism in Chinese culture, we predicted that supervisory commitment also significantly influenced organization-relevant outcomes, in addition to its effect on leader-relevant outcomes. Two separate questionnaires were administered to 538 subordinates and their supervisors in Taiwanese companies. Structural equation modeling and hierarchical block regression analysis shows that the principle of compatibility and personalism can explain the proposed relationship in this study. Implications and research directions are discussed in light of Chinese culture for future investigation into organizational commitment and supervisory commitment. Copyright © 2003 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Introduction

In the past several decades, a great deal of research has focused on the effects of organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Previous studies have demonstrated that organizational commitment is positively related to employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction (Bateman & Strausser, 1984), attendance (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), prosocial organizational behavior (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), and job performance (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), and negatively related to turnover intention (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). However, these studies typically have only focused on organizational commitment and have not investigated the effects of different foci of

*Correspondence to: Bor-Shiuan Cheng, Department of Psychology, National Taiwan University, #1 Sec. 4-Roosevelt Road, Taipei, Taiwan 106. E-mail: chengbor@ccms.ntu.edu.tw

Contract/grant sponsor: Ministry of Education, Republic of China.
Contract/grant number: 89-H-FA01-2-4-4.

Received 2 November 2001
Revised 24 September 2002
Accepted 2 January 2003

commitment. Reichers (1985), one of the early foci of commitment researchers, noted that the general concepts of organizational commitment might be best understood as a collection of commitments. She argued that employees could experience several different commitments to the goals and values of multiple groups within the organization. Thus, within an organization, it is important not only to understand the simple organizational commitment but also the foci of commitment. Using the multi-foci commitment approach, Becker (1992) provided support for reconceptualizing employee attachment as a multiple-foci phenomenon. He demonstrated employees' foci of commitment (e.g., commitment to top management, supervisor, and workgroups) account for unique variances in job satisfaction, intention to quit, and prosocial organizational behaviors above and beyond the variance of commitment to organization.

Reanalyzing data from Becker's study (1992), Hunt and Morgan (1994) illustrated that organizational commitment is a key mediating concept; organizational commitment directly influences the various organizational outcomes, and foci-specific commitments influence those outcomes only by way of their influences on organizational commitment. Hunt and Morgan's work suggested that organizational commitment is a global construct, and therefore we called their key mediating model the 'global hypothesis'. Unlike Hunt and Morgan, however, Becker, Billing, Eveleth, and Gilbert (1996) argued that local foci, such as supervisor or workgroup, are psychologically more proximal than global foci (i.e., top management or organization) and thus local foci would influence subordinate behavior more than would global foci. Using regression analysis, their results showed that supervisory commitment is more positively associated with job performance than is organizational commitment. Becker et al.'s model highlighted that local foci have stronger influences on employees' attitudes and behaviors than do global foci. Consequently, we called Becker et al.'s model the 'proximal hypothesis'.

But why did the conflicting results occur in the studies of Hunt and Morgan (1994) and Becker et al. (1996)? Although it seems like two competing hypotheses have provided different explanations, the principle of compatibility, proposed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) and Ajzen (1989), can integrate the competing findings. According to Ajzen (1989), the principle of compatibility suggested that the relationship between a given attitude and other attitudes or behaviors is based on the attitudes and behaviors having the same targets. As a result, we suggest that the global hypothesis is better suited for predicting organization-relevant outcomes, such as job satisfaction and turnover intention, while the proximal hypothesis is more conducive in explaining the leader-relevant outcomes, such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and job performance.

Furthermore, there is limited information on the generalizability of applying Western findings to Chinese society. For instance, unlike Western culture, Chinese culture fosters a strong vertical linkage between supervisor and subordinate (Redding, 1990). Therefore, supervisory commitment is more important in the Chinese context than it is in the Western context.

If foci-specific commitments are to become more useful concepts for understanding organization phenomena, then studies based on more comprehensive theories need to be undertaken. In addition, if the research findings are to become more valuable and relevant for Chinese organizations, it is necessary for researchers to use Chinese organizations for organizational research. Thus, the purpose of this study is to explicitly investigate the relationship between organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and employee outcomes as well as to test the global and proximal hypotheses in the Chinese context.

Organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and employee outcomes

Early commitment studies focused on organizational commitment as a single dimension. Reichers (1985, 1986), however, has proposed a multiple constituency model of organizational commitment

and suggested employees could commit to different constituencies (or foci) such as top managers, supervisors, coworkers, union, and customers in the organization. Additionally, employees could also commit differentially to these constituencies due to the degree of congruence between the individuals' and constituencies' goals and values. Following her perspectives, several studies (Becker et al., 1996; Hunt & Morgan, 1994) investigating the relationship between organizational commitment and constituency-specific commitment were conducted.

Hunt and Morgan (1994) performed an in-depth study using structural equation modeling to specifically examine the relationship between organizational commitment, constituency-specific commitments, and employee outcomes. The two hypotheses tested in their study were as follows: (a) organizational commitment, like other constituency commitments, is one of the commitments having independent influence on employee outcomes; and (b) organizational commitment is a key construct mediating the relationship between other constituency-specific commitments and employee outcomes. Using the data reported in Becker's study (1992), Hunt and Morgan found the second model (key mediating construct) is a better model than the first model (one of many); that is, organizational commitment is a mediating variable between constituency-specific commitments and employee outcomes. Thus, the key mediating model (global hypothesis) suggested organizational commitment is a global concept and constituency-specific commitments influence the employee outcomes by contributing to global organizational commitment.

Although in Hunt and Morgan's study (1994) the key mediating model best explained relationships between organizational commitment, constituency-specific commitments, and employee outcomes, the model still needed further testing. Based on field theory (Lewin, 1943), in which the psychologically proximal factor should have a dominant effect on behavior, Becker et al. (1996) suggested local foci are psychologically more proximal than are global foci and, therefore, leader-relevant factors should have a bigger impact on monitoring, rewarding, and influencing employee behavior. Through proximity and regular interaction with supervisors, it is easier for employees to seek and receive feedback on behaviors that are consistent with supervisors' values and goals. Becker et al.'s results did not support Hunt and Morgan's mediating construct model. Rather, Becker et al.'s finding showed supervisory commitment has a stronger direct relationship with performance than organizational commitment. Therefore, the proximal hypothesis was supported in Becker et al.'s study.

The theories proposed by Hunt and Morgan (1994) and Becker et al. (1996) seem to conflict. One of the ways to reconcile the findings between Hunt and Morgan and Becker et al. is to examine the different outcome variables each used. Based on the principle of compatibility perspective, Becker and Billing (1993) suggested that commitments toward global foci are more strongly related to organization-relevant outcomes whereas commitments to local foci are more strongly related to leader or coworker-relevant outcomes. Their study classified outcome variables into two categories: (a) global outcomes (organization-relevant), including overall satisfaction, intent to quit, and overall prosocial organizational behavior, and (b) local outcomes (leader-relevant), including satisfaction with supervisor and coworkers, and prosocial behavior directed toward the supervisor and coworkers. The same global outcomes described here were used in Hunt and Morgan's work, and that could be the reason why the results of Hunt and Morgan's study showed that organizational commitment is more strongly correlated with outcomes than supervisory commitment.

Although Becker and Billing (1993) treated overall prosocial organizational behavior as a global outcome, a critical review demonstrated that supervisors play a key role in influencing citizenship behavior because they can administer rewards contingent upon subordinates' citizenship behavior (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). In addition, some researchers further separated OCB into individually directed or organizationally directed citizenship behaviors (Williams & Anderson, 1991) implying that OCB are local-relevant or global-relevant behaviors. However, in Eastern collectivist culture, Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) suggested that OCB is a leader-relevant

phenomenon rather than an organization-relevant one. Moreover, similar to OCB, job performance is also a local outcome because supervisors have significant or dominant influences on subordinates' performance appraisals (Aryee et al., 2002; Becker et al., 1996). Because this study focuses on OCB in the Chinese context, we adopted Aryee et al.'s point of view, and treat OCB as a local (leader-relevant) outcome.

Although there are various commitment foci, supervisory commitment is the most influential one (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Becker & Billing, 1993; Becker et al., 1996; Gregersen, 1993). For this reason, this study focuses on investigating supervisory commitment. According to previous studies, we believe that the principle of compatibility should provide a better framework for understanding the relationship between organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and employee outcomes. To further test the principle of compatibility in the Chinese context, this study would examine (a) two global outcomes, including job satisfaction and turnover intention and (b) three local outcomes, including OCB, supervisor-rating job performance, and self-rating job performance. The first two hypotheses illustrate our conceptual framework:

Hypothesis 1: There are direct relationships between organizational commitment and global outcomes.

Hypothesis 1a: There is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1b: There is a negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2: There are direct relationships between supervisory commitment and local outcomes.

Hypothesis 2a: There is a positive relationship between supervisory commitment and OCB.

Hypothesis 2b: There is a positive relationship between supervisory commitment and supervisor-rating job performance.

Hypothesis 2c: There is a positive relationship between supervisory commitment and subordinate's self-rating job performance.

Culture influences and personalism effects

Culture plays a significant role in the interaction between supervisors and subordinates, and consequently culture differences may influence the degree of subordinates' supervisory commitment (Trompenaars, 1993). While the principle of compatibility suggests there will be no direct relationship between supervisory commitment and organization-relevant outcomes, this is not the case in the Eastern culture. Hofstede (1993) noted that most organizational behavior theories are constructed in Western culture, which represent individualistic cultures believing that everyone is supposed to take care of his or her own interests, and one's identity is grounded in the individual and in that person's achievements. Organizational dynamics in individualistic societies stress calculative exchanges between the organization and employee (Chemers, 1997); the LMX theory, for example, presents the mutual commitment between supervisors and subordinates (Graen & Scandura, 1987).

On the other hand, collectivistic cultures emphasize the responsibilities to and support from one's in-group (Hofstede, 1980, 1983, 1993). In collectivist cultures, leadership is more of a group-focused phenomenon in which one of the leader's most important functions is to unite an 'in-group' identity among team members, thereby eliciting from followers the selflessness and loyalty owed to in-groups

(Chemers, 1997). Therefore, the leader-member relationship in collectivistic culture, especially in the Chinese context, is not a form of mutual commitment but rather an unequal relationship (Hofstede & Bond, 1988), which highlights the subordinate's loyalty to the supervisor (Cheng, 1995; Farh & Cheng, 2000). Thus, the supervisor will never 'commit' to his/her subordinates. Instead, the supervisor can view the subordinate as 'trustworthy', which is a reciprocal norm of the supervisor initiated by his/her subordinate's loyalty (Cheng, 1999). Silin (1976) and Redding's (1990) studies showed that leadership style in the Chinese context (e.g., Taiwanese and Hong Kong enterprises) enhances subordinates' personalized loyalty, which fosters the linkage between subordinates and the specific supervisor. Triandis (1994, 1995) called this vertical linkage a form of vertical collectivism that stems from Chinese family life (Yang, 1995, 1998).

Obviously, supervisory commitment, as a vertical linkage, is contrary to Western perspectives to leader-member relationship on a mutual or equal basis. The notions of vertical and one-way loyalty would create more legitimate and informal power for supervisors in the Chinese context than their Western counterparts. These unique phenomena represent the Chinese cultural characteristic called personalism, also referred to as particularism, which is a major force that dominates the management practice in most Chinese organizations (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997). According to Redding (1990), 'Personalism is the tendency to allow personal relationships to enter into decision making' (p. 135), which implies that in Chinese society the subordinate's successful organizational life is based on the appropriate relationship with the supervisor. Furthermore, Silin (1976) noted, 'the chief, and to a lesser extent superiors in general, is free to act arbitrarily and inconsistently. Subordinates are expected to accept such behavior' (p. 63). Consequently, when conflicting goals exist between supervisor and the organization, subordinates will inevitably face the conflict and have to 'take sides', choosing to whom to be loyal (Cheng, unpublished masters dissertation, National Taiwan University, 1996). Under the influence of personalism, subordinates will show more loyalty to their supervisor rather than to the organization, and supervisors are more likely to be concerned about subordinates' supervisory commitment and less concerned about subordinates' organizational commitment (Chi-Yin Cheng, unpublished, 1996).

Based on prior discussion, we hypothesized that supervisory commitment has relationships with global outcomes in addition to local outcomes in the Chinese context. Thus, our third hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 3: There are direct relationships between supervisory commitment and global outcomes.

Hypothesis 3a: There is a positive relationship between supervisory commitment and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: There is a negative relationship between supervisory commitment and turnover intention.

From an integrative perspective, our study examines four competing models illustrated in Figure 1. First, Figure 1(a) shows the global hypothesis, in which organizational commitment served as a key-mediating role between supervisory commitment and outcome variables. Second, Figure 1(b) presents the local hypothesis, in which supervisory commitment mediates the relationship between organizational commitment and outcome variables. Third, Figure 1(c) shows the hypothesis generated from the compatibility principle, in which organizational commitment influences only organization-relevant outcome variables, and supervisory commitment affects leader-relevant outcome variables without directly influencing organization-relevant outcome variables. Finally, Figure 1(d) illustrates the hypothetical cultural influences, namely personalism effect, which emphasizes the impact of the attachment to the supervisor in one's organizational life. We believed that the principle of compatibility

Figure 1. Hypothetic relationships derived from different perspectives

perspective would explain more variance than global or proximal hypothesis, and supervisory commitment would influence both the leader-relevant and organization-relevant outcome variables. Thus, our fourth and fifth hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis 4: The compatible hypothesis model is a better model to explain the relationship between organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and outcome variables than the global or proximal hypothesis models.

Hypothesis 5: The cultural hypothesis model is a better model to explain the relationship between organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and outcome variables than the compatible hypothesis model in the Chinese context.

Context

Business Group in Taiwan

The business group is an important type of organization in Chinese societies, which is similar to the situation of *Zaibatsu* in Japan and *Chaebol* in Korea. In Taiwan, the Top 100 enterprise groups only make up 6 per cent of the total workforce, while their employees produce a total amount of profit that reaches up to 45 per cent of the gross national product (GNP). In this study, we collected research data from subsidiary and partner companies of a Taiwan business group, abbreviated as H Group, for the year 1999. H Group is the third largest business group in Taiwan with a total asset value of \$34 billion in year 2000. Within the same year H Group employed over 18 000 people and made a profit of \$6 billion. H Group's core business is financial services, but it also holds a variety of other industries to maintain competitive. Currently, H Group has businesses in various industries such as banking, import/export trade, telecommunication and communication services, paper production, etc. H Group is headquartered in Taiwan, and it has bases of operation across several continents, such as North America, Europe, and Asia.

History of H Group

The rise of H Group is closely related to Taiwan's economic development after World War II. H Group represents the economic achievement and the industrial policy's success of Taiwan. When the National Government of the Republic of China moved to Taiwan in the 1950s, the government decided to release the ownership of government-owned stock in exchange for land to conduct land reform. This economic policy allowed landowners to transfer their assets from land to industry and commerce. The founder of H Group used this opportunity to take over Taiwan Concrete Enterprise and started to expand the cooperation. Furthermore, government-run enterprises were turned over to private citizens; this encouraged stocks and bonds to circulate in non-government circles, which later facilitated the stock market in Taiwan. During the 1960s, H Group established stock investment companies and commercial banks, complying with the Taiwan government's policy. Furthermore, H Group bought an unprofitable life insurance company as its response to the government's social welfare policy. It thus started the business related to investment and management of life insurance. After 1970, Taiwan gradually acquired a position in the international work system. This enabled H Group to start its manufacturing industry by producing rubber products, petrochemistry material, paper, and machinery. At the same time, H Group also began to engage in the business of real estate, rental, and advertisement. In the 1980s, financial investment became a crucial focus of development in Taiwan because of the globalizing trend for enterprises and liberalization of finance

around the world. Therefore, H Group broadened its stock investment range and established various professional investment companies such as entrepreneurial business investment companies, option market investment companies, and stock brokerage companies. In the 1990s, high-tech industry, especially the production of computers and electronic components, gradually became a vital industry in Taiwan. Accordingly, H Group then advanced into the high-tech sector and engaged itself in the manufacturing of computer terminals, monitors, and hard disks. With the growth of e-commerce, H Group expanded its business to telecommunication services. It used super-media as a multifunctional platform for connecting all its businesses and operation bases around the world. At present, H Group is continuing to develop in the direction of business-to-business (B2B) services, Internet software rental services, and Internet access using cable and broadband, with the expectation of transforming itself in the B2B market.

Management Philosophy of H Group

H Group's management style fully represents the characteristics of Chinese business groups. First, in terms of expansion policy, H Group is built up by outside investments based on family connections. Since all enterprises within H Group are owned by close relatives, there is a strong sense of *familism* permeating all the business groups. Second, in terms of decision making, H Group shows the style of *paternalistic leadership*. The family head is the leader of the enterprise group and the major decision maker. In other words, subsidiary enterprises' decisions, such as the assignment of important management personnel, transfer of funds or investment in new business, are determined through a group meeting led by the family head or some important family members. Subsidiary companies do not hold strong decision-making power. Third, in terms of manager recruitment in H group, *social tie* is a key issue for consideration. Such dynamics is a characteristic of the differential hierarchy in Chinese societies, which distinguishes employees into different types while specific power and responsibilities are authorized accordingly. This is very different from the contract-based hiring procedures of the Western enterprise. For a brief introduction on Taiwan business groups, please refer to Hamilton (1997). For more details about H Group, please read the study by Chien-Chih Kuo (unpublished doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan University, 1999).

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 538 subordinate-supervisor dyads from 59 Taiwanese companies in manufacturing, electronic, or service industries. In our subordinate sample, there are slightly more males (56.0 per cent) than females. Of these subordinate participants, the average age is 31.5 years ($SD = 5.8$) and the majority (86.9 per cent) had completed at least 2 years of college education with an average organizational tenure of 4.4 years ($SD = 3.7$). Of all the participants, 76.0 per cent were non-supervisory employees, 17.3 per cent were first-line supervisors, and 5.6 per cent were middle managers.

Procedure

To test our hypothesis, we collected data via executive MBA students who worked at 26 business enterprises of a major Taiwan business group. Most of these executive MBA students were middle managers in their companies. Each executive MBA student was given 20 subordinate/supervisor dyads' questionnaires and trained to collect the data via written and oral instructions.

There were two types of questionnaires: (a) subordinate questionnaire and (b) supervisor questionnaire. Using their own relationship network, these executive MBA students distributed one copy of the supervisor questionnaire and two copies of the subordinate questionnaire to each supervisor. Supervisors were then asked to give their subordinates the corresponding questionnaires in sealed envelopes. To reduce the possible bias of supervisors, we encouraged supervisors to select subordinates with dissimilar attributes when distributing the questionnaires. By giving two subordinate questionnaires to a supervisor, we would get two usable dyad questionnaires if the supervisor and both of his/her subordinates returned their questionnaires. The responses are confidential and anonymous. To protect the anonymity and confidentiality of supervisors and subordinates, we instructed participants to seal their completed questionnaires in the business-reply, postage-prepaid envelopes and mail the surveys directly to the researchers.

We precoded the questionnaires to ensure the linkage between the supervisor and corresponding subordinates. In addition, we instructed supervisors to write down the corresponding subordinates' precoded numbers on the cover page of supervisor questionnaire and then used the information to verify the accuracy of coding and matching of questionnaires. Finally, we also color-coded the questionnaires (subordinate questionnaire was white; supervisor questionnaire was blue) to make sure participants could distinguish and complete the appropriate questionnaires.

We distributed 330 supervisor questionnaires and 660 subordinate questionnaires and received 293 supervisor questionnaires and 567 subordinate questionnaires; a response rate of 88.8 per cent and 85.9 per cent, respectively. After deleting the unmatched supervisor-subordinate pairs, a total of 538 supervisor-subordinate dyads remained in our study—a response rate of 81.5 per cent from the original sample.

Measures

In our study, we examined two types of employee outcomes: (a) global outcomes, including job satisfaction and turnover intention; and (b) local outcomes, such as job performance and OCB.

The subordinate questionnaire measured subordinates' supervisory commitment, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intention, job performance, perceived organization support, perceived supervisor support, and demographic attributes, whereas the supervisor questionnaire measured two corresponding subordinates' OCB and job performance (see Appendix). Unless noted, most of the scales in this study were measured using a six-point Likert-like scale (1 = strongly disagree and 6 = strongly agree). We used the six-point Likert-like scale because Chinese people tend to choose the mid-point of the scale regardless of their true feelings or attitudes (Chiu & Yang, 1987). Therefore, by not including a mid-point, we hoped to prevent this response bias.

Subordinate questionnaire

Supervisory commitment

We measured supervisory commitment with the five-item scale modified from Becker et al.'s (1996) and Gregersen's (1993) studies. The scale included internalization to or identification with supervisor. The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.91.

Organizational commitment

We measured organizational commitment with the five-item scale drawn from previous research (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). For the purpose of comparability with the supervisory commitment

measure, we selected only items measured internalization to or identification with the organization. The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.84.

Job satisfaction

Participants rated their overall job satisfaction in the organization by a one-item graphic rating scale (0 = very unsatisfied and 100 = very satisfied).

Turnover intention

Participants rated their likelihood of quitting in the next year by a one-item graphic rating scale (0 = very unlikely and 100 = very likely).

Job performance (self-ratings)

Respondents rated their own job performance in four areas: quality, efficiency, overall performance, and relative performance compared to their coworkers. This is a four-item graphic rating scale taken from Cheng, Yang, and Chuang (1986) (0 = very poor quality/efficiency/performance and 100 = excellent quality/efficiency/performance). The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.91.

Control variables

We selected five subordinates' demographic attributes as control variables: age, gender, education, position, and tenure. Age, ranged from under 20 to over 50, was classified into eight categories (1 = under or equal to 20, 2 = 21–25, etc.). Gender was coded into two categories (1 = male and 2 = female), and education was assigned into five categories (1 = middle school diploma or less, 2 = high school degree, 3 = vocational school degree, 4 = bachelor degree, and 5 = master degree or above). Position was measured by five categories (1 = shop floor employee, 2 = staff, 3 = first-line supervisor, 4 = middle manager, and 5 = upper manager). Tenure ranged from less than 1 year to more than 13 years and was coded into eight categories (1 = under or equal to 1 year, 2 = more than 1 year, but less than or equal to 3 years, etc.).

Perceived organization support

The perceived organizational support scale was used for examining the construct validity of global outcomes and was measured with the four-item scale drawn from previous research (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.75.

Perceived supervisor support

This study used the perceived supervisor support scale for examining the construct validity of local outcomes. The scale contained four items modified from Eisenberger et al. (1986) and Yoon and Thye (2000). The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.83.

Supervisor questionnaire

Organizational citizenship behavior

We assessed subordinates' OCB using the scale developed by Farh et al. (1997). We selected 11 items from three dimensions: (a) altruism toward colleagues, (b) conscientiousness, and (c) identification with the company. The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.90. The dimension 'identification with the company' named by Farh et al. (1997), emphasizes the willingness on the part of the employee to spread positive company news to outsiders, to defend company reputation, and to make suggestions

for improvement. Although this OCB dimension 'identification with the company' has an identical name as the organizational commitment dimension used in this study, the OCB identification with the company dimension is actually very similar to Civic Virtue, an OCB dimension in Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). Therefore, 'identification with the company', as an OCB dimension, is different from identification as an organizational commitment dimension and should not be confused with it.

Job performance (supervisor-ratings)

We used a four-item scale developed by Farh and Cheng (1997) to measure job performance. The job performance scale in the supervisor questionnaire is different from the previously mentioned job performance scale in the subordinate questionnaire. The coefficient alpha for the supervisor-ratings of the job performance scale was 0.89.

Analysis

We conducted the data analysis in three stages. First, using confirmatory factor analysis (EQS 5.7b), we examined the factor structure of the commitment foci and outcome variables within the subordinate questionnaire, and using correlation analysis we assessed the criterion-related validity of global outcomes and local outcomes. Perceived organization support and perceived supervisor support, which exhibit strong exchange meaning, were chosen to represent the global-relevant criterion and local-relevant criterion, respectively (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 2002).

Second, using hierarchical block regression we examined the hypothesized relationships between organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, OCB, job performance, job satisfaction, and turnover intention after controlling the demographic variables. Table 1 lists the four regression models used in the hierarchical block regression analysis. In the first regression model, we entered only the demographic variables in block 1 to determine the effects of control variables. In the second regression model, we added supervisory commitment in block 2 to demonstrate the effects of supervisory commitment. In the third regression model, we entered the demographic variables in block 1 and organizational commitment in block 2, to show the effects of organizational commitment. In the final regression model, for testing Hypotheses 1–3, we entered both supervisory commitment and organizational commitment to determine the unique effects of each commitment.

Third, using structural equation modeling (SEM) (EQS 5.7b), we evaluated the four hypothesized models to test Hypothesis 4 and 5. First, in the global hypothesis model and proximal hypothesis model, job satisfaction, turnover intention, OCB, and job performance (self-rating and supervisor-rating) indicated one latent variable. Next, in the compatible hypothesis model and cultural hypothesis model, there were two latent variables: global outcome, including job satisfaction and turnover intention, and local outcome, including OCB and job performance (self-rating and supervisor-rating).

Table 1. Hierarchical block regression analysis model

Analysis model	Block order		
	1	2	3
Model 1	Demographic variables		
Model 2	Demographic variables	Supervisory commitment	
Model 3	Demographic variables	Organizational commitment	
Model 4	Demographic variables	Supervisory commitment	Organizational commitment

Results

The confirmatory factor analysis results of organizational commitment and supervisory commitment showed that the two-factor model ($\chi^2 = 119.61$, d.f. = 34; GFI = 0.96; NFI = 0.96; CFI = 0.97; RMSEA = 0.07) was a better fit than the one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 654.89$, d.f. = 35; GFI = 0.72; NFI = 0.77; CFI = 0.77; RMSEA = 0.19). The results suggested that organizational commitment and supervisory commitment were indeed distinctive constructs. Moreover, the confirmatory factor analysis of outcome variables including job satisfaction, turnover intention, and three self-rating job performance items showed that the two-factor global/local model ($\chi^2 = 7.23$, d.f. = 4; GFI = 0.99; NFI = 0.99; CFI = 0.99; RMSEA = 0.04) was a better fit than the one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 84.18$, d.f. = 5; GFI = 0.94; NFI = 0.91; CFI = 0.92; RMSEA = 0.18) or any other two-factor models. The correlation analysis results showed that local outcomes, including supervisor-rating job performance, OCB, and self-rating job performance, were significantly related to perceived supervisor support ($r = 0.15$ – 0.24 , $p < 0.01$), but unrelated to perceived organization support ($r = 0.01$ – 0.07 , $p > 0.05$). Whereas global outcomes, such as job satisfaction and turnover intention, were significantly related to perceived organization support ($r = 0.41$ and -0.37 , $p < 0.01$) and perceived supervisor support ($r = 0.35$ and -0.30 , $p < 0.01$), and the strength was greater within global outcomes and perceived organization support ($\Delta R^2 = 0.09$ and 0.08 , $p < 0.01$). These findings provided support for the distinctiveness of global outcomes and local outcomes.

Table 2 reports the means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and zero-order correlations for all study variables. At the zero-order correlation level, organizational commitment was significantly related to supervisory commitment ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.01$). These two foci of commitment both had significant correlations with job satisfaction, turnover intention, and OCB. Supervisory commitment had a significant positive relationship with supervisor-rating of the job performance, and both supervisory commitment and organizational commitment correlated positively with self-rating of the job performance. Table 3 shows the hierarchical block regression results for organizational commitment and supervisory commitment on job satisfaction, turnover intention, OCB, and job performance (supervisor-rating and self-rating).

Hypothesis 1 proposed that organizational commitment has direct relationships with global outcomes. After controlling the demographic variables and supervisory commitment, organizational commitment still had significant unique effects on job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = 0.13$, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 1a) and turnover intention ($\Delta R^2 = 0.08$, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 1b). Thus, the first hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 2 proposed supervisory commitment would have direct and positive relationships with local outcomes. After controlling the demographic variables and organizational commitment, supervisory commitment still had significant unique effects on OCB ($\Delta R^2 = 0.06$, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 2a), supervisor-rating job performance ($\Delta R^2 = 0.06$, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 2b), and self-rating job performance ($\Delta R^2 = 0.01$, $p < 0.05$) (Hypothesis 2c). Thus, the second hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that supervisory commitment had direct relationships with global outcomes. After controlling the demographic variables and organizational commitment, supervisory commitment still had significant unique effects on job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = 0.05$, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 3a) and turnover intention ($\Delta R^2 = 0.02$, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 3b). Thus, the third hypothesis was supported.

Table 4, the SEM analysis result, showed that the 'compatible hypothesis' model provided a much better fit to the data (AIC = 44.91; CAIC = -380.70) than the 'global hypothesis' (AIC = 376.55; CAIC = -64.63) and 'proximal hypothesis' (AIC = 405.57; CAIC = -35.61) models, and the chi-square difference tests showed the same results ($\Delta\chi^2_{\text{global-compatible}} = 366.66$, d.f. = 3, $p < 0.01$; $\Delta\chi^2_{\text{proximal-compatible}} = 338.64$, d.f. = 3, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 4). The 'cultural hypothesis' model,

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and intercorrelations ($N = 530-534$)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Gender	1.43	0.50	—											
2. Age	3.69	1.16	-0.29**	—										
3. Education	3.47	0.84	-0.01	-0.17**	—									
4. Position	2.20	0.70	0.02	0.40**	0.01	—								
5. Organization tenure	3.16	1.88	-0.11*	0.57**	-0.29**	0.27**	—							
6. Supervisory commitment	4.15	0.87	-0.06	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	(0.91)						
7. Organizational commitment	3.69	0.83	-0.16**	0.10*	-0.19**	0.09*	0.09*	0.49**	(0.84)					
8. Job satisfaction	73.30	16.53	-0.10*	0.04	-0.14**	0.02	0.07	0.45**	0.56**	—				
9. Turnover intention	40.30	28.90	0.11*	-0.15**	0.16**	-0.10*	-0.15**	-0.34**	-0.44**	-0.37**	—			
10. Job performance (supervisor-ratings)	4.36	0.81	-0.01	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.15**	0.23**	0.04	0.14**	-0.13**	(0.91)		
11. Job performance (Self-ratings)	76.85	10.48	-0.03	0.10*	-0.07	-0.00	0.17**	0.11*	0.12**	0.35**	-0.03	0.17**	(0.89)	
12. Organizational citizenship behavior	4.35	0.67	-0.09*	0.05	0.10*	0.05	0.09*	0.27**	0.11**	0.13**	-0.17**	0.71**	0.05	(0.90)

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; two-tailed tests; coefficient alphas are in diagonal; gender (1 = male, 2 = female).

Table 3. Hierarchical block regression analysis for organizational commitment and supervisory commitment on employees' outcome variables ($N = 523$ –524)

Variable	Job satisfaction				Turnover intention				Organizational citizenship behavior				Job performance (supervisor-rating)				Job performance (self-rating)			
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M1	M2	M3	M4	M1	M2	M3	M4	M1	M2	M3	M4	M1	M2	M3	M4
<i>Control variable</i>																				
1. Gender	-0.10*	-0.07	-0.01	-0.01	0.09*	0.07	0.02	0.03	-0.09*	-0.08	-0.07	-0.08	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03
2. Age	0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.04	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	0.03	-0.02	-0.00	-0.01	-0.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
3. Education	-0.13**	-0.12**	-0.03	-0.05	0.14**	0.14**	0.06	0.08	0.14**	0.15**	0.17**	0.14**	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.07	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.00
4. Position	0.02	0.02	-0.04	-0.03	-0.08	-0.07	-0.03	-0.04	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.07	-0.07	-0.08	-0.08
5. Organizational tenure	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	-0.06	0.14*	0.14**	0.14*	0.14**	0.19**	0.19**	0.19**	0.19**	0.17**	0.17**	0.17**	0.17**
ΔR^2	(0.03)*	(0.02)**	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.06)**	(0.05)**	(0.02)*	(0.02)*	(0.04)**	(0.04)**	(0.04)**	(0.04)**	(0.03)**	(0.03)**	(0.03)**	(0.03)**	(0.04)**	(0.03)**	(0.04)**	(0.04)**
6. Supervisory commitment	0.45**			0.25**		-0.33**		-0.17**		0.27**		0.27**	(0.03)**	0.23**		0.28**	0.11**			0.10*
ΔR^2	(0.21)**			(0.05)**		(0.11)**		(0.02)**		(0.07)**		(0.06)**	(0.05)**			(0.06)**	(0.01)**			(0.01)*
7. Organizational commitment			0.55**	0.42**			-0.43**	-0.34**			0.13**	-0.01			0.05	-0.10		0.08		0.03
ΔR^2			(0.28)**	(0.13)**			(0.18)**	(0.08)**			(0.02)**	(0.00)			(0.00)	(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.00)
Adjusted R^2	0.02*	0.22**	0.30**	0.35**	0.05**	0.16**	0.22**	0.24**	0.03**	0.10**	0.04**	0.10**	0.02**	0.07**	0.03**	0.08**	0.03**	0.04**	0.03**	0.04**
F-value	2.97	26.07	38.94	40.97	6.08	17.21	25.02	24.13	4.03	10.34	4.73	8.86	3.25	7.81	2.87	7.28	3.75	4.34	3.66	3.75
d.f.	5,517	6,516	6,516	7,515	5,519	6,518	6,518	7,517	5,518	6,517	6,517	7,516	5,519	6,518	6,518	7,517	5,518	6,517	6,517	7,516
Standard error of estimate	16.17	14.38	13.62	13.17	28.31	26.62	25.67	25.33	0.66	0.64	0.66	0.64	0.80	0.78	0.80	0.78	9.88	9.82	9.86	9.83
(SEE)																				

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; two-tailed tests; gender (1 = male, 2 = female).

Table 4. Results of model comparisons

Model	χ^2 (d.f.)	NFI	GFI	CFI	AIC	CAIC	SRMR	RMSEA
(a) Global hypothesis	575.57 (85)	0.86	0.86	0.87	405.57	-35.61	0.15	0.11
(b) Proximal hypothesis	546.55 (85)	0.86	0.87	0.88	376.55	-64.63	0.14	0.11
(c) Compatible hypothesis	208.91 (82)	0.95	0.95	0.97	44.91	-380.70	0.07	0.06
(d) Cultural hypothesis	194.28 (81)	0.95	0.95	0.97	32.28	-388.14	0.06	0.05

however, had the lowest model comparison indexes value ($AIC = 32.28$; $CAIC = -388.14$), provided the best fit to the data among the four models ($\chi^2 = 194.28$, d.f. = 81; $GFI = 0.95$; $NFI = 0.95$; $CFI = 0.97$) and had low residual based fit indexes ($SRMR = 0.06$; $RMSEA = 0.05$). Additionally, the chi-square difference test showed that the 'cultural hypothesis' model provided a better explanation than the 'compatible hypothesis' model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 14.47$, d.f. = 1, $p < 0.01$) (Hypothesis 5). Thus, the fourth and fifth hypotheses were supported.

Figure 2 shows the results of the 'cultural hypothesis' model, in which organizational commitment had direct and significant positive influence only on global outcomes with a standardized path coefficient = 0.75 ($p < 0.01$); whereas supervisory commitment had a direct and significant effect on local outcomes, as well as on global outcomes, with a standardized path coefficient = 0.31 and 0.24 ($p < 0.01$), respectively.

Using SEM analysis, furthermore, we constrained the path coefficients to be equal between commitments and latent variables to test the relative strength between path coefficients (Schumacker & Lomax, 1996). The results showed that organizational commitment had a significantly higher effect on global outcomes than did supervisory commitment ($\Delta\chi^2 = 21.44$, d.f. = 1, $p < 0.01$), whereas supervisory commitment had a stronger effect on local outcomes than did organizational commitment ($\Delta\chi^2 = 21.97$, d.f. = 1, $p < 0.01$). The findings provided additional support for the principle of compatibility perspective.

Discussion

Using the principle of compatibility perspective (compatible hypothesis), we integrate global hypothesis and proximal hypothesis by classifying employee outcomes into two domains, global outcomes and local outcomes, which represented corresponding attitudes or behaviors to commitment phenomena. Overall, our findings provide strong evidence that the relationships between organizational commitment, supervisory commitment, and employee outcomes vary depending on the types of employee outcomes. Furthermore, our findings demonstrate the possible influence of personalism in the Chinese context, in which supervisory commitment has a significant impact on both global and local outcomes.

Previous studies have consistently shown that organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention are significantly correlated (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Becker, 1992; Becker & Billing, 1993; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Our analyses also show the same pattern between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Moreover, we point out that both organizational commitment and supervisory commitment have relatively unique strengths associated with job satisfaction and turnover intention in Chinese business enterprises. Thus, whether an employee decides to stay or to quit and feels satisfied or unsatisfied, the commitment to his/her supervisor would be considered as

Figure 2. The 'cultural hypothesis' model for outcome variables. All point estimates and correlations shown are significant at $p < 0.01$. OC_ID, identification with organization; OC_IN, internalization to organization; SC_ID, identification with supervisor; SC_IN, internalization to supervisor; OCBA, civic virtue; OCBB, altruism; OCBC, conscientiousness; JP_M1 to M3, three self-rating items measuring job performance; JP_L1, L2, L4, three supervisor-rating items measuring job performance

an important factor, in addition to his/her organizational commitment. Our findings support that supervisory commitment has an important role in employees' individual or organizational outcomes in the Chinese context. Nevertheless, for other cultures, specifically Western culture, the relationship may or may not be true. The importance of supervisory commitment is worth further investigation with the cross-cultural sample.

Consistent with the previous research (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997), our results show that organizational commitment did not predict job performance, regardless of self-ratings or supervisor-ratings in regression analysis. Additionally, we found supervisory commitment positively correlated with job performance from both self-ratings and supervisor-ratings, which confirms results from past studies (Becker et al., 1996). Our results suggest employees with a higher degree of commitment to their supervisors would more favorably rate their own job performance. At the same time, supervisors would also provide more positive ratings for these employees.

Findings in our study also demonstrate that both supervisory commitment and organizational commitment have positive relationships with OCB, and yet only supervisory commitment has direct effects on OCB. This reveals that the relationship between employees and organization does not directly influence employees' OCB, and organizational commitment only influences employees' OCB through employees' supervisory commitment. If we apply the OCB concept to a group level, we believe group members' commitment to their leader will not only make the operation run more smoothly due to the increased OCB, but it will also improve group members' job performance.

Consequently, if the organization would like to increase employees' job performance and OCB, improving the relationship between supervisors and employees is the key. Unfortunately, the employee-supervisor relationship is an important but often overlooked factor. Therefore, we should not merely emphasize improving employees' attachment to organization and neglecting the value of increasing employees' supervisory commitment. Through promoting attachment to the supervisor, we would effectively improve employees' job satisfaction, decrease turnover intention, and significantly enhance their job performance and extra efforts.

This study highlights the significance of supervisory commitment and cultural influence in employees' behavior. Still, our study leaves several interesting topics needing further investigation. First, we should investigate the nature of the relationship between organizational commitment and supervisory commitment. According to Heider's balance theory (1958), subordinates will balance relationship between self, supervisor, and organization. Therefore, if the supervisor's organizational commitment is high, the more subordinates commit to their supervisor, the more strongly subordinates will commit to the organization. Consequently, we propose that supervisors' organizational commitment will moderate the relationship between subordinates' organizational commitment and supervisory commitment. Second, the influence processes can also operate in another direction, such as how the organization affects the subordinates' supervisory commitment. Using the same rationale as above, the company's attitude or behavior toward the supervisor can influence the relationship between subordinate and supervisor. Accordingly, we propose that an organization's support for the supervisor will moderate the relationship between subordinates' organizational commitment and supervisory commitment. Further investigations using balance theory are needed to explore the dynamic view of commitment foci in the workplace.

Our research is limited only to cross-sectional phenomena of employees' organizational behaviors, and we did not examine the dynamic processes between organization, supervisors, and employees. Further examination on these processes should provide researchers with more insight into how employees' commitment to the organization, as well as to their supervisors, affects supervisors and the organization itself. The context in which we conducted this study was in Taiwanese business enterprises, where supervisors have much more power influencing subordinates' work behavior. Supervisory commitment, perhaps, may not be so important when supervisors have limited influence on

employees' behavior, as well as in highly structured organizations where employees do not have freedom or opportunities to perform spontaneous and innovative behaviors.

Although this study has some limitations, our findings have two implications for practitioners. First, in the Chinese context, supervisory commitment plays a significant part in management practices. Many organizations too often fail to notice the importance of supervisory commitment and some organizations even discourage employees from having a high level of commitment to their supervisors. Our study findings suggest in the Chinese context that supervisory commitment has a significant impact on employees' job satisfaction, turnover intention, job performance, and OCB. In fact, supervisory commitment is even more important than organizational commitment regarding these employee outcomes. Therefore, to increase the organizational effectiveness, organizations should pay extra attention to improving supervisors' management and leadership skills and to monitoring the relationship between supervisors and employees. Second, organizations should have various strategies when dealing with different types of employees' organizational behaviors. Our research results suggest organizational commitment and supervisory commitment have different impacts on these employee behaviors. Thus, organizations should use appropriate strategies to manage these behaviors. For example, if the organization has concerns about high turnover rate in Chinese business enterprises, the organization should focus not only on building employees' organizational commitment but also on improving employees' commitment to their supervisors. On the other hand, if the low level of cooperation and citizenship behavior among coworkers is the main problem, developing employees' commitment to their supervisor will create more significant and direct improvements.

Acknowledgements

This article was written with support of a grant (89-H-FA01-2-4-4) to the first author from the Ministry of Education, Republic of China. The authors would like to thank three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on a previous draft.

Author biographies

Bor-Shiuan Cheng is a Professor of Industrial/Organizational Psychology at National Taiwan University, where he received his PhD. His primary research interests include leadership, organizational identification, commitment, and organizational culture in Chinese organizations. He has published in journals such as *Organizational Science*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Journal of Cross-Culture Psychology*, and *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*.

Ding-Yu Jiang is a doctoral candidate of Industrial/Organizational Psychology at National Taiwan University. His research interests include employee–organization relationships and employee–supervisor relationships. He has published in *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*.

Jean Riley is a doctoral candidate of Industrial/Organizational Psychology at Alliant International University. Her research interests include commitment and citizenship behavior in US and Chinese organizations. She is also interested in linkage research studying how employee opinion relates to customer opinion and business performance. Currently, she serves on the board of the American Society of Training and Development (ASTD), San Diego Chapter.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1989). Attitude structure and behavior. In A. Pratkanis, S. Breckler, & A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude structure and function* (pp. 241–274). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude–behavior relations: a theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 888–918.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 267–285.
- Bateman, T. S., & Strausser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 95–112.
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 232–244.
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: an empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 177–190.
- Becker, T. E., Billing, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 464–482.
- Bosshoff, C., & Mels, G. (2000). The impact of multiple commitments on intentions to resign: an empirical assessment. *British Journal of Management*, 11, 255–272.
- Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cheng, B. S., Yang, K. S., & Chuang, C. J. (1986). Task oriented leadership and subordinate performance. A supplementary model, and its validation. *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology Academia Sinica*, 60, 61–119 (in Chinese).
- Cheng, B. S. (1995). Hierarchical structure and Chinese organizational behavior. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 3, 142–219 (in Chinese).
- Cheng, B. S. (1999). Trust between supervisor and subordinate in Chinese business organization. *Sociological Studies*, 2, 22–37 (in Chinese).
- Chiu, C., & Yang, C. F. (1987). Chinese subjects' dilemmas: humility and cognitive laziness as problems in using rating scales. *Bulletin of the Hong Kong Psychological Society*, 18, 39–50.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. A. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500–507.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565–573.
- Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (1997). Modesty bias in self-ratings in Taiwan: impact of item wording, modesty value, and self-esteem. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 39, 103–118 (in Chinese).
- Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context* (pp. 84–127). London: Macmillan.
- Farh, J. L., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. C. (1997). Impetus for action: a cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421–444.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 9, 175–208.
- Gregersen, B. (1993). Multiple commitments at work and extrarole behavior during three stages of organizational tenure. *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 31–47.
- Hamilton, G. G. (1997). Organization and market processes in Taiwan's capitalist economy. In M. Orrú, N. W. Biggart, & G. G. Hamilton (Eds.), *The economic organization of East Asian Capitalism* (pp. 237–296). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relation*. New York: Wiley.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9, 42–63.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 81–94.

- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: from cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 14, 5–39.
- Hunt, S. D., & Morgan, R. M. (1994). Organizational commitment: one of many commitments or key mediating construct? *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1568–1587.
- Lewin, K. (1943). Defying the 'field at a given time'. *Psychological Review*, 50, 292–310.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171–194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538–551.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee–organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492–499.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107–142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513–563.
- Redding, S. G. (1990). *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465–476.
- Reichers, A. E. (1986). Conflict and organizational commitments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 508–514.
- Silin, R. H. (1976). *Leadership and value: The organization of large-scale Taiwan enterprises*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (1996). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CA: Westview Press.
- Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture*. London: Economist Books.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617.
- Yang, K. S. (1995). Chinese social orientation: an integrative analysis. In W. S. Tseng, T. Y. Lin, & Y. K. Yeh (Eds.), *Chinese Societies and Mental Health* (pp. 19–39). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Yang, K. S. (1998). Chinese responses to modernization: a psychological analysis. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 75–97.
- Yoon, J., & Thye, S. (2000). Supervisor support in the work place: legitimacy and positive affectivity. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 295–316.

Appendix

Supervisory commitment

Identification

1. I talk up my current supervisor to my friends as a great supervisor to work with.
2. When someone praises my supervisor, it feels like a personal compliment.
3. My supervisor's successes are my successes.

Internalization

4. Since starting this job, my personal values and those of my supervisor have become more similar.
5. The reason I prefer my current supervisor to others is because of what he/she stands for, that is his/her values.

Organizational commitment

Identification

1. I feel a sense of ownership for this organization rather than being just an employee.
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

Internalization

4. Since joining this organization, my personal values and those of the organization have become more similar.
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.

Supervisor-appraised job performance

1. *This subordinate makes an important contribution to the overall performance of our work unit.
2. *This subordinate is one of the excellent employees in our work unit.
3. This subordinate can always fulfill the jobs assigned by the supervisor in time.
4. *The performance of this subordinate can always meet the requirements of the supervisor.

(Items with '*' mark are used in SEM analysis.)

Subordinate self-appraised job performance

1. *How would your supervisor rate your quality of work? In other words, are your work outcomes perfect, free of error, and of high accuracy?
2. *How would your supervisor rate your work efficiency? In other words, what is your supervisor's assessment of your work speed or quantity of work?
3. *How would you rate your own work performance? In other words, are you able to complete quality work on time?
4. Compared to your coworkers, how would you rate your work performance?

(Items with '*' mark are used in SEM analysis.)

Organizational citizenship behavior

Altruism toward colleagues

1. Willing to assist new colleagues to adjust to the work environment.
2. Willing to help colleagues solve work-related problems.
3. Willing to cover work assignments for colleagues when needed.
4. Willing to coordinate and communicate with colleagues.

Conscientiousness

5. Complies with company rules and procedures even when nobody watches and no evidence can be traced.
6. Takes one's job seriously and rarely makes mistakes.
7. Often arrives early and starts to work immediately.

Civic virtue

8. Willing to stand up to protect the reputation of the company.
9. Eager to tell outsiders good news about the company and clarify their misunderstandings.
10. Makes constructive suggestions that can improve the operation of the company.
11. Actively attends company meetings.

Job satisfaction

Please rate your overall job satisfaction in the organization.

Turnover intention

Please rate your likelihood of quitting in the next year.

Perceived organizational support

1. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
2. The organization really cares about my well-being.
3. If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me. (Reverse)
4. The organization shows great concern for me.

Perceived supervisory support

1. My supervisor offers help when I am in a personal crisis.
2. My supervisor is willing to listen to my job-related problems.
3. My supervisor recognizes my excellent performance.
4. My supervisor is willing to give me a chance to remedy when I make a mistake.