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ABSTRACT

It is understood that national culture has an impact on organisations but what is not well understood is the extent to which this occurs and how it occurs. This thesis examines how employees working in a major multinational corporation (MNC) in the Asia Pacific Region (APR) perceive work commitment. Multinational corporations use ethnocentric and largely American constructs and measures in all areas of staff performance, including work commitment. This study is situated within the service sector where the work commitment of employees is increasingly posited as an important element of achieving competitive advantage. This is an applied research study that seeks to both further the understanding of work commitment in a cross-cultural context, namely the collectivist cultures of the APR, and to provide answers to questions that the management of the MNC in question had regarding the applicability of their American-developed measure of work commitment. The MNC in this study is one of the largest hotel chains in the world, employing 154,000 employees.

The methodological approach adopted was a mixed methods sequential exploratory study, with triangulation of data that included: surveys, interviews, focus groups, forced choice questionnaires and expert panels. The final analysis of data was conducted using the MNC’s employee survey (n=19950) of APR countries. A hallmark of the research is the extensive use of triangulation or multiple methods within a mixed methods approach. Cross-cultural studies are fraught with methodological problems, and triangulation of data is considered to be essential to overcome a range of problems, associated with the use of traditional survey methods.
This is an insider investigation as the researcher was an employee of the MNC, called Merico for the purposes of this thesis, to maintain the organisation’s privacy.

The first stage of the study revealed the dimension of collectivism as being of importance to employees in the APR. The familial-type organisational culture Merico created a degree of isomorphism because it aligned more readily with the collectivist values and orientations of employees. In the second stage, the research explored work commitment and discovered that in the APR there was a different set of understandings of work commitment compared to the one used currently by Merico. Through integrating the findings from both stages of the study a new framework of work commitment, called the ‘Work and Organisational Kinship’ (WOK) framework, was developed. The WOK was then tested against the American model through using the existing employee survey that Merico conducted in 2000 and a new index of work commitment, called the WOKI was proposed for use by Merico. The relevance of this study is that it shows that the ‘one size fits all’ approach to work commitment will no longer provide a sound approach for managing performance within a competitive market place. The research shows that there are differences between drivers of work commitment and outcomes in the APR compared to those of the US and Australia. Performance management in Merico is heavily rewarded by work commitment. To misunderstand work commitment in the context of the APR and to measure it in a culturally insensitive manner, and then apply reward systems accordingly, poses major problems in performance management. The WOK framework introduces two constructs called ‘organisational kinship’ and ‘service loyalty’ that are critical to creating a geocentric approach to work commitment in the APR, and in Merico.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In this era of best practice and benchmarking, organisations are continually seeking quantifiable data with which to assess staff and improve performance, in order to gain a competitive edge. Large multinational corporations (MNCs) measure many items, using consultancy based tools, and prominent amongst these items is work commitment. A good example of this is Merico International\(^1\), an American hotel chain and one of the world’s largest. One of the numerous consultancy firms that Merico has employed, named Anon\(^2\), has supplied it with an assessment instrument titled the Work Commitment Index (WCI). This is one of several significant “off-the-shelf” products that Anon sells to companies worldwide. The WCI was developed as a result of research using workers within the United States and a report entitled “Americans@Work\(^3\)” (1999). This WCI is one of Anon’s key report tools that it markets to companies worldwide.

The index is not a self-contained, separate ‘test’ but, rather, is embedded in an employee opinion survey (EOS). Certain questions, estimated as a group, relate to the degree of work commitment. Merico

---

\(^1\) Merico is a pseudonym used as a requirement of the organisation to protect confidentiality.

\(^2\) Anon Consulting is a pseudonym used as a requirement of Merico.

\(^3\) “Americans@Work” is a pseudonym, but like the actual title, represents its clearly American origins.
International currently conducts such a dual purpose EOS each year in all its establishments, after having first restricted its use to its hotels in the US for two years. A “one size fits all” type of measuring system evidently suited the organisation, and the domestic surveying could perhaps have seemed to sufficiently trial the WCI for its relevance and reliability within cross-cultural contexts. Anon itself provided no overt warnings about the cross-cultural relevance, (although, at the same time, it did not suggest a foreign use for its clearly American-made tool). And yet, how likely is it that the WCI may suit all cultural situations? And what kind of culture does Merico itself portray? Merico promotes itself as a family oriented company with an overarching desire for a collective approach, while at the same time emerging from what at the national level is arguably the world’s most individualistic culture.

American management methods dominate in many industry sectors within the global context, as exemplified in the rise of the American-based MNC. The traditional “one size fits all” approach to global management has been called into question for some decades through the work of cross-cultural researchers. However, what is not clear is what replaces a “one size fits all” approach to work commitment in the cross-cultural context. As Merico’s Senior Vice-President for Human resources International (SVP-HRI) acknowledged at a meeting in Washington US, in January 2002, the “one size fits all” approach to work commitment within the context of
Merico’s APR operations was flawed. But it is not clear what the alternatives might be. The present research explores the individualistic and collectivist challenges in the field of employee commitment, in terms of measuring employee performance and managing it better in a cross-cultural context through the study of the WCI in the Merico context (Davidson, 2000; Jones & James, 1979).

The researcher, in the position of Director of Human Resources for Merico International in Australia, met with the members of the Department of Research and Development at Merico’s Headquarters in Washington, US, in January 2002. At the meeting, the SVP-HRI raised concerns about how effective the WCI, which had been based on the US’s individualistic culture, would be in the more collectivist cultures of other countries. At this time the SVP-HRI was deciding whether or not Merico should introduce internationally the WCI as a new performance management tool by which general managers’ and other senior managers’ bonuses could be decided. The question being asked was could the WCI be applied equitably to the international senior management in regions ranging from, for example, Europe, the United Kingdom, South America, the Middle East and the Asia Pacific Region.

Employees in senior management positions have the opportunity to significantly increase their bonuses if they receive high scores on a set of
performance management measures. This is a remuneration incentive commonly offered to management in the service industry. In Merico, the WCI was one such performance measure. The SVP-HRI began to question the tool and the assumptions upon which it was based. There was also growing concern in Merico about the use of the Work Commitment Index, in its overseas hotels. The SVP-HRI suggested an examination of the index. As we have seen this WCI, within the EOS is administered annually so that Merico may gauge its organisational climate. Merico defines organisational climate as the way the organisation feels to employees at any point of time. There are dangers associated with the oversimplification of organisational climate as described by Merico.

The SVP-HRI had asked, at a Merico regional HR meeting in Shanghai in early 2000, if the present researcher would examine the WCI and its applicability when used in collectivist national cultures. The APR region was selected by the SVP-HRI who, along with the researcher, regarded it as the most suitable area to be used for this study, due to its high number of so-called collectivist cultures and her knowledge of the region and access to it. The APR, as defined by Merico, was selected as one of the most challenging areas in which to implement the WCI as, in stark contrast to the US, it contains numerous collectivist national cultures. Many collectivist cultures are under pressure from Western businesses to accommodate and adapt Western business practices, cultures and norms.
The SVP-HRI considered that if implementation problems occurred with the WCI in the APR, the remaining international regions may have to be examined. The general staff of the Research and Development (R&D) Department expressed concerns that if they had to change the measure for one region, as a result of this study, they may need to change it for all of them, a daunting task for them to consider.

The study was considered by some within the organisation to be contentious. Shortly after arriving at Merico’s International Headquarters the researcher was taken to a meeting with two members of the R&D department. The R&D employees stated that the current index could not be changed, citing its importance in relation to the standardisation of pay and rewards. They felt any attempt to tailor the existing index to various national cultures would be “opening a can of worms”.

Despite the opposition and resistance from the R&D staff, the SVP-HRI persisted in raising doubts about the WCI, especially mindful of the importance of the measure and its direct link to the organisation’s standardised performance management incentive bonuses. Individuals are measured against key performance indicators and the manager’s objectives for the prior year are assessed. Successful achievement of those objectives significantly increases the percentage bonus awarded by way of a salary increment. At least one of the objectives, of no more than five, must be
linked to the EOS results and the performance measures contained within the survey. Performance management is driven by corporate culture and Human Resource Management (HRM) practices. Therefore, to achieve a high score in the relevant performance management measures, certain HRM practices receive a greater allocation of resources and support from senior management. The link between employees’ perceptions, as recorded by the EOS, and the salary implications, are made clear to senior management through training and induction. The adverse career implication of failing to achieve minimum standards in the performance appraisal is made equally clear.

The goal of the SVP-HRI was to be sure that the organisation was measuring the relevant perceptions and attitudes in the various national cultures, in turn to establish clearly whether the measures in the WCI were equitable and accurate. Merico’s Senior Management appeared to be narrowly focused, albeit with good intentions, upon measurement alone.

However, the researcher was confronted with a broader problem. Given the unique cultural features of the APR, several questions arose: how do employees from collectivist cultures, working in a MNC, perceive work commitment? What if Merico, and companies like it, have the whole notion of work commitment wrong? And if they have it wrong, how can they appropriately sensitise their perception and measuring apparatus?
Measuring work commitment was the primary interest of the MNC in question, rather than a desire to understand that factor within national cultures or cross-cultural contexts. The approach was ethnocentric, a stance or outlook that has been heavily criticised in the academic literature (Cohen, 2003; 1999, p.270).

The Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this sequential, mixed methods study (as outlined Creswell, 2003, p.102), was to first explore and generate themes about work commitment and national and organisational culture across the APR then, based on these themes, multiple phases of data collection were used to produce a new conceptual framework of work commitment in the APR. The rationale for using a sequential mixed methods approach, which included both qualitative and quantitative data collection, was that to develop a new framework and to propose a more culturally sensitive measure of work commitment and this required extensive exploratory and confirmatory research. A mixed methods approach has been suggested by Hofstede (1980), one of the leading researchers in cross-cultural studies, as essential to advancing knowledge in this field of study.

The research question that informed the first phase of this thesis is:

**Q1. How do employees in collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC?**
The mixed methods approach of this thesis is unique because it uses multiple methods within various phases of the research. It is not the conventional mixed methods approach that usually involves, in either order, a qualitative or quantitative phase. A defining feature of mixed methods research is that research in one phase informs the next and it is difficult to specify second phase research questions in advance of the study (Creswell, 2003, p.114). The research questions that emerged in the study are described in each of the research phases. In mixed methods priority is given to the qualitative aspect of the study” (Creswell, 2003, p.215) and this is the case for this thesis.

The Aims of this study are:

1. To investigate how employees from collectivist cultures who work in a large MNC within the service sector perceive work commitment.

2. To develop a more culturally sensitive approach to the indexing of work commitment in the APR.

3. To inform Merico and other companies like them of a more geocentric approach to understanding work commitment and its effect on HRM practices, and performance measures in particular.

4. To add to the body of literature and the knowledge on work commitment in collectivist cultures within the service sector.
The Problem of Work Commitment in a Cross-Cultural Context

Critics have cautioned against adopting an ethnocentric approach to HRM practices, warning it can result in a cultural backlash, as described by Whiteley (1995). Problems of worker disenchantment can also arise and ultimately result in a lack of commitment. The literature in cross-cultural organisational commitment is extensive (Adler, 2002; Tayeb, 2003; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998), however work commitment is, by comparison, under-researched, and not as well understood. Work commitment is defined by Cohen (1993) as affective attachments to one or more of the objects of commitment: organisation, occupation, job and union. In contrast to work commitment, organisational commitment as defined in this thesis consists of team development, referral behaviour and tenure intentions, differing from work commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). There is confusion in practice between these two concepts as seen in the use of Merico’s index. The way national culture and corporate culture transfers from one country to another is also less well researched. How differing cultural dimensions align is of significant interest to this thesis in terms of work commitment.

Merico was created and grown within an individualistic national culture, yet it espouses a clearly collectivist ‘family’ corporate culture. Despite the company extolling such a strong corporate culture, it is unclear how this influences employee’s work commitment. The ways in which the
distinctions between corporate and organisational culture, organisational climate, organisational commitment and work commitment are defined is critical to this thesis and is discussed in detail in the review of the literature. The problematic and contested nature of the definitions and delineations of these terms, as noted by researchers, is discussed in Chapters Three and Four (e.g. Swailes, 2002).

The EOS, as used by Merico, is an organisational climate survey and so is meant to provide a picture of, among other things, an employee’s perceptions of his or her work commitment. Outcomes of the climate survey are used for the performance management of employees. To better understand the performance management measures used by Merico, it is important to explore how organisational commitment differs from work commitment.

In this thesis work commitment is explored in two ways: from the understanding of the MNC, and from the academic literature. The MNC’s perspective is critical because what Merico and companies like it are attempting to measure is ‘work commitment’. Merico has adopted the work commitment construct used by Anon Consulting as discussed in the final section of Chapter Two. Anon’s work commitment model defines work commitment as: willingness to exert effort (team development), belief in and acceptance of organisational goals and values (referral behaviour), and
a desire to retain membership (tenure intentions) (Anon, 1999). This thesis will argue that Merico’s WCI is, more accurately, a measure of organisational commitment, as described by Mowday et al.\(^4\) (1982), and not work commitment, per se. If Merico, and by default Anon, are using a flawed measure, this has the potential to be a costly error for the US$8.4 billion hotel management chain. While Merico and companies like it are interested in practical solutions, such as developing measurement tools, their approach to measuring work commitment is problematic, contradictory and potentially dangerous for a company trying to operate globally and competitively. Being globally competitive means becoming more locally sensitive to issues relating to human resources practices, such as the varying perceptions of different national cultures upon the same concept, such as work commitment.

As revealed in the literature, various definitions and measures of work commitment exist. Morrow’s (1993) work has combined five universal types of work commitment: job involvement, affective organisational commitment, continuance organisational commitment, career commitment, and work ethic endorsement. Cohen’s (2003) approach to work commitment is basically to ‘start from scratch’ (Morrow, 1993). Cohen advocated a ‘multiple-commitment’ approach to work commitment.

\(^4\) Mowday et al. (1982) define organisational commitment as constituting team development, referral behaviour and tenure intentions.
His rationale was premised on the assumption that if employees are less committed to one aspect of the workplace, they may be more committed to another. Cohen noted the growing interest in a broader concept of work commitment, one which questioned the salience and role of organisational commitment and introduced other equally valid foci.

According to Cohen (1993), work commitment requires one or more of the following: identification, moral involvement and affiliation to one or more foci: the organisation, the occupation, the union or the job. As long as the employee is committed to some part of the organisation, this opens up the potential for strategies to increase and maintain commitment. If one commitment area decreases, it may be offset or balanced by increases in another. Cohen also suggests exploring other potential foci when adopting a multiple-commitment approach. The differences between national cultures may be the source of some of these potentially new foci, and may help to add further to the understanding of work commitment.

The literature is largely in agreement about the differences between individualistic and collectivist cultures. Conceptual frameworks of national culture dimensions, such as that adopted in this research, and based on the work of Trompenaars and Hampden Turner (1998), are widely recognised. What is not so clear is how these differences impact on work commitment in different types of work settings, such as the service and hospitality
sectors. Organisational climate has much to offer in terms of its ability to explain the behaviour of people at work (Davidson, 2000). The service sector is rapidly growing in the APR, yet the area remains under researched in this respect.

There is substantial research supporting the claim that there are significant variations in beliefs and values among people of individualistic and collectivist national cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Drawing on this body of literature, Merico, through this study, began to ask if these cultural differences had implications for the instruments they were using to measure their success in key areas of performance. Merico International has adopted an organisational effectiveness instrument (Kaplan & Norton, 1996) which focuses on the following three distinct areas: financial results, guest satisfaction and employee satisfaction. Merico is not alone in using such measures within the hospitality industry. The ‘employee’ segment of the measure is the focus of this research.

Significance of the Study

One of the perennial challenges facing modern management is to understand what creates work commitment in an employee. When the objective is one of gaining commitment across many national borders, within one company, the challenge is considerably greater and more
perplexing. Even after decades of studying the impact of culture, and the search for strategies to gain international competitive advantage, scholars and managers are still searching for the optimal answer to the question: How does employee commitment differ from one country to another and what should be done to accommodate these differences in terms of HRM performance management practices?

Despite the plethora of studies of organisational commitment in cross-cultural studies across a broad section of employees and organisations, there still remains no clear picture of how work commitment can be better understood in collectivist national cultures, and in the service sector in particular (Cohen, 2003). A study that examines how employees perceive work commitment in the APR, and within the MNC context of the service industry, will help to fill a substantial gap in the literature. This study draws on several work commitment and national culture studies to guide the research and develop a more culturally-sensitive framework of work commitment which could be adopted in collectivist cultures (Cohen, 2003; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). The findings of this study may significantly impact upon HRM practices in hospitality in general and Merico in particular, challenging the ideas and practices associated with performance measurement.
It is known that there are differences in national culture and corporate culture and these are measured in different ways by different researchers. A practical outcome of this research is the development of an alternative approach to measuring these differences within a specific industry sector, and to explore its impacts on one key area of performance. In theory, these differences should enable the organisation to accommodate and utilise the unique cultural dimensions of the region to better harness employee work commitment.

The role played by the researcher is another aspect which adds to the significance of this research. The researcher had the advantage of holding an insider’s position in the company being studied. As a Director of Human Resources in Australia for Merico International, the researcher was granted free access to the data and personnel in the eight countries included in this study. This enabled comprehensive and in-depth research to be conducted. The researcher’s role was ‘independent’ to the extent that the company knew the research was for the purpose of developing a PhD thesis, and an agreement was negotiated accordingly. The agreement (see Appendix A) was negotiated in relation to access to the data and approval was granted by the Department of R&D at Merico International's Headquarters in the year 2000. This ‘insider’ role provided the researcher with a unique level of access to data which forms the basis of this study.
This issue will be explored further in the methods discussion in Chapter Four.

**Approach to the Study**

Figure 1.1 presents an overview of the thesis chapters. Chapter Two provides the context for the thesis by a providing detailed account of Merico International, its historical development, and the organisational culture that developed and still operates within the company. The importance of Merico’s ‘family’ type corporate culture is also introduced and discussed in detail in review of the literature in Chapters Three and Four.

The way in which this culture is maintained and introduced into international settings, while touched upon, is not the focus of the research. However, the fact that the corporate and organisational culture is viewed by the management of Merico as a key tool of management in successfully internationalising the company is of relevance to this study. The measurement of success used by Merico internationally includes employee satisfaction and their level of work commitment. A discussion of the measurement of these factors, in the context of Merico International’s organisational culture leads into the theoretical discussion (see Figure 1.1).
Chapter Two presents an account of Merico International’s development and growth and details of its organisational culture and the way the company measures work commitment.

Chapter Three contains a review of the literature from which the theoretical construct of culture is explored. Culture is considered in terms
of both corporate and national culture. The literature review is used to develop a theoretical construct to inform the study. Chapter Four explores the construct of work commitment. A collectivist framework of work commitment is proposed, resulting from an exploration of the literature related to national culture and work commitment. The collectivist attitudes and beliefs could be expected to have an equally significant impact upon the foci of work commitment as that of the individualistic position adopted by Anon.

Chapter Five, the methodology chapter, introduces Stage One of the research that involves three qualitative studies from which a number of additional research questions emerged. This research was conducted in eight countries in the APR: Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, Philippines, Korea, Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong and China. The first stage of the study was to explore the phenomena of work commitment, national culture and examines the alignment of the corporate culture of Merico International developed in the US with national cultures of the participating countries. The methods used in the first stage of the research used involved an open-ended questionnaire, face-to-face interviews and focus groups. Stage Two of the study involved research questions and propositions which developed from the initial research and are presented in Chapter Five. The methods used in the second stage of the study involved the use of a forced choice questionnaire, Expert Panels and the use of an organisational climate
survey to focus on national culture dimensions as presented by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) and work commitment. This builds upon the research reported in earlier chapters.

Chapter Six presents the data and analysis of the Stage One and Stage Two studies. The data is presented sequentially. From the first stage of the research the Preliminary Investigation Questionnaire (PIQ), interviews and focus group outcomes are presented and discussed in relation to the research issues. Chapter Six then reports the findings of the studies conducted in Stage Two of the research. The forced choice questionnaire findings are presented and discussed, and the dimensions of national culture are explored. The findings of the Expert Panels are also reported and the integration of the various studies conducted in this research is presented. Items were then analysed and used in conjunction with previous findings of the research to begin to develop a more potentially culturally sensitive framework of work commitment in the APR. Together, the qualitative and quantitative data then contribute to the framework piloted in the EOS as discussed in Chapter Six. The final stage of the research involved piloting the collectivist framework of work commitment in the EOS. The secondary data was collected from a sample group, and included participants from each of the eight countries who completed the employee organisational climate survey, or the EOS. The total sample size of the participants in this part of the study was 19,950.
Chapter Eight, as seen in Figure 1.1, addresses the aims of the study summarises and discusses the findings from each of the above stages of the research and how they led to the development of a new framework and potential measurement of work commitment. The applicability of the research in the international business field is analysed, and suggestions made as to how this new knowledge may affect international performance management practices within the service sector. Limitations of the research are explored in regard to particular issues of access, demographics and sampling. The future direction for potential research is explored in light of the limitations discussed.
CHAPTER TWO

MERICO INTERNATIONAL IN THE CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Introduction

With a presence in 51 countries, Merico is one of the largest international lodging providers with a history of success in the hospitality industry. Deeply reflected in its corporate culture and, arguably the primary key to Merico’s success, are values that appear classically and undeniably American.

As part of its management policy in all locations, Merico assesses employees’ overall performance by a tool that was enabled by research that was designed to have more than simply a short-term focus on performance. Merico was committed to long-term growth, and dissatisfaction had been growing in regard to re-engineering and Total Quality Management (TQM), both of which are being used elsewhere in the management sector.

This chapter centres on the nature of Merico’s corporate culture, highlighting the way in which the Work Commitment Index (WCI) has been incorporated into its culture. It also outlines the way it is used within the various cultures in which Merico is located. For Merico, the definition of a committed employee is based upon research in the US, and the assumption that a ‘one size fits all’ approach to management techniques is effective. Until recently there
has been a seeming lack of consideration for the values of those other national cultures upon which the American and Merico cultures have been imposed.

One of the critical areas explored in this research is how this WCI index is used within the various cultures in which Merico is located. At the outset, it has been critical to refine the concepts of culture at both the company and national level. If work commitment is linked to culture, then its definition and understanding will differ from place to place and by implication, so should its measurement. With the acculturation of the notion of work commitment previous concepts based purely on ‘Western’ values are likely to be rendered cross-culturally inapplicable.

The microcosm of problems presented here, namely those of adapting management practices into other cultures, is a perennial problem in terms of performance and employee satisfaction. The service sector is one of the strongest growing global businesses today. The rapid expansion of the service industry in the Asia Pacific Region (APR), and the need to ensure that the industry continues to achieve this growth, highlights the need to develop management practices suited to diverse cultural settings. It appears that, despite the negative impact of the events of September 11 2001, in New York and Washington, the bombings in Bali and, more recently, the SARS epidemic on the travel and tourism industries, a small but steady growth has been re-established, despite an understandably large initial downturn in the sector.
Whether such growth is sustainable or not remains to be seen, but every avenue to improve performance will need to be pursued. The nature of this sector warrants further elaboration in order to provide a context for this study.

**The Service Sector in Lodging**

Macdonald and Sirianni (1996) note that, in an age where there has been a shift to a global economy, the growth in the service industry has been strong. As a result of this shift, the majority of people now employed in economies across the world are located within the service sector (Macdonald & Sirianni, 1996). The tourism industry, according to the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC, 1998), is the largest sector contributing to international employment and economic growth. Brown and Schneider (1988) draw attention to the fact that what constitutes a definition of the service sector is not clear:

…there is still no strong consensus regarding precise distinctions between services and goods. Clear delineation is difficult, if not impossible given the output of goods is typically accompanied by a facilitating service and service output is sometimes accompanied by a facilitating good…

Despite this confusion, there is a measure of agreement that the service sector has distinct characteristics, as first noted by (Regan, 1963) and later by (Nickson, 1998). The characteristics are described as intangibility, heterogeneity, inseparability and perishability. Heterogeneity refers to the way in which services may vary according to the labour component of the delivery. Inseparability refers to the face-to-face nature of the service, also known as the
‘service encounter’ (Nickson, 1999). Perishability denotes the time orientation of a service and reinforces the concept that it is also time bound. Intangibility is of particular relevance here because it deals with experiences that can only be created or participated in, much like a performance, rather than a tangible product that a consumer may purchase and that has physicality.

As a result of this intangibility, unique difficulties in measurement arise. Some international service industries, in particular hotels, seek to ‘tangibilize’ (Bowen & Schneider, 1988) the intangible components of service through standardisation. Standardisation can be viewed as reflecting and being applicable to the ‘hardware’, which itself can be defined as the product, as opposed to the ‘software’, or notions of service, quality, service delivery, management styles and the emotional interaction between the producer and the consumer (Nickson, 1999). However, some ‘software’ is being standardised within the service industry as management techniques are adopted unilaterally across organisations. An example of this standardisation is the adoption of the same core management training programs and Human Resource Policy and Procedures across Merico International. In effect, this approach dictates the means and methods of executing much of the ‘software’ aspect of the service delivery into a standardised exercise and format.

A lack of empirical research into the internationalisation and standardisation of this industry, specifically focusing on hotel groups, is

The continued growth of the service sector, as noted by Mather and Todd (1995), is encouraged and pushed by expanding economies which see a positive benefit in the increase in the travel and tourism industry for the purposes of both business and pleasure. Guerrier and Lockwood (1990) stated that, despite current work in exploring hotel operations in both the UK and the US, “…there is still a distinct lack of information about other sectors of the industry and we have not found any studies which make comparisons across national boundaries”. In contrast, Levitt (1983) gives quite another explanation for the possible lack of research: “…different cultural preferences, national tastes and standards, and business institutions are vestiges of the past” (p.96) as organisations seek to standardise “completely”. Through their analysis of firms' business strategies, Campbell and Verbeke (1994) argue that organisations are either very nationally responsive, allowing for local decentralisation and innovation, or they tend to be very centralised, reducing the ability to be locally responsive. Within the service sector and specifically international hotels, sits the organisation to be studied amidst this debate, Merico International. Merico International is an ideal company to research as it matches the descriptions given by researchers as the type of MNC which likes to control the influence of
national culture through a strong corporate culture. Also, as do many others, it hales from the ‘home of hospitality’ – the USA (McSweeney, 2002).

The USA Culture and ‘The Home of Hospitality’

Research by Adler (2002) concluded that the US was unique in several aspects among all of the Eastern and Western cultures studied. America’s culture of extreme individualism, combined with its highly participative management techniques, renders US management practices unique. Despite the existence of these differences many American hoteliers believe that it is not only their right to impose the ‘American Dream’ upon other cultures, but also their duty as Conrad Hilton, founder of Hilton International appears to confirm.

We humbly believe that our Hilton flag is one small flag of freedom which is being waved defiantly against communism exactly as Lenin predicted. With humility we submit this international effort of ours as a contribution to world peace (Hilton, 1957, p.262).

Hilton viewed each of his hotels as a ‘little America’ (Nickson, 1999). The management of Holiday Inn also supported the view that the world was coming to resemble the United States. Its founder, Kemmons Wilson, espoused the notion that, “The formula that proved to be successful in Pittsburgh would surely win followers in Paris” (Luxenberg, 1995, p.213 cited in Nickson, 1997, p.180). Despite these simplistic assumptions of cross-cultural applicability, many examples demonstrate that the transition was not so straightforward. For example, as Adler (2002) shows, the parochialism of the Americans can create a negative impact on people living in non-Western countries, such as Indonesia.
The questions Americans ask me are sometimes very embarrassing, like whether I’ve seen a camera. Most of them consider themselves the most highly civilised people (Adler, 2002, p.14).

One of the cultural dimensions most strongly reported in service sector research is that of the extreme ‘individualism’ of Americans (Adler, 2002; Nickson, 1997; Tayeb, 2003). Since the time of the Founding Fathers there has been a respect for ‘rugged individualism’ (Guest, 1990, p.390), especially for those who push forward into new lands and succeed. The profile fits a number of highly successful paternalistic-type success stories from the American Service Sector, including those of Conrad Hilton (the founder of Hilton International) and Kemmons Wilson (the founder of Holiday Inn).

The Foundation of the Merico Family Business

The individualism and opportunism of the organisational Founding Fathers, such as Fred Merico Snr, reflected the stories of the Founding Fathers in many other areas of US history. The culture they stamped upon their growing ventures was clearly and proudly American (Guest, 1990). The founder, Mr. Merico, combined a blend of faith, vision, integrity and hard work to make the ‘American Dream’ a reality. Once described by Ronald Regan as a “living example of the American Dream” (O'Brien, 1977, p.1), Fred Merico Snr “conditioned and vitalized every policy, every decision, every corporate move” right from the very beginning (O'Brien, 1977, p.2). Mr Merico began with a small shop that he opened in Washington DC in 1927; a world leader in the
lodging and food service sector, Merico now has over 154,000 employees, and had an annual sales figure in excess of US $4 billion in 2002.

Merico Snr was born in 1900 in Merico Settlement, Utah, the first of eight children. He often attributed much of his work ethic to his father, of whom he said “My father gave me the responsibilities of a man” (O'Brien, 1977, p.141). At thirteen, Fred Merico Snr started his first business venture. Taking over some unused acres on the family farm and, enlisting the help of his brothers and sisters, he raised a crop of vegetables that earned a US $2000 profit when they were sold. Perhaps this venture sparked his desire to progress or, as Merico Snr expressed it, “When you're born and raised on a Western sheep ranch...have eight brothers and sisters depending on you...and a burning desire for education, you have a choice of becoming resigned to your state of life or reaching outward and upward - which I did” (O'Brien, 1977, p.3).

The Merico family members were raised as devout Mormons. Merico Snr has attributed many of his good work habits, and the importance he places on the sharing of success, on the time he spent as a missionary. Having completed his degree at the University of Utah he married a co-ed from a nearby city. Together, they opened a small shop in Washington DC selling drinks in the summer. With summer drawing to a close they added food to the menu to keep the business profitable through winter, and so they entered the restaurant business. Further restaurants followed. Merico realised that many
outlets would give him a labour pool, purchasing power and a broad base for his operations. In 1928 he opened the first drive-in restaurant on the East Coast and continued to push this concept as he saw Americans embracing the automobile. To ensure consistency, the rigid standards, still a hallmark of the company today, were introduced, e.g. every day, each employee repeated the ‘saying of the day’, which rotated through what is referred to as the ‘20 sayings’. Each saying is related to serving the customer, serving each other as employees and serving the community. It was upon these foundations that the company began to grow.

In 1937 a manager from a restaurant near Washington’s old Hoover Field Airport mentioned that his customers were buying food to take away and have aboard their flights. Before long, Merico had the contracts to supply meals to Eastern and American Airlines (Merico Snr is credited with inventing in-flight catering.) Still fascinated by the drive-in concept, Merico extended it to lodging and, in 1957, opened the largest motor hotel in the country. In 1964, after 40 years in the business, Merico Snr asked his board to elect a new leader; Fred Merico Jnr was elected president in 1964 later becoming Chairman in 1972.

The new leader took the company forward in directions it had not yet explored, using management methods and techniques not previously regarded by the founder as necessary for success. One example of this entrepreneurial
endeavour was the use of advertising. Merico Snr. has often been recalled as suggesting that if you need to advertise you can’t afford to, and if you don’t need to advertise then you can afford not to (Merico & Brown, 1997). The company continued to grow and, five years later, celebrated its 50th anniversary with sales topping US $1 billion. By 1981 sales figures would double, and they doubled again by 1985.

The success of the company was attributed, for the most part, to Merico’s corporate culture. Strong American pride was woven into the fabric of the culture. Its common thread was unapologetically American patriotism, as demonstrated by the founder. In 1970 Merico Snr, speaking at a special “Honor America Day” celebration, asked the 450,000 strong crowd to help “rekindle the spirit of patriotism and respect for individual liberties which have made America great” (O’Brien, 1977, p.270). He said, “We want to demonstrate to the world that despite its imperfections, America is still the greatest country on earth, a land above all other”(O'Brien, 1977, p.207). The American patriotism can be felt strongly within the company through such features as a domestic focus on employee programs and the flying of the American flag on every Merico Hotel worldwide, although the flags are often removed in international locations for a limited period when America is in conflict, such as post September 11, 2001, or during the war against Iraq in 2003.
A managed culture such as Merico’s provides a sustainable competitive advantage, not easily imitated by competitors (Merico & Brown, 1997). Merico believes that employee loyalty, commitment and longevity leads a company to distinction through enabling a high level of retention of strongly performing employees which in turn creates a magnet to attract high calibre prospective employees. With its corporate culture believed to be so important to Merico’s success, it is treated as a serious business strategy and practice. The founders sought to create this organisational culture as a business strategy, but it is also a ‘shared legacy that will survive death or departure from an institution – a personal form of immortality’ (Martin, Sitkin and Boehm, 1993, p. 99, cited in Nickson 1999, p.180). It is this corporate culture that left the shores of America with the aim of being assimilated into new countries and national cultures.

**Merico’s Corporate Culture**

Merico International’s Senior Management considers the ‘culture connection’, to be what gives the firm its competitive advantage (Merico & Brown, 1997). In March 2000, at the Worldwide Human Resource Conference held in San Francisco, USA, Frank Merico (nephew to the Founder and currently Senior Vice President of Merico International) presented the following view of the culture of Merico. He said: “… culture is the experience we create in the minds of our customers and is demonstrated through the behaviour of our employees: employees model it and customers experience it” (Merico, 2000, p.2).
In addition, he believes that this culture does not change over time. Because this modelling occurs continually as new members are added, little change occurs over time: the culture continues as a distinct blend of shared values, goals, actions and images. Senior Management was told at the conference that the corporate culture gives employees meaning, purpose and guidance. Using the words of the founder, Merico said, “If you take good care of your people (employee focus), they’ll take pride in their work, and when they take pride in their work, they’ll take care of the customer (customer focused)” (Merico & Brown, 1997, pxiii). These words, and the blend of values and ideals that they instil in the company’s employees, are the result of a long history during which the culture has been refined and the words still appear in the boardrooms and lobbies of Merico’s hotels and businesses today. To understand the corporate culture in its context, as an ‘American model’, it is important to know about its origins.

What comprises the culture? Here, it helps to look at origins. The origins of Merico fall neatly into the category of ‘hard working family business gains international success’. The familial rhetoric in the organisation’s culture shows there was no place for third parties, such as trade unions (Nickson, 1999). Merico has always been depicted rather as “one big happy family”, and paternalism could be considered a feature. According to Forte, paternalism means “a family attitude and employees being cared for, valued and noticed,
however big the organisation may be” (Forte, 1987, p.60, cited in Nickson, 1999, p.32). A sense, of family and belonging easily evokes kinship, and suggests a type or order of relationship that may be emulated within the organisation. In a sense the notion of generating an organisational kinship through strong, paternalistic corporate cultures is exactly what may drive the desire for the immortality of the Founding Fathers, in addition to the goal of spreading the word to countries further a field.

The year 1979 saw the first overseas Merico hotel opened in Europe. Although at the time the company had no strategic interest in conducting business outside the US, it was an opportunity that somehow ‘fell into’ the portfolio (Nickson, 1999). By the mid 1980s Merico had increased its move towards assuming an international presence largely due to the saturation of the domestic hotel market. Perlmutter (1969) identified the place multinationals held as a key factor in securing harmony for the world. He saw the multinational as a “… new kind of institution – a new type of social architecture” (Perlmutter, 1969, p.10, cited in Nickson, 1999, p.32). It was thought that the new social architecture could have the impact of increasing world peace and stability, while at the same time as increasing America’s economic strength and reducing the risks of war. Perhaps Merico, like Perlmutter (1969), may have perceived the role of the multinational to be potentially so much more than simply a new market to dominate. For Merico’s contribution, the company’s goal of having 200 hotels in their international
division by the year 2000, was achieved. It was immediately followed with a new directive, viz. 300 hotels by 2003. In May 2003, the total stood at 287 hotels.

‘Hardware’ vs ‘Software’

The ‘hardware’ within Merico refers to those things that remain the same, like an American ‘Home Away from Home’. This is a marketing strategy which is clearly aimed at only one market, the huge American domestic market and those who travel and work internationally. Merico has many hundreds of standards in their hardware. In this way Merico resembles the other great globaliser, McDonalds. The commonality in its strategies lay in their being executed in such an unapologetically ‘American’ style. With fifty percent of all Merico International customers being American, this approach could be justified. Strong central control was seen as imperative if standards or levels of consistency were to be maintained in a time of such rapid expansion into new frontiers. In each hotel, ‘core standards’ were to be enforced and strictly adhered to, such as the American Flag being flown at the hotel’s entrance, the presence of a copy of USA Today in the lobby, along with a portrait of the Merico family. Strict requirements extended to the rooms, the kitchens, the restaurants and bars, housekeeping and the front office. High levels of standardisation were considered important for the success of an American-driven internationalisation process in the hotel sector in the early 1980s, and Merico certainly adhered to this (Nickson, 1999).
Although the hardware remained very reflective of the country of origin, the software began to diversify. The crucial reason was that some adaptation to the local market demands was essential if the organisation wanted to avoid being seen as ‘imperialistic or American/Western arrogant’ (Nickson, 1999, p.33). A shift from ‘hardware’ (mostly not negotiable) to ‘software’ occurred, brought about first by a shift in focus, towards areas where a competitive advantage could most effectively be gained. The reason for this shift was highlighted in research by Thompson and Nickson (1998), who caution companies to be aware of the dangers of assuming that corporate culture can be taught to Host Country Nationals (HCNs). The authors perceived that a Parent Country National’s (PCN) way of managing is closely entwined with their national identity, so that when expatriates move into a host country, their management style, and consequently the ‘software’ they take with them, is a reflection of their own national identity. Wheeler and McClendon (1998) noted how American firms are undertaking numerous innovations in work systems that are designed to increase productivity, reduce costs and improve quality. They suggest that these new approaches usually involve some form of employee involvement or an emphasis on coordination and decision making with management. The shifting of the physical product or ‘hardware’ to the service encounter and ‘employee experience’ or ‘software,’ was seen as a way of gaining competitive advantage. In research conducted by Black and Gregersen (2002), Merico Jnr explained the reliance on ‘software’ by
explaining that: “We don’t manufacture anything. Everything we do is service. Everything we do has some sort of people-relationship component to it” (p.8).

A strong belief of the founder, and the oft-repeated maxim, ‘Take care of the employees and they will take care of your customers, and they will take care of your business’ was exported and reinforced through Human Resource Policies and compulsory management training. To achieve their even greater international dominance in 1996, Merico considered the success of the ‘software’ to be critical. It was recognised that an organisation needed to have not only satisfied employees, but also ‘happy’ ones, in order to gain an advantage over competitors. Merico Snr believed that it was the strength of the organisational culture which would produce the most desirable attitude (Nickson, 1999). This attitude was a part of the ‘software’. However, to ensure that the culture was developed and maintained to the expected levels internationally, it needed to be quantifiable.

Merico adopted one evaluation approach and began to standardise this to ensure adherence to its internal human resource principles and the application of the ‘software’. The Department of International Human Resources was enlisted to achieve the implementation together with the headquarters research team. Merico’s international mission statement reads: “To achieve a competitive advantage in the international market where we do business by integrating the Merico culture with the cultures in which we do business”
(Merico & Brown, 1997). The company’s ability to gain this competitive advantage became imperative given the increasingly crowded international market. Applying, retaining, clearly measuring on an on-going basis and transposing the ‘software’ package, or paradigm, thus became a critical management strategy.

Employee Satisfaction

The measurement of internal indicators in Merico International is undertaken in a number of ways, but when this involves staff, it is measured predominantly using the Employee Opinion Survey (EOS) (Appendix B). As stated in the introduction this is an organisational climate survey. The EOS, one of the means used by Merico in their management evaluation, links results to remuneration and bonuses for managers. Thus, employees are tied to the business strategy of the unit. Key question results are reported to the respective regional office, while the links to appraisals and remuneration, and making the results open for scrutiny by most senior members of the organisation, also make the outcomes important in any consideration of promotion or transfer within the company. Through these mechanisms it would appear that Merico has clearly indicated to staff members its commitment to the use of the EOS as a relevant and necessary management tool.

The purpose of the EOS is to measure employee satisfaction in relation to customer service, the work environment and communication, as well as to
development and opportunities within Merico International. It is important to explain here how this is done, as it is highly relevant to this study. The participation, by all hotels, in the staging of the EOS is compulsory. However, at the property level, employees are given the choice of participating and participation is anonymous. Nevertheless Merico awards recognition prizes to those hotels which gain greater than 95% participation and adhere to the ‘best practice’ guide that addresses, among other topics, ‘how to get involvement from employees’. The EOS is Human Resource (HR) driven within Merico and the HR sector is seen as the ‘police’ of the exercise. HR must follow strict administrative guidelines, which are randomly audited by Headquarters in Washington DC. The guidelines, for the most part, appear to attempt to ensure the confidentiality of employees, and that data is not tampered with. This instrument has the potential to be abused, as do all performance measures. Apparently aware of this, Merico has put in place the above safeguards however, to minimise this risk.

The Process

If the hotel would like additional information the annual survey can be run with what Merico refers to as a ‘mini’ survey between each annual survey. However, due to the high costs involved, approximately US$12.00 per employee, most Merico hotels only complete the annual survey. The survey itself asks questions of employees covering: overall satisfaction, the work environment, the people they work with, leadership at their hotel, their work
and career, the guest, the company, communication, tenure intentions, referral behaviour and team work. The ‘best practice’ model encourages completing a training course before doing the survey to ensure a common understanding of the meaning of the questions. The survey is available in the following languages: English, Spanish, Tagalog, Hungarian, Dutch, Portuguese, Czech, Mandarin Chinese, Vietnamese, Arabic, Greek, Haitian/Creole, Burmese, Cantonese Chinese, German, Polish, Thai, Russian and Japanese.

Employees complete their surveys confidentially on a computer-readable form. The scoring system runs from ‘1’, ‘being very satisfied’, to ‘5’, ‘being very dissatisfied’. A score of ‘6’ is provided to give a neutral ‘does not apply’ response. Completed surveys are placed in a sealed envelope and then placed into a sealed box by the employee. HR is required to ensure the security of the box throughout the survey period. It is then returned, unopened, to Washington. Once analysed, the results are returned to the hotel in a report format. The statistics provided for the hotel’s use are broken into various sections.

The first section provides the benchmarking score for the relevant region. The report provides the lowest and highest score to each question for each region. Hotels use this information to locate themselves among others in their area. If this were the only benchmark too that was used, to a degree this would then address potential cultural variations by region. Other sections
include an overall hotel result report. The report breaks down each question, with the answers received, including a percentage favourable result. The total number of responses is also recorded in the corresponding answer. Finally the report also gives departmental reports.

Departmental reports are used to partially determine managers’ remuneration and appraisal results. In the survey answers, the employees address areas of management, leadership and supervision that are directly related to their managers. This parameter is specified at the initial training session. A detailed and involved post-survey pattern is then followed, including action planning, focus groups and goal setting. A brief description of this pattern is worthwhile.

Upon receiving the reports, the General Manager and Director of HR review the results. The next stage of the process involves a review of their specific report with each department head. This enables HR to begin to prepare for focus groups procedures. The next stage involves bringing the employees together, without the managers or supervisors, to review the results and begin to determine if there are any issues that need attention. Action plans are developed using the employees as the key contacts to execute the plans. The managers and supervisors are then brought into the focus group and the action plans are agreed to. Within the reports can be found the Work Commitment Index (WCI).
Work Commitment Index (WCI)

The design and use of the WCI are highly relevant to the current research. The WCI was established in 1997 as a measure of the relationship between employees and their employers. Employees who give ‘their best’ to an employer, and who help the organisation meet its business goals, are characterised as committed. Anon Consulting’s\(^5\) main business ventures lie in risk management, retail, reinsurance and wholesale brokerage, claim management and finally human capital consulting. Anon has 53,000 employees operating in over 120 countries. Since 1982, the company has grown to be the world’s largest reinsurance broker and captive insurance company manager. In 2001 Anon celebrated its 50\(^{th}\) year of operation, with a US$7.7 billion reported revenue. In the ‘Human Capital’ division of Anon, there are three main fields: employee benefits, compensation and management consulting. The WCI was developed by the management consulting branch. In 1996, Anon’s Loyalty Institute conducted research to measure the current level of employee commitment and investigated conditions that enhanced or impeded commitment and retention. Anon claimed that:

In short, throughout behavioural science literature, a significant causal relationship has been shown to exist between job satisfaction, organisational commitment, work performance, and turnover intent. (Anon, 1999, p.1)

\(^5\) Anon Consulting a pseudonym as previously explained, this is an attributed title for the purpose of protecting the company’s identity.
The WCI was the first American national measure, or gauge, of the relationship of employees to their employers. Anon Consulting (1999) argued that, in the past, a good employee was not difficult to keep; it could be done by simply paying enough, providing good benefits, and holding a picnic once a year. However, workforce environments have changed. Frequent job changes are now expected, with complete career changes not uncommon (Teicher, Holland, & Gough, 2002). There is also an expectation that there be a balance between personal life and work commitments. Recently, there has been greater emphasis on personal career progression than on committing to a single employer. It has been proposed by Anon Consulting (1999) that the WCI can be used to gauge future trends, develop effective workforce strategies to maintain commitment and retention, while also providing a benchmark for organisations to compare themselves against.

Discussing their 1999 study, Anon Consulting considered the validity of the index. They refer to correlations in the findings as ‘strong’ (.53 and stronger); the study appears valid in its method. Unfortunately, with the index being generated as part of a consultancy report, the details of how they tested for validity is unclear. Despite attempts to elicit further details from Anon in relation to this by the researcher, no information was forthcoming. Anon’s stance is thus, that on the basis of their presented evidence, the index is valid. Despite this difficulty, it has been established that their sample consisted of American employees only.
The index, created through six questions, represents dependent or outcome variables based upon three key dimensions of workforce commitment, as defined in the areas of motivation and productivity. The key dimensions, as presented by Anon, are teamwork behaviours, referral and recommendation behaviour and intended tenure with the company. The analysis of the independent variables or “drivers” by Anon began in 1997. Anon’s independent variables are company direction, work satisfaction, recognition and rewards, opportunities for personal growth, company work environment, and a work/life balance, as seen in Figure 2.1.

**Drivers**

- For Self: *Knowledge of Organisational Direction*
- *Job Satisfaction*
- For Self: *Recognition/Reward, Growth Opportunities, Work Environment*

**Outcome Behaviours**

- WORK COMMITMENT
  - *Team Development (Willingness to exert effort)*
  - *Referral Behaviour (Belief in and acceptance of organisational goals and values)*
  - *Tenure Intentions (Desire to retain membership)*

---

**Figure 2.1 Anon Consulting’s Work Commitment Index (WCI) for Merico.**

Despite both the dependent and independent variables being present in the EOS, only the dependant variables are measured. Once again, attempts by the researcher to establish why this was the case with Anon proved fruitless.
The index is correlated and reported currently in all US domestic Merico Hotels. Within Merico, the index is linked to and carries considerable weight in decisions regarding a manager’s remuneration and career progression and so it takes on a greater significance. It is currently being proposed that this index be extended to all international hotels and be used in a similar way for critical decision-making regarding managers. The WCI is widely used within a range of industries within the domestic situation in the USA. However, at an international level, no other organisation uses it, nor has it been tested for cross-cultural influences. This makes the enquiry of this thesis particularly valuable.

SUMMARY

Merico plays an important role in the international service industry as one of the world’s largest hotel chains. By virtue of its size and dominance in the market, it is often viewed as being at the forefront of developing and adopting new systems and processes. The company’s strong corporate culture, with its historical foundations and its ‘family run’ feel (Mr Merico Jnr is still Chairman), makes it a unique case to study. Its presence in 51 countries, and continued expectation of growth, make it of significant interest to cultural anthropologists, HR practitioners and management theorists.

Merico operates across a range of national cultures, while attempting to maintain a strong and standardised corporate culture, making it an excellent subject for this research. In such a diverse setting, Merico, presents an
intriguing case of MNC practices. In addition, the company uses tools which it hopes will ensure that the corporate culture remains consistent, including the use of the EOS. The potential links between national culture, the drivers of work commitment and the potential differences between domestic US and the area of focus, the Asia Pacific Region (APR), provide an ideal context for investigation. The study is made more interesting as noted in chapter two, by the knowledge that cultures such as those in Asia, rely significantly on non-verbal and situational techniques in communication. In Australia, the USA and Britain, the reliance is upon verbal discourse for all parties to simply ‘say what they mean’ (Deresky, 2002). The extent and nature of the divergence of these cultures has not previously been researched in the service sector in relation to work commitment.
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW: NATIONAL CULTURE AND CORPORATE CULTURE

Introduction

This thesis seeks to demonstrate that a more geocentric approach to understanding work commitment and International Human Resource Management practices in a cross-cultural context needs to be developed, and proposes an alternative model and approach to achieve this.

The following literature review examines national and corporate culture over two chapters: the present chapter reviews national and corporate culture while chapter four addresses literature associated with the issue of work commitment. How culture and commitment are connected is examined in the later section of chapter four, in which a new model for understanding work commitment in collectivist cultures is proposed.

Corporate culture, organisational culture and organisational climate require clear demarcation in this thesis because of the overlap and proliferation of concepts presented in the literature. It is important then to configure the concept of national culture and to establish how corporate culture differs from organisational culture and organisational climate. Figure 3.1 below portrays the subjects of this research and their cultural
meanings, or types. The concepts will be examined individually with the aim of assessing the importance of each to answering the questions: “How do employees in collectivist national cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC” and “What are the implications for international performance management practices within the hospitality context?” National culture, which is fundamental in cross-cultural studies, will be considered first.

Figure 3.1: Interrelationship of factors affecting work commitment.
Source: R.McPhail (2003), designed for this study.
Tayeb (2003) views national culture as some form of combination of the numerous definitions in the literature, including: norms, values, feelings, thinking, roles, rules, behaviour, beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and meanings. National culture, involving core values and assumptions, embedded in centuries of traditions and beliefs, is highly resistant to change. The concept of national culture as explained by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), which was built on the work of Hofstede (1980), is particularly relevant to this thesis as it considers the phenomenon in relations to organisations such as Merico. The work of these authors in thus examined later in this chapter.

**Corporate Culture**

Corporate culture can be defined as the organisation’s core values and assumptions wrapped in an image, which it projects as a deliberate strategy to solicit engagement from various stakeholders (Linstead & Grafton Small, 1992). The history of the company plays a vital role in the communication and re-telling of the core values and assumptions of the organisation, selling, perhaps, the promise of a preferred organisational culture over which management have great influence, but not total control. Given the part played by history in old companies such as Merico and companies like it, the corporate culture may be slow to change. Linstead and Grafton Small (1992) portray corporate culture as being transmitted and marketed, sold or imposed on the rest of the organisation, with bold internal and
external images, yet also by action and belief – the rites, rituals, stories and values which are offered to organisational members as part of the seductive process of achieving their membership and gaining commitment.

Organisational Culture

Organisational culture, which is derived from corporate culture, is able to be changed more quickly than the latter. The increased susceptibility to change is due largely to the increased number of subcultures influencing the corporate culture at the operational level (Tayeb, 2003). The organisational culture is that which grows or emerges within the organisation and which emphasises the creativity of the organisational members as culture-makers, perhaps resisting the dominant culture (Linstead, 2004). Although possibly fragmented, organisational culture is the outcome of the collective understanding of the employees’ everyday world (Linstead, 2004; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Schien (1985, p.3) defined organisational culture as the “pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration and that have worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore taught to new members”. Organisational culture, although not the focus of this study, is impacted upon by the corporate culture, which is explored further in this chapter. Organisational culture is composed of the shared values and assumptions of employees including the formal and informal rules within
the organisation which influence the behaviour and perceptions of employees (Nickson, 1997). Organisational culture is involved in the transmission of the corporate culture and is mediated by organisational climate at any given time within any organisation. All three are embedded at the same time in an organisation and interplay of each occurs in no necessarily easily or clearly discernable causal manner.

**Organisational Climate**

Organisational climate concerns the way the organisation feels to employees at any point in time (Swailes, 2002). Climate can change abruptly with significant consequences. The organisational climate of the MNC changes regularly and can be sensed very quickly (Swailes, 2002). Organisational climate is of particular relevance as it is from such a snapshot, taken in a specific time and place, that Merico and other organisations like it, seek out the perceptions of employees on a range of areas which have performance measurement implications for management. It is from the organisational climate that Merico takes its annual employee survey and its work commitment index. Having begun to demarcate the important concepts of national culture, corporate culture, and organisational climate, the overarching theme of culture is explored next.
Culture

Culture is a force that is so strong that, even when an individual is removed from their own milieu and located in another, their perceptions or cultural frame of reference, in relationship to the world around them, remains, if not untouched, at least largely intact (Chinese Culture Connection Group, 1987). Certainly culture is always latently present at a minimum, actively engaged as the norm, even if suppressed in a surrounding dominant and different culture.

The multitude of theories and models that have been developed to describe culture includes numerous terms that are used loosely and transferred to other types of culture, such as organisational and corporate cultures. Tayeb (2003) summarises the argument surrounding culture by stating, “[S]ome argue that culture is something that a group of people has, or something a group of people is. Some argue definitions of culture from the stance of what culture is not and some argue from the position of what culture is.” Following Tayeb, this thesis adopts the view that culture is regarded as a filter or lens through which the individual forms perceptions, which determine the responses to an environment or relationships.

The controversy that surrounds the current debate regarding the applicability of current definitions and models of culture has resulted in many different proposals, such as that offered by Schien (1985), who
envisages different layers of culture, each with a varying degree of visibility. As we have seen, Tayeb (2003) envisages culture as some form of combination of numerous factors, including: norms, values, feelings, thinking, roles, rules, behaviour, beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and meanings. Westwood and Kirkbride (1998) note that culture at its most simplistic is a highly abstract concept and, at its most abstract, is a concept of multiple levels of abstraction. They describe culture, at its most abstract, as the human ability to use complex linguistic and non-linguistic symbols to transmit shared tradition and patterns of social interaction through time and space.

While the understanding of culture is difficult enough in one country or nation, cross-cultural understanding remains a major challenge for academics and practitioners alike. The following section examines the work of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) in order to develop the alternative framework for the cross-cultural analysis of work commitment as proposed in this thesis. While these authors are not without their critics, their works remain the benchmark for many studies on cross-cultural management and organisations.

**National Culture**

Hofstede (1984) is considered to be the founder of cross-cultural analysis. Hofstede defined dimensions that could be analysed in
determining natural cultural differences. Through his research with IBM, data was obtained from 116,000 employees spanning 50 countries (Brooks, 1999). The application of Hofstede’s national topography of values, which psychologised culture by enabling it to be classified into dimensions, is not designed to be applied to individuals, but rather to a country level (McSweeney, 2002). Inferring his results to individuals is a commonly found approach in cross-cultural research.

The following four well-rehearsed cultural dimensions emerged from Hofstede’s research: power distance, individualism versus collectivism, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity/femininity. Individualism refers to a national cultural attribute describing a loosely-knit social framework in which people focus mainly on the care of themselves and their immediate families. Collectivism describes the attribute of a tight social framework in which people expect others, in the groups of which they are a part, to look after and protect them. The focus is on the group. Power distance is the extent to which a society accepts that power in institutions and organisations is distributed unequally. Uncertainty avoidance is the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid them. Finally, masculinity refers to the extent to which societal values are characterised by assertiveness and materialism, while femininity refers to the national culture attribute that emphasises relationships and the concern for others. The latter terms should not be
mistaken for gender references, as in female and femininity, but rather an approach to the viewing or doing of things.

Later in Hofstede’s work with Bond (1988), a fifth dimension was added. Denoted the ‘long-term orientation’ (LTO), this dimension emerged primarily as a result of work by the Chinese Culture Connection Group (1987): the Group evaluated Hofstede’s dimensions in a Confucian, setting using the Chinese Values Survey. As Brooks (1999) has described it, the new dimension proved particularly relevant in an Asian setting due to the long-term perspective that was taken both on work and the organisation. Triandis (1988) considers Hofstede’s four dimensions as unable to demonstrate the ways in which cultures differ because of the work-related focus. This is indeed worth noting, given Triandis’s concern (1988) that Hofstede’s four dimensions were unable to demonstrate the ways that cultures differ, because of the focus given to work. Traindis proposed, that it was not only in values that cultural differences could be located, but also in perceptions, cognition and action.

Bird, Joyce, Osland, Mendenhall and Schneider (1999), *inter alia*, criticise Hofstede’s treatment of values as superficial and simplistic, showing little appreciation of how complex cultures are. Such criticism does not appear to take into account work by the Chinese Values Survey and the research applying Hofstede to Eastern Europe, which has further
developed his work by providing sample sizes in these studies of greater than the original 116,000 (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Such criticism fails to offer viable and valid alternatives and the continued universal use of this popular tool proves it is still by far the most commonly used today. Despite developments since Hofstede’s research and analysis, his work remains the foundation upon which most models of culture are built, such as that of Child (1984), who introduced more complex and contemporary models of culture.

Kluckhorn and Strodtbeck (1961) approached culture from an anthropological point of view and were among the earliest to explore this concept. The authors established six orientations of values: the nature of individuals, a person’s relationship to the environment, the nature of a person’s activities, the time dimension and the space dimension. Some dimensions of Hofstede’s (1980) early work would appear to be based on this. The six value orientations were to help classify and create cultural profiles. The research had a smaller sample size than Hofstede’s however, it was conducted only in the south east of rural America and was therefore restricted in domain. Later work expanded that of Kluckhorn and Strodtbeck (1961), taking it into other countries. By their own admission, unfortunately the lack of generalisability renders Kluckhorn and Stodtbeck’s research less appropriate to use than that of Hofstede.
Adler (1997) further explored Kluckhorn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) values orientations, specifically focusing on Americans and how they differed from other nationalities. Indeed Adler (1997) has added weight to Hofstede’s claims that the American methods were not globally effective, specifically dispelling the universal management myths surrounding culture. Adler (1997; 2002) also explored concerns about the ‘one size fits all’ method of management, especially those espoused by the West. He demonstrated in various cultures the lack of flexibility and applicability of the ‘one best way’ approach to management, and used these findings to highlight the need for further investigation (Adler, 1997, 2002). Laurent’s research (1983), also based on that of Kluckhorn and Strodtbeck (1961), focused purely on management, and began to categorise culture into broad groups of like behaviours. While Hofstede’s research is only applicable at a countrywide level, Laurent’s research focuses on the individual and individual behaviours.

Hofstede (1980) explains that in the 1930s and 1940s the study of national cultural differences became a popular paradigm in anthropology, and that some of the work had racist and supremacist overtones. However, he concedes that, despite this negative aspect, anthropologists have the potential to indeed contribute valuable knowledge and insight into culture and individual cultures, which could also prove of use to other disciplines. Hofstede has not only highlighted flaws in earlier anthropology, he has
criticised mainstream anthropology of recent decades, stating that it has “…constrained itself to marginal groups and to problems which for our society as a whole are fairly trivial” compared to the more serious concerns of the world, such as peace and hunger (1991, p.248). However, this trend that Hofstede perceives may be about to be radically reversed as the result of the increased status of the cultural anthropologist. McIntosh, (1999) comments that those concerned with more serious matters report on the many cultures which share a compatible frame of reference, many with a concern to stem the influx of the culture that is American. In addition, the groups’ compatible frames of reference in regard to this matter are magnified and increased as cultural anthropologists seek to adopt a more globally humanitarian stance on the distribution of wealth and on the future status of foreign debt which poorer countries collectively owe to the US. The US President George Bush stated, while addressing the American people in reference to the recent invasion of Iraq, “We impose our values, let us not impose our culture” (Miller, 2002). Such statements illustrate the confusion that surrounds this issue, and raise the question of whether such a convenient distinction can be sustained between the two; or are culture and values one and the same?

**Values as Culture**

Shared values underlie the concept of national culture, according to Hofstede (1984), and culture has become synonymous with the notion of a
shared set of values. Hofstede defined culture as “the collective programming of the mind, which distinguishes the members of one human group from another … culture, in this sense, includes systems of values” (1984, p.13). Westwood and Everett (1987) make the case that in measuring these values, we can determine cultural differences.

Thus, an important question arises regarding which values are being measured (McSweeney, 2002). For example, Hofstede’s study (1980) concerned work values, and he presumed these to be effective indicators of national culture. McSweeney (2002), the most recent and most strident of Hofstede’s critics, argues that Hofstede is attempting to “measure the immeasurable” and that in fact the overall assumptions underlying the theoretical position, as well as the methodology, were flawed. McSweeney states that:

Hofstede’s claims are excessive and unbalanced; excessive because they claim far more in terms of identifiable characteristics and consequences than is justified; unbalanced, because there is too great a desire to ‘prove’ his \textit{a priori} convictions rather than evaluate the adequacy of his ‘findings’. (McSweeney, 2002, p.112)

McSweeney is not alone in his concerns. Others (Westwood & Everett, 1987) also believe that Hofstede’s definition of culture should be treated cautiously, as it evokes, some important problems. One problem is the implications of theorising cultures as ‘national’. Another is the methodological soundness of Hofstede’s work; questions include the sample sizes, the assumption of only one organisational culture within IBM,
and the notion of worldwide uniform occupational culture as a result solely of early socialisation. A third problem is the inherent flaw in trying to generalise to the national level from the micro-level of IBM. The final problem is Hofstede’s de-valuing of organisational culture, as addressed in the model developed by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (McSweeney, 2002).

In contrast to Hofstede’s definition of culture with its roots in organisational life, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner view culture as a more psychological/individual construct. The latter’s model explains culture as an individual’s set of cognitions, whereas Hofstede sees the aggregation of individual values as the key to understanding culture. Such theoretical differences are now explored.

**Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s Model of National Culture**

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s research evolved from the work of Kluckhorn and Strodbeck (1961) and Hofstede (1984). From a consultant’s background, they sought to find solutions and tools for managers and organisations to use. It was from this perspective that their model of culture began to develop. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner believe that national culture is affected by the following factors: language, religion, legal system, values, political system and education (Brooks,
They note that it is crucial to have shared expectations to establish effective and successful interactions in business and management. This is ultimately the field in which they have applied their model of culture. Such shared expectations are built upon by a group through the same layers that make up all culture accordingly (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). As seen in Figure 3.2 below, the layers of culture are built on the core that contains underlying assumptions that are implicit; the middle layer is made up of beliefs and values; while the outer layer is the most explicit, and it is comprised of behaviours and artifacts. The layers are arranged according to visibility, with behaviours being observable and assumptions inferred.

**Figure 3.2 Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s model of culture.**

The level of explicit culture is that which is observable—artefacts, such as houses; food, language, art and shrines. The next layer, the middle
layer, includes norms and values that are reflected by the outer one. Norms are the mutual sense of group, the written laws or social control mechanisms adopted in our societies. Values determine our view of what is considered ‘good’ and ‘bad’. Where norms reflect the values of the culture there should be stability. It is when the two do not reflect each other that destabilisation results (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998).

This model of cross-culture by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) consists of our assumptions about existence. The most basic value people hold in relation to nature is that of survival; this is demonstrated throughout cultures in the way they organize themselves. The word ‘culture’ was derived from the verb ‘to cultivate’, to till soil, which is related to how a person or group survives, and the methods or organisation and cooperation required for them to live safely and securely. In order to deal effectively with problems and solve them, different cultures have formulated various logical assumptions, referred to as sets of assumptions. The national culture or functional culture, then, is no more than a reflection of this. The deep set of basic assumptions is the result of cultural conditioning and these drive the surface behaviours (Brooks, 1999). This is a bottom up notion of national culture, being an aggregation of individual assumptions. However, it also appears that there is a powerful top down force that ‘coerces’ the individual as well.
Unfortunately neither Hofstede nor Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner offer the next step in applying their models to broader social issues. The key problem is, therefore, defining how individuals aggregate into groups and then into a society or culture. We are usually born into families where the primary acculturation occurs, thus the critics mentioned below see the current models and definitions of culture as incomplete.

By synthesizing the work of Hofstede, who considered values to be the core of culture, with that of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, who viewed the core of culture to be a set of assumptions, Brooks (1999) developed a new core represented by both values and sets of assumptions, as seen in Figure 3.3. Called here a Cultural Frame of Reference (CFR), this can be thought of as a series of filters through which we make sense of our world. The concept of culture as a series of filters is not new. McWhinney (1992), for example, described culture as having several dimensions or realities to it including the sensory (dealing with how we relate to nature); the social (how we construct our world views through collective actions); the unitary (referring to how we formulate truths, laws, customs and traditions) and mythic (how we deal with spirituality and faith). McWhinney argued that most people draw at most on two of these realities to construct their world views or cultural perspectives. In a similar way we could propose that the CFR is made up of values and assumptions that each individual calls on to make sense of their world, doing so,
however, in selective ways. We could further claim that aspects of the CFR are dominant in some societies, but not in others, or are more adaptable and changing in one place than another.

![Diagram of Trompenaars' Model and Cultural Frames of Reference Model](image)

**Figure 3.3. Development of the Cultural frame of Reference Model of Culture**


Brooks’ work is invaluable as a corrective to the deficiencies in both the values and the assumption approaches to studying national culture. While his approach might not answer all the criticisms raised against both approaches, and in particular the approach of Hofstede (e.g. McSweeney, 2002), it does acknowledge the importance of giving neither values nor assumptions pre-eminence in theorising national culture. Whether in fact the issues of aggregation or individualisation, universalising or particularising cultural theories can be overcome by such a move remains to be seen, but the CFR does exemplify the uneasy tensions and contradictions that continue to plague cross-cultural studies. Brooks is not alone in
recognising such tensions. Tayeb (2003) also sought to disaggregate cultural influences from others in order to identify what specific areas of national culture impacted upon organisational structure. Her typology uses concepts to identify whether the structure of an organisation is affected by national culture or by other factors, such as contextual ones (e.g. technology, size) or national/societal factors (e.g. education system; industrial relations system). She found that national culture could explain only a limited number of organisational characteristics. While this thesis cannot explore the impact of other factors on work commitment, national culture does seem to be greater than the sum of its parts (values and assumptions). This is most evident when trying to identify how national and corporate cultures influence each other.

The Critics of National Culture

McSweeney (2002) notes that in addition to the methodological flaws already mentioned, the notion of ‘collective’ is problematic in its boundaries. Hofstede does not appear to clarify whether ‘collective’ refers to the residual of the total of the values of individuals once their own unique components have been subtracted, or rather to an aggregated consensus view. Such criticism at the level of concepts raises important questions regarding the notion of ‘the majority’ and its relationship to the ideological and hegemonic functions of culture (Westwood & Everett, 1987). McSweeney (2002) also queried the appropriateness of Hofstede’s
use of the concept of ‘programming’, suggesting that it seems unsuited to the task of defining culture. ‘Programming’ indicates a type of blueprint of behaviour and raises concerns about how it appropriately accounts for the diversity of the values and behaviours of individuals.

However, the criticisms fail to offer viable and valid alternatives; the continued universal use of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions has proved to be still by far the most commonly ascribed today. Hofstede’s work remains the foundation upon which most models are built, despite research which has since gone beyond his, such as Child’s (1984). Child introduced more complex and contemporary models of culture based on collectivist national cultures. His work, together with others (Fulop & Richards, 2002; Redding, 1990), explored Guanxi and the clan-based connections found in the Asia Pacific region and is generally accepted that the connections between the family and other units are critical for survival and success. Still other people, from even unrelated disciplines and fields, joined the debate on the validity of the use of values. For example, Lee (1985, p.10), the Hong Kong democracy champion, was quoted as saying: “Don’t let anyone in Hong Kong, or for that matter in Asia, convince you that Asian values are different from your values…it’s only a convenient excuse by Asian leaders to deny basic freedoms to their people”. The question of the appropriateness of Hofstede’s definition and criticism, and even the use of values, is ongoing.
The outer layers of Trompenaars and Hampden Turner’s framework are also becoming more questionable as a contemporary model. As societies move towards a ‘one world’ look of Levis and McDonalds, the cultural by-products of clothing and so forth blend superficially from Shanghai to Sydney. Other authors such as Westwood (1992) highlight ‘hidden’ versus ‘explicit’ forms of cultural signalling. Despite this cultural sensory morphing, national cultural differences still pervade and influence every aspect of our lives. Any two people who engage in, and sustain a relationship over time, are likely to develop their own culture (Tayeb, 2003). But culture goes beyond just our relationship and response to the environment—it begins with the self.

Bertrand Russell, the eminent British philosopher, wrote as follows over half a century ago:

The manner in which animals learn has been much studied in recent years, with a great deal of patient observation and experiment. Certain results have been obtained as regards the kinds of problems that have been investigated, but on general principles there is still much controversy. One may say broadly that all the animals have been carefully observed have behaved so as to confirm the philosophy in which the observer believed before his observations began. Nay, more, they have all displayed the national characteristics of the observer. Animals studied by Americans rush about frantically, with an incredible display of hustle and pep, and at last achieve the desired result by chance. Animals observed by Germans sit still and think, and at last evolve the solution out of the inner consciousness. To the plain man, such as the present writer, this situation is discouraging. I observe, however, that the type of problem which a man naturally sets to an animal depends upon his own philosophy, and that this probably accounts for the differences in the results. The animal responds to one type of problem in one way and to another in another; therefore the results obtained by different investigators, though different, are not incompatible. But it remains necessary to remember that no one investigator is to be trusted to give a survey of the whole field.

(Bertrand Russell as cited in Hofstede, 1991, p.247.)
This illustrates the way in which a researcher influences what is perceived, but also the intense influence national culture has upon our paradigms (sets of assumptions) or theories-in-use. The idea of culture, as a combination of values and a set of assumptions, as proposed by Brooks (1999), suggests that the most deep-rooted element of culture is the set of basic values and assumptions held by a group of people, which manifest into people’s attitudes and behaviours.

Derskey (2000) notes that high-context cultures, such as those in Asia, rely on the importance of non-verbal and situational techniques, whereas those from the West expect others to ‘tell it like it is’. Therefore the definitions or labels of Western culture are likely to have no meaning to those in Asia unless they correspond with each other to some extent. To gain any ground in understanding another culture, the starting point needs to be understanding the way others think and then building from there. As Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998, p.19) noted, “One culture may be inspired by the very thing that depresses another.”

**Dimensions of National Culture**

Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars (1996) explored replication research based on the work of Hofstede (1980), Bond (1988), Schwartz (1990), and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). Their results gave considerable encouragement to the view that value surveys are producing replicable
results across large numbers of nations (Smith et al., 1996). This thesis employs the dimensions established by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner in their value survey. Hofstede’s dimension of individualism and collectivism is included in Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s model. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s dimensions have been chosen because their work used cultural dimensions to explore various corporate cultures, whereas Hofstede restricted his work to national level analysis and his concept of values was designed for use only at the national level. Researchers such as Kirkman (2001) and Maznevski, DiStefano, Gomez, Noorderhaven & Wu (2004), among others, have studied cultural orientation frameworks such as Hofstede’s at both the national and individual levels of analysis. The current research analyses cultural dimensions at an individual level through the exploration of employees’ perceptions of work commitment.

Culture, according to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), can be broadly defined into three areas: relationships with other people, the passage of time relationship and the relationship to the environment. Within these three broad dimensions are seven more specific ones: individualism versus communitarianism, universalism versus particularism, neutral versus emotional, specific versus diffuse, achievement versus

---

6 The researcher acknowledges Hofstede’s dimension of individualism/collectivism as being included in Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s model from this point forth.
ascription, attitude to time, and attitude to the environment (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998).

The findings of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner in the countries relevant to this study are presented in Appendix B and discussed here. The first dimension; that of individualism versus collectivism, refers to whether the people in the culture see themselves as individuals or as a part of a group. Another aspect of this orientation is whether the individual sees community as a priority over the individual or as something a person may contribute to if they wish. Adler (1997) noted that Americans, who are highly individualistic, perceive individuals who achieve as ‘champions,’ and he provides examples such as Bill Gates and Michael Jordan. This dimension of culture is thus relevant to different perceptions of success and achievement between cultures. Widespread agreement is found in the literature supporting the view that the dimension of individualism/collectivism is the most influential. Smith et al (1996, p.236) concluded that this dimension of individualism and collectivism is “the most important yield of cross-cultural psychology to date”. The current research is guided by it in the exploration of employees’ perceptions of work commitment within the highly collectivist countries of the APR. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s research found that Japan, Singapore, Malaysia and China were highly collectivist, while Australia and the US were highly individualistic.
Within the universalism versus particularism dimension, relationships between people are examined. The universalist approach applies what is considered to be ‘right’ and is always applicable, regardless of the circumstances of the individual, whereas the particularist culture believes in the focus on the individual, their relationships and particular circumstances. China, Japan, and to a lesser extent Singapore, were found to be universalistic, whereas Australia and the US were particularistic in Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s findings.

The neutral versus emotional dimension (also known as neutral versus affective) describes the expression of emotion in interactions. In a culture where interaction is objective and detached a neutral orientation is observed. Other cultures are more emotional in the conduct of business, fully expressing feelings. In Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s study this dimension did not result in the APR countries being clustered together. Instead, the Philippines, Malaysia and Thailand preferred interactions to be neutral while Australia and the US, along with Singapore, China and Hong Kong, adopted an emotional approach.

The specific versus diffuse orientation discloses different levels of immersion in relationships. When a contractual relationship exists, it is referred to as specific. When a full and holistic connection is made between
parties it is considered to be diffuse. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner found that while China, Japan and Singapore tended to adopt more specific relationships, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Australia and the US preferred diffuse ones. Again, the APR results vary in this dimension, and do not clearly indicate a clear collectivist national culture preference.

The achievement versus ascription orientation refers to what is achieved by the individual as opposed to what they are born into, or with, such as status, gender and kinship. On this dimension there does appear to be a clustering of the APR nations, as Japan, China, Hong Kong, Philippines, Thailand and, to a lesser extent, Singapore place importance on ascription. In contrast, Australian and US results favoured achievement.

In addition to the five relational orientations that form the basis of cultural differences in this model, the attitude to time differs. Some cultures, such as the French, place a lot of value on the past, whereas others, such as the American, place importance on what is currently under way and what is planned for the future (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). This dimension may affect strategic planning, company motivation techniques and recognition programs. Of the APR countries reported, Japan and China were clearly past-oriented, while Australia and the US were highly futuristic in their planning.
Finally, the attitude to the environment is different between cultures. As Trompenaars (1993) puts it, either the attitude is inner directed or outer directed. Where motivation and values are from *within*, the focus is on being in harmony with the environment, whereas outer directed cultures see the environment as something to be feared (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) recount an example of how, in Japan in winter, people wear facemasks so as not to “pollute” or infect other people, whereas in London people wear masks so as not to be “polluted” by the environment or others. Adler (1997) suggests Americans tend to be more the conquerors of the environment in comparison with Confucian nations and their more harmonious approach. Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s research reported the APR counties of Japan, Singapore, China, Malaysia, Philippines and Hong Kong to be outer directed as regards the environment, while the US and Australia were inner directed. The distinctive difference in cultures from collectivist national cultures is of particular interest in this research.

**National Culture and the Asia Pacific Region**

The APR contains the greatest cultural diversity in the world and, as stated by Price (1998), the languages learnt, religions experienced, and the culture absorbed, shape a person’s character more so than any geographical border in the world. Ronen and Shenkar (1985, cited in Tayeb 2003) grouped the nations of the world into nine clusters including, among others,
Arab, Near Eastern, Far Eastern and Anglo, as a macro measure of cultural
differentiation. Within the Anglo cluster they placed the USA, Australia,
Canada, New Zealand, the UK, Ireland and South Africa. Within this
cluster alone, a clear divide would currently be found among those who
especially want to tolerate the growth of the US culture as an overlay
within their own national culture, and those nations who wish to maintain
their own unique cultural frame of reference with minimal external
influence. The world in the twenty-first century is no longer so readily
divisible into clusters, yet this deterministic approach to culture is not
without merit. Undoubtedly it is one’s geographical location at birth and
during infancy and childhood that conditions the unique cultural frame of
reference that the individual adopts throughout life. Determining what
national culture is, by framework and definition, is no mean feat. As noted
by Tayeb (2003), “‘culture’ is very hard to define due to the wooliness of
the concept”. This highlights the need for further precision in definition.

Irwin (1996) focused specifically on Asia, which he defined as countries
that are generally grouped as Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia and thus
share Pacific Ocean contact with Australia. Countries Irwin included are
Japan, China, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Laos, Vietnam, Thailand,
Cambodia, Singapore, Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia. In this
definition of Asia, Irwin quickly reminds the reader that to flippantly regard
Asia as “an amorphous mass, homogeneous in its characteristics is to fall
into the trap of the European shorthand from whence it came” (Irwin, 1996, p.11). Irwin (1996) added to the literature by raising awareness of the uniqueness of the region and how researchers must be cautious not to generalise within it. Woolcott wrote in a *Bulletin/Newsweek* article about a former secretary of Foreign Affairs and Trade from Australia who stated “as Asia matures as a nation….” (1993, p.28). Irwin correctly points out that Asia is no more a nation than is Europe. Asia is in fact a diverse group of countries which, although sharing much in common, are uniquely different in many respects.

As Korman asked: “Is Belgium one culture or two? Are the Moslems, Sikhs and Hindus of India all one culture?” (1985, p.224). Westwood and Everett (1987, p.192.) identify Southeast Asia as comprising pluralistic nations, such as Malaysia, Singapore and Hong Kong. Questions are raised about the degree of homogeneity that might exist, and how much shared meaning is present within each location, raising arguments for a more multi-perspective approach (Fulop, 1992).

Hofstede (1984) addressed the definition of homogeneity by stating that, despite internal differences, an aggregate sameness exists within national boundaries. The view of internal differences is supported by Westwood and Everett (1987), who remind us of images that are carried of ‘typical’ Chinese and other nationalities, thus making the concept plausible. For the
purpose of this research, the definition of Asia Pacific will include a selection of those countries defined by Irwin (China, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, India and Singapore) and, in addition, Australia.

The inclusion of Australia is of interest, as the cultural geographers Russell and Kiffen (1951) noted that the idea of ‘cultural worlds’ distances Asia from Australia. In the APR, two ‘worlds’ were identified: the Oriental Cultural World covering China, Korea, Japan, Malayan and Indian and the Pacific Cultural World, covering Australia, New Zealand, Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia. Australia, in this research, is therefore not only historically and ideologically vastly different from the other countries, but also possibly even exists in a different ‘cultural world’. Nevertheless, Australia is geopolitically part of the APR, with a growing need to better understand and relate to its neighbours in a bid to become a part of this emerging super-region. Its inclusion is therefore relevant. And in any case, what defines a country as a member of a region is an exercise in creating dominant discourses where geographical proximity can assume more significance and at other times, racial similarities, e.g. in crises such as the tsunami in Indonesia in 2004, Australia is seen as a part of the Asian ‘neighbours’.

Australia and the Asian nations are banded together regionally under the APR banner. This immediately raises questions. Given the diverse differences that this text has already recognised as existing between
and within the Asian countries themselves, and the massive gap between Asia and Australia in culture, can the management strategies and practices used to motivate employees and create work commitment in an organisation’s country of origin (e.g. the United States) be effective in the APR? The question is important, not only to MNCs seeking to succeed in business in the APR, but also to cross-cultural studies in general. It could be argued that one of the key elements for the success of MNCs may be found in their ability to create and maintain employee commitment.

**Corporate Culture and National Culture**

Before beginning to examine corporate culture, it is necessary to recognise the recent work of Davidson (2000) who researched organisational climate within the service sector. His work clarifies the theory that organisational climate is derived from the notion of organisational culture. As he noted (2000), the importance of climate for the hospitality industry has been highlighted by a number of theorists (Francese, 1993; Meudell & Gadd, 1994; Schneider, Breif, & Guzzo, 1996). Davidson (2000) determined that sustainable organisational change is mostly short-lived when both the climate that the organisation’s members experience, and the culture that the organisation’s members believe the organisation values to be, change (Schneider, 1994). The concepts of organisational climate and corporate culture, are interrelated. The research on organisational climate and corporate culture warrants further
investigation. However, it is beyond the scope of this research to fully explore the links between organisational climate and corporate culture that Davidson’s work acknowledges (2000). The impact of corporate culture on employees’ perceptions of work commitment is explored as an issue in this thesis through qualitative data as the first step to better understanding work commitment in collectivist national cultures. A clash was anticipated between the highly individualist national culture, from which the corporate culture in this study derived, and the highly collectivist national cultures of the Asia Pacific Region, raising critical questions for the MNC and its IHRM practices.

Westwood and Kirkbride (1998) contend that corporate culture is constructed and engineered to change the values and behaviours of employees, thereby enhancing the performance of the organisation. Rather than viewing corporate culture as simply being imposed by organisations onto another cultural system, a process of appropriation, mimesis and hybridity occurs. American organisations, according to Adler and Jelinek (1986), may be unable to recognise the influence of individualism on their corporate culture, which consists of a set of taken-for-granted assumptions, such as free will, which align with their national cultural assumptions. Much of the literature of corporate culture portrays the employee as arriving as a ‘blank slate’, willing and ready to receive cultural conditioning from the organisation (Adler & Jelinek, 1986). Managers are therefore
supposedly able to create and manipulate the corporate culture with little regard for the external environment. In the mid 1980s there appeared numerous studies on corporate culture, most failing to pay proper attention to the wider environment (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lyndberg, & Martin, 1985).

Laurent (1986) proposed the notion of ‘supra-culture’ wherein corporate culture could act to supersede the specificities of national culture. Kirkbride and Wan Chaw (1987) argued that in fact the engineering and management of corporate culture is limited, if not obstructed, by national culture. In their research on two Hong Kong companies, cultural values were compared to corporate mission statements. The researchers asked to what extent a US MNC’s corporate culture could be transferred to its Hong Kong subsidiaries. They found that ‘supra-cultures’ did not work, and they cautioned MNCs to be aware that national specifics must be considered. Despite this warning, it appears that many MNCs persist in taking their HR management style and applying it globally (Kirkbride & Wan Chaw, 1987).

Westwood and Kirkbride caution that “when an engagement between elements of two or more cultural systems occurs, it is just that, an engagement” (1998, p.556).

As is evident, various proposals have been made about the nature of corporate culture. However, the model seen in Figure 3.4 was devised by
Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) it illuminates more areas, and it will now be examined
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Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) specify two types of dominant corporate culture to distinguish different cultural dimensions: (a) equality-hierarchy and (b) orientation of the person to the task. The four corporate cultures which they define vary considerably in the areas of rewards, motivation, conflict resolution, change, learning and thinking. The four types, which are derived from the quadrant, are: 1. The family; 2. The Eiffel Tower; 3. The guided missile; and 4. The incubator (Figure 3.4). These four metaphors describe the relationships employees have to their organisation, and although there is a danger of simplifying the complexity,
by the authors’ own admission, these are presented as ideal types only. The structures that help determine corporate culture are the relationship between employees and the organisation, the system of authority defining superiors and subordinates (hierarchical system or vertical system); and the employees’ views of the organisation’s destiny, purpose and goals, and their places within it.

A person’s national culture may have a potential relationship to the type of corporate culture that is established in an organisation. Therefore, the following models of corporate culture may be representative of the organisation in their home countries of origin, but may be different when examined in different cultures. The first of these models is the family corporate culture, which is characterised by a father who knows more than his children; it is the power-oriented corporate culture. The employees (or ‘children’) are viewed as being overseen by the all-knowing employer (or ‘father’), who does what is considered to be the best for them (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). The Japanese corporate culture reflects this model, where long term devoted relationships are held to the firm and where younger employees are spoilt and indulged and older employees revered and respected. Additionally, the power may be exercised through all the members, not necessarily over them, and relationships are considered high context. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) name Singapore and South Korea, among others, as typical examples of this model, and
countries which went through late and rapid industrialisation, holding on to many feudal traditions.

The author notes that the general happiness and welfare of the employees in this family-type corporation are concerned with housing, family sizes, wages and standard of living. The power and differential status of the leader is seen as natural rather than as having anything to do with their successes or failures. The family culture, according to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), is also more interested in intuition than in rational knowledge. In relation to motivating, rewarding and resolving conflict, those in the family oriented culture are more moved by praise than money. Pay-for-performance rarely sits well with them, nor does any motivation that threatens the family bonds. The family model can be summarised by saying that it gives a high priority to doing the right things and a low priority to doing things right.

The Eiffel Tower stands for the formal bureaucracy which is narrow at the top and, through numerous layers, makes its way down to a broad and stable base. The hierarchy, as described by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), is very different from that of the family, as each level below is held together by the one above. The boss represents a role rather than a person, and status is ascribed to that role, which is greatly assisted by professional qualifications. Examples of this framework are German and
Austrian companies which see the organisation’s purpose as logical and distinct from personal needs for affection or power. The way those in the Eiffel Tower learn, think and change relates to their roles. Change, according to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), is time consuming and disruptive as it requires major role realignments. To motivate the Eiffel Tower employee, order and predictability must be maintained. Promotion is gained through acquisition of the skills required for the next role. Conflicts are seen as irrational and time wasters; channels exist with rules and procedures for grievances.

The guided missile culture is egalitarian in style. According to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), it resembles the Eiffel Tower in flight. Everything is done to reach the target using a predetermined strategy. Tasks are given to teams or project groups in which the strategy of establishing how to get to the target may not be clear. Roles are not necessarily defined; indeed, roles are all equal in power and status, with each having its various strengths. The egalitarian approach allows the leadership of the team to change according to the needs of the group. The expense of this model means that it is often superimposed on the Eiffel Tower to give it structure and make it more affordable to the general multinational corporation (MNC). The guided missile organisation will rarely change its mind about the target; thus learning ultimately requires fitting in quickly and assisting the team. If the target moves, change comes
quickly to the guided missile group. The groups are often fluid, with loyalty to the ‘function’ rather than the company, therefore turnover is high. Motivation is intrinsic, so people are paid for their performance (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998).

The final model of corporate culture discussed by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) is that of the incubator. It is based on the discourse that self-expression and self-fulfilment should be the purpose served by organisations. As a result, the culture tends to be bound by emotional ties, rather than by ties to people. Thus, the world-changing, society-focused, self-sacrificing work performed by the group is the bond; the problem can be redefined and therefore change itself is not a threat. These companies are very creative; however, beyond this change they rarely survive. Nevertheless, they quickly reinvent themselves into more attractive and contemporary versions of their former selves. The motivation for the employees is in the creative process.

The way in which any one of these four models of corporate culture is maintained across national boundaries by multinational companies is, however, beyond the scope of the current research, although it is of interest for future research. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), Hofstede (1980) and Laurent (1993) all assert that national culture defines corporate culture. If this is true, how does any one of Trompenaars’ and Hampden-
Turner’s models’ hold across nations; or is it possible to have one corporate culture represented by all of the four models? This makes the topic of cross-cultural management extremely important to managers. Indeed, Brooks (1999), states that the importance of national cultural characteristics, as determinants of management behaviour and business success, have long been acknowledged as critical by multinational business strategy researchers (Adler, 2002; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001; Tayeb, 2003), and so this work becomes critical. The present research, in its examination of the effect of national culture upon the perceptions of employees of work commitment within a MNC, needs to firstly establish what the corporate culture is. In the case of Merico, as described in chapter two, a family corporate culture exists.

Corporate culture, like work commitment within the MNC, is affected by national culture, but to what extent, and how, remain intriguing questions to be answered. It is important to note that although there is a distinct difference between corporate culture and national culture in the literature, there is also much support for the theory that the corporate culture is inevitably defined and developed by the national culture from which it is grown. This conjecture then leads to an inevitable blurring of the boundaries in relation to the definitions of the corporate culture which, to some degree, will reflect the culture of the nation.
Redding (1984), who has extensively researched management in China, argues that “the most successful organizations in the Chinese case have managed to develop particularly powerful family atmospheres which releases higher levels of motivation and trust” (p.7). The link between the cultural dimensions of collectivism and paternalism has been established in Redding’s work (1984, 1990). Paternalism occurs when the MNC’s figurehead owns some of the stock, controls the company and acts as a father figure within its corporate culture, such as is the case in Merico, the focus of this study. The collective cultural dimension, as discussed previously, is demonstrated when the needs of the group supersede those of the individual and—of specific interest to this research—a sense of identity is achieved through the membership of the group. Westwood and Kirkbride (1998) argue that collectivism is the orientation that influences organisational relationships and behaviour in Chinese businesses. The potential link between the family corporate culture and the highly collectivist national cultures of the APR, where a form of cultural isomorphism may occur, is of significance to this research. Roberts, Karlene, Boyacigiller and Nakiye (1983) state that no investigations explored by them “simultaneously embedded people into organizations and organizations into their environment”. Nonetheless, the authors continue, “the very reason to do cross-national organizational research is just that, examining how behaviours are embedded into organizations and organizations into their environment” (p.12).
Through the examination and location of an organisation within Trompenaars’ and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) typology of corporate culture we begin to see why some norms and procedures work well in one culture but are less effective in others. Hofstede (1980) and Laurent (1993) found that even in large MNCs, such as IBM, there remained differences due to national culture, despite the organisations having very strong corporate cultures. The greater the pressure for convergence to the corporate culture, the stronger the backlash against losing national cultural identity (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turners, 1998). McIntosh (1999) supports this view with his concerns that US authors have been persuading unsuspecting managers to force their Western practices onto the diverse cultures of the rest of the world without due consideration of the consequences.

Sub-groups and subcultures (Linstead & Grafton Small, 1992), which occur within the corporate culture, also play a critical role as they will ultimately influence the model which is most effective and reliable. An organisation may state that it is a ‘family’ model, but sub-groups of employees may view their corporate culture as something very different. In addition, there is growing recognition of the need to isolate and deal with national culture as an influential independent variable within corporate culture (Linstead, 2004). Adler (2002) has reinforced the importance of national cultures by concluding that, while organisations are becoming
more and more similar across the globe, the employees’ behaviour is not changing; therefore national culture is still affecting the organisation. She goes on to state that the notion that an organisation can operate “beyond nationality” is only a myth (Adler, 2002).

One of the dilemmas for those who manage cross-culturally is the extent to which they should impose a corporate culture on foreign norms and national cultures; i.e. centralise or, alternatively, allow each national culture to go its own way (i.e. decentralise), despite the overarching template of the ‘imported’ corporate culture. When decentralisation is implemented the consistency versus the flexibility of the organisation’s running must be considered. When decentralisation is thought to be achieved, deciding which aspects of the organisation, such as roles, responsibilities and accountability, are to be decentralised is a priority. However, research by Dowling, Welch and Schuler (1999) indicates that global and multinational companies are essentially centralised.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) demonstrated that, to best achieve and optimise local and head office corporate culture, a balance must be found. This means finding a balance between local freedom to prioritise employment values and rewarding efforts. In a truly international or transnational corporation, the right mix between these factors in relation to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) cultural dimensions is
determined by, for example, how much group versus personal rewards are given in any one culture. The term “glocalization”, which combines the word “global” from globalisation with “local”, was used by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) and refers to the need, on the one hand, for international organisations to become more standardised in their mode of operation and level of service delivery as they become global. On the other hand, the organisations need to adapt to the local characteristics of the market, including the national culture and all that it encompasses. Such an approach is intended to create a balance between local and parent country needs, achieved through ‘glocalization’. Since the earliest anthropological studies, the question of achieving this balance has been the subject of much research.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) state that companies such as IBM and others founded in the US are less likely to have foreigners in the top management team, perpetuating the ‘one size fits all’ universally applicable management myth. In contrast, many international and transnational companies strive to address the ‘centralise and decentralise’ balance. In those international companies referred to by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), such as Shell, ABB, Ericson and Procter & Gamble, the role of ‘Headquarters’ is to coordinate, not to instruct. Each area determines competitive pricing while top management is a true representation of all cultures involved. Those roles are not just part-time
short-term senior roles for representatives of other cultures, but permanent and equally represented positions in the highest offices. Shell International Petroleum Company is a good example of this, with groups of management, rather than one CEO, and shared relocatable ‘Headquarters’ rather than headquarters based in one territory. The opposite of the ‘one size fits all’ approach is clearly adopted by this transportable power centre, which accounts for, and embeds, diversity into the corporate culture. Determining the degree of balance to create organisational commitment in a wide diversity of cultures is the future challenge of MNCs.

**Literature Summary**

National culture has been examined through the national typography of values as presented by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). The work of others such as, but not only Hofstede (1980), Kirkbride and Westwood (1993), Adler (2002), and Laurent (1986) have been presented in this discourse of culture, while critics such as McSweeney (2002) have added much to the debate. The APR has been examined with regard to the challenges of cross-cultural management and found to be diverse. The literature has revealed that the role of the dimension of collectivism is of relevance to this study and has been explored through the literature review. Through the framework of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), Merico, the MNC in this study, has been shown to be a ‘family model’ of corporate culture. Despite this, the universally applicable management
theory has been called into question as MNCs now seek new answers to old questions. When the question of how national culture and corporate culture may affect performance arises, the focus turns to the individual level of employees’ work commitment and their perceptions. The following chapter explores work commitment in the APR and its link to national culture.
CHAPTER FOUR

LITERATURE REVIEW: WORK COMMITMENT

Introduction

Employee commitment is highly sought after by those in the emerging field of International Human Resource Management (IHRM). As the previous chapters have explained, the means by which MNCs can gain employee commitment, and how they can capitalise on it once it has been attained, are questions the current research seeks to address. Today’s changes in employment practices and shifts in management structure have put commitment at the centre stage of the strategies for gaining workplace control and competitive advantage (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Tayeb, 2003). Throughout the literature there appears to be a range of views and theories about commitment in the workplace, its functions, and the impact of national cultures. This chapter traces the development of the construct of work commitment then, reviews how it is measured. Motivation and the link to work commitment is then examined in a cross-cultural context. Finally cross-cultural work commitment is explored and an explanatory framework proposed.

An examination of the literature suggests that the term ‘organisational commitment’ is being replaced by ‘work commitment’ as
the construct expands to include not only the traditional, but more contemporary definitions as well (Morrow, 1993). The terms ‘organisational’ and ‘work’ appear in relation to the same concepts, and seem to be used interchangeably in some studies (Cohen, 2003). The more traditional theorists use the term ‘organisational’ with the term ‘work’ replacing it as an all-encompassing definition which includes the specific foci within the organisation to which an employee might attach commitment.

**Work Commitment**

A committed employee, according to research conducted in the US, demonstrates personal concern for the success of the company almost with moral overtones (Anon, 1999). The commitment goes beyond the enjoyment of work for its intrinsic motivation and income (Robbins, Bergman, Stagg, & Coulter, 2000). Work-committed employees know how their own efforts fulfil the needs of the company, and they defend the organisation if it appears threatened in any way. Loyalties to subgroups (sub-cultures), as noted by Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990), conflict with organisational commitment. This conflict means that overriding loyalty to a particular profession or department decreases the individual’s overall loyalty to the organisation.
The concept of commitment appeared in Fayol’s management principles in 1949. His work suggested that a committed employee would always place a greater priority on the needs of the organisation over the interests of any individual or group (Fayol, 1949). Fayol employed tenure as a reliable outcome of commitment in an employee. However, the outcome of tenure has been shown to be less reliable in more modern times (Swailes, 2002).

Webber (1947) explored commitment through the achievement of organisational goals, exploring how identification with the goals was achieved. Without exploring any of the personal needs of the employee, Webber found that formal rules, career structures, and reward systems which were perceived to be fair, were features that led to commitment.

Burns and Stalker (1966) were the first to expand the concept of commitment to other parts of the organisation. By exploring the ‘organic’ form of organisation, which was successful with achieving change, employees were found to have a tripartite system of commitment, in which the foci were identified as a sense of obligation to sectional commitments, work groups and career.

Likert (1961) expanded on one of the foci, the role of the supervisor. He suggested the supervisor played a critical role in the organisation
achieving their goals by motivating employees to become involved in attaining them. Already expanding in its definition, organisational or work commitment was further extended, and by the 1960s was viewed as a distinctive construct, able to be used as both a dependant variable and an independent variable (Swailes, 2002). In the 1970s the work continued to increased however; according to Swailes (2002), there was no greater conceptual clarity added despite the increase in the number of theoretical frameworks presented. Organisational commitment, according to Porter, could be defined as a belief in, and acceptance of, organisational goals and values, and a willingness to exert effort towards achieving organisational goals along with a strong desire to maintain organisational membership (Porter, 1974).

In 1983, Morrow identified 25 related measures and concepts of work commitment, stating that the number was growing rapidly. Her review of the literature showed the various foci were to work itself, union or staff association, career or profession, a specific job, or the employing organisation (Morrow, 1993).

Randall and Cote (1991) replaced commitment to a specific job, as found in Morrow’s framework, with commitment to a work group. Mowday (1982) identified the following three forms of commitment: continuance, cohesion and control. The research also concluded that an
employee will have one dominant form of commitment. Neale and Northcraft (1991) believed that the visibility, the irrevocability and the volitionality of the employee’s act tied them to the employer and hence led to commitment. This proposal stemmed from the behavioural commitment literature which explored the effects of past behaviour on commitment. Another theme has emerged as central to the phenomenon of commitment and that is psychological attachment to the organisation. O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) found that compliance, identification with the organisation, and internalisation of the employee to the organisation was linked to pro-social behaviour and extra-role activities.

In the management literature, attitudinal commitment is measured by linking positive feelings toward the organisation to increased commitment. Allen and Meyer (1991) noted three types of commitment: affective, continuance and normative. Affective commitment occurs when there is an emotional attachment to, and identification with, the organisation and its goals. In other words, people stay because they want to. Oliver (1990) also identified this type of commitment as ‘attitudinal’, describing the individual’s commitment to the organisation and its goals as a motivational force. Continuance commitment occurs when a calculative and exchanged based relationship exists, and relates to the perceived ‘costs’ of leaving the organisation. Individuals feel they ‘have’ to stay as leaving would be too costly through the loss of status, job security or lack of
alternative employment. Continuance commitment theory was first proposed by Becker (1960), who gave it the aptly coined title of the ‘side-bet’ commitment. Finally, as noted by Meyer and Allen (1991), the least common commitment is normative commitment, otherwise known as ‘value commitment’. Normative commitment occurs when an employee stays because of their sense of duty or loyalty to ‘do the right thing’. Normative commitment has been criticised for not representing what managers would seek in gaining commitment from their employees (Swailes, 2002).

**Defining and Measuring Commitment**

Porter (1974) and later Mowday et al. (1982), defined commitment as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, an organisation. The underpinning factors of commitment were identified as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values, willingness to exert considerable effort for the organisation, and a strong desire to retain membership in the organisation. The failure to separate motives from effects was criticised, because a desire to retain membership may be considered a consequence rather than a part of the definition of what commitment is (White, Parks, & Gallagher, 1995). Despite this, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday was considered pivotal in the development of a
measure of commitment. The OCQ provided a more holistic view of ‘what is commitment?’

Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) define the difference between those employees who are committed to work and those who have commitment to the organisation. While the foci may appear similar, these authors caution against confusing them as there are distinct differences. One employee is motivated by the work itself, whereas another employee may expend his or her efforts because of allegiance to the organisation. Work committed employees often seek occupational specialisation, and would therefore be less likely to perform duties as required by the organisation to fulfil its objectives (Lincoln and Kalleberg, 1990). Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) also clarify the differences between organisational commitment and behavioural commitment.

The addition of multiple foci was expanded in the literature in the early 1990s. Reichers (1985) saw the organisation as a sum of parts with employees likely to be committed to multiple goals and values. Foci identified by Becker (1992) were to the supervisor or work group, to top management or the organisation, locally and/or globally. Building on Becker’s work, Hunt and Morgan (1994) found that management’s goals and values are those of the organisation due to the flow down of
information, possibly rendering commitment measurement as more accurately compliance testing.

Cohen (2003) asked: how distinct are the various forms of commitments? From his research he defined work commitment as affective attachments to one or more of the objects of commitment (organisation, occupation, job and union) taking on one or more of the following dimensions identification, affiliation and moral involvement. Identification and moral involvement are similar to the dimensions of O’Reilly and Chatman (1986). The dimension of affiliation and identification is used in formulating the conceptual framework of this study. The items for the affiliation were “I talk to my friends about how great it is to work/belong to this organisation”, “I am proud to work for/be a member of, this organisation” and “I feel myself a part of this organisation”. The items for identification were “I find it easy to identify with the objectives of the organisation”; “Most of the values I believe in are demonstrated by this organisation”; and “There are a lot of similarities between my goals and the goals of the organisation”. The present study adopts Cohen’s multiple foci perspective and definition of work commitment, as it provides a more accurate framework for the APR than that of Mowday et al. (1982), which more closely reflects the model currently being used by the MNC in question.
As noted by Swailes (2002), researchers have used combinations and variations of the definition of commitment and forms of measurement. Various antecedents and outcomes of commitment have been presented with little improvement in the construct validity. He proposes that researchers have focused too heavily upon the links of the employee to the organisation, rather than on what these links lead to, and achieve. Swailes (2002) argues that commitment is the outcome of these linkages, it is not the links themselves. Oliver (1990) proposed that the focus of commitment should be the actions or behaviours and not the organisation or objects, noting that with the recognition of multiple constituencies, the organisation has become too complex.

The need for research in this area is supported by Swailes (2002) who argues that researchers are significantly more concerned with the use of current measures, than with what constitutes commitment in the perceptions of employees today. Redding (1994, p. 653.) demonstrated that commitment has been built upon the ‘behaviours and attitudes of Westerners’, and cautions that these may not be valid from an Asian perspective.

According to Fulop and Linstead (1999), drawing on Weick (1995), the display of commitment within organisations will depend upon the following environmental factors: the ability for explicitness of actions; revocability of
the action; the degree to which actions are executed in public view; and how voluntary the act is. Weick (1995) claimed that only when the action is voluntary will commitment occur. In other words, the forcing or manipulation of employees into certain actions will not result in a committed workforce. Nor does this behaviour make people take responsibility for their own actions, and therefore become committed. For example, Weick (1995) found that those organisations providing employees with a large degree of choice of roles and behaviours allowed increased commitment to develop. These organisations are, however, the exception not the rule (Tayeb, 1994).

The above discussion of commitment reflects a dominant Western paradigm and does not help when considering cross-cultural dimensions of influence on commitment (Swailes, 2002). As Linstead (1999) noted, when addressing the question of whether motivation and commitment vary from culture to culture:

Despite the fact that very few writers and managers have acknowledged it, the research evidence that it does is extensive. Discovering how it varies, and what impact these variations have in specific situations, will be an increasing challenge as world business globalises further. Linstead (1999, p.290).

Western in this thesis is used to describe work deriving predominantly from North America in the literature.
Understanding what work commitment is and how it links to national culture is problematic in a global context. This issue is further discussed later in this chapter. Commitment is linked in part to issues of motivation and identity (Fulop & Linstead, 1999) but it is also a problematical construct in a cross-cultural context. A brief review of criticism of motivational theory in a cross-cultural context will help to better isolate the problems with theorising commitment in a cross-cultural context.

Motivation

Cultural differences between countries such as the US and China, as Hofstede (1980) noted, bring into question many of the motivational theories used today. For example, Maslow’s (1954) model of the Hierarchy of Needs has been questioned by authors such as Onedo (1991), who, when studying motivation in Papua New Guinea, found security out-ranked autonomy. Nevis (1983) found in China that security associated with loyalty to the nation outranked self-actualisation, considered the highest level by Maslow (Brooks 1999). Hofstede (1980) and Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (1998) suggest that Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs is not applicable outside the US. They use Japan as an example: a culture that is high in uncertainty avoidance. In contrast to America, security to the Japanese is a greater motivator than self-actualisation. Thus, definite conclusions about motivation theories such as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs do not hold true globally (O’Reilly & Roberts, 1973). Studies have found
that an individual’s frame of reference will determine the order of importance of his/her needs. The framework is in part developed and based upon culture, so that our needs and our culture are, to a degree, bounded (O’Reilly and Roberts, 1973).

Brooks (1999) notes that Herzberg’s (1968) Two-Factor model of motivation claims that there are extrinsic factors associated with the surrounding environment of the job, which can be considered demotivators for the employee. There are also intrinsic factors, related to the job itself, which are motivators. However, the theory failed to be applicable when tested in cross-cultural settings. Hines (1973) demonstrated this by using the model in New Zealand where it was found that some of the hygiene/extrinsic factors were indeed considered motivators. Adler (1997) found that the hygiene/motivator factors changed in varying cultures, and therefore questioned the universal applicability of the model, thus supporting the findings of Hines (1973). Indeed Adler (1997) makes the point that the factors which create motivation and cause demotivation, and their relative importance, are apparently culture bound and even situation specific. This may also be the case for corporate culture.

As noted by Hofstede (1984), McClelland’s needs theory (McClelland & Burnham, 1976), which explores the need for power and achievement and affiliation, is also questionable when applied in cross-
cultural settings. These Western terms are not regarded as such desirable qualities when used in more collectivist cultures, such as those in Asia. Adler (1997) and Fulop and Linstead (1999) support the view that the universal applicability of the needs theory is doubtful.

Finally Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory is another that appears most applicable in highly individualistic societies and may only be cross-culturally sound when modified. The theory states that individuals will make choices and decisions based on what will provide them with the most personal gain. Hence the preconceived result (Expectancy, or E), multiplied by the outcome (V, its valance) equals motivation (M), so M=ExV. The theory is not as applicable in a collectivist setting where commitment to managers, co-workers and owners is of greater concern than commitment to the job or pay (Adler, 1997).

The universal part of expectancy theories is that the type of reward is not specified. Therefore, the reward may be group oriented and serve a collectivist culture well, or it may be highly individualistic and suit other national cultures equally well. It is also acknowledged that basic human needs are universal, but that culture determines how these needs are most effectively met. An example provided by Adler (1997, p.165) is that of a Canadian CEO working in Tokyo who wanted to reward one of his Sales Representatives. He promoted the employee to manager (status reward);
however, as a result, the employee’s output actually decreased rather than increasing, as expected. The Japanese need for harmony had been ignored by the Canadian CEO; the individualistic reward had separated him from his co-workers, causing him embarrassment and resulting in demotivation. As noted by Derskey (2002), rewarding an individual in Japan increases competition rather than group motivation. When managers are able to control the work environment and the types of rewards can be modified to be culture specific, the expectancy theory may hold across cultures.

Despite the literature and research showing that increased motivation is linked with decreases in turnover and absenteeism, there is no evidence to link satisfaction to the care and effort taken in performing tasks (Perrow, 1979). Research conducted by Kirkman and Shapiro (2001) reaffirmed the importance of work commitment due to its close association with other positive organisational outcomes. When researched in a cross-cultural setting, the strength of the correlations may change, as was found in a study of three-hundred and thirty-three Chinese employees (Chen & Francesco, 2000). The research introduced various supporting arguments for a strong correlation between organisational commitment and turnover intentions within Western cultures, in contrast to the Chinese findings, where the relationship between commitment to the organisation and turnover intentions was significantly weaker.
There is little research that documents the relationship between commitment and employee productivity, however, empirical evidence does demonstrate that commitment negatively corresponds with turnover and absenteeism and that these are Western constructs that might translate poorly in Asia (Mowday et al., 1982).

**Cross-Cultural Work Commitment**

This study demonstrates how commitment is created in the APR and explores a more culturally sensitive index than currently exists, with which to measure work commitment. Cohen (2003) explored work commitment studies, finding that they were seldom located outside of Western societies and those that were focused on Japan. Increasingly, studies concern in other locations, such as China and the Arab nations, but they rarely span more that one national culture (Cohen, 1999; Redding & Wong, 1986). Most of the cross-cultural literature focuses on organisational commitment as described by Mowday et al. (1982) and used by MNCs such as Merico in their climate surveys to gauge employee work commitment levels. Cohen (1999) identified a gap in the literature regarding studies which explore work commitment across a number of national cultures. This research aims to fill this gap in the literature. In addition, there does not appear to be a theoretical framework of work commitment which spans cross-cultural organisational commitment studies, making outcomes very difficult to compare (Randall, 1993). While the majority of studies have focused on
organisational commitment, others have chosen to explore other forms of commitment such as commitment to union, work involvement and commitment to the work itself (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1985; Luthans, Baack, & Taylor, 1987; Near, 1989).

In 1958, Abegglen explored the concept of lifetime commitment in Japanese workers. Sparking interest in the emerging field of cross cultural commitment research (Abegglen, 1958), noted that the Japanese belief that the organisation constituted a family, with a strict hierarchical system, supported the expectation of employees to remain loyal to one employer for their working lifetime.

Marsh and Mannari (1972) questioned Abegglen’s notion of lifetime commitment. They believed that status enhancement through a system of succession based on service motivated lifetime employment, rather than did loyalty to the organisation (Marsh & Mannari, 1972). In a later study conducted in a Japanese electrical goods company, it was found that the lifetime model of commitment may no longer be applicable and that the importance of paternalism was also diminishing (Marsh & Mannari, 1977), clearly not in economic down turns.

Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), in a study of 8,000 US and Japanese workers, failed to find any proof of the prevailing belief that workers in
Japan were more committed to their organisation than American workers. In a study of 7,000 production workers located in the US and Japan, Near (1989) provided contrary evidence to the popular management literature of the time, finding US workers more committed than the Japanese employees. These findings supported earlier work of Luthans et al. (1987) who found Korean and Japanese workers to be less committed than their US counterparts. The cultural boundedness of US management theories may have been overstated, according to Palich, Hom and Griffeth (1995). While they found that US MNCs could confidently use domestic practices if adapted as required, the location of the study in Canada and Europe may limit these findings in their generalisability to the APR.

Recent research from McMurray (2003) explores cross cultural work commitment and supports a growing interest in the cross-cultural commitment field. The study was conducted in Australia in a multi-ethnic manufacturing environment. Having clustered workers with Hofstede’s VSM model, McMurray used the Country of Origin (COO) to determine that the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) is not a valid construct and should be replaced by a Work Values Ethic construct. The study is, however, limited by its location in one Australian site. McMurray’s work supports this thesis in its call to re-examine the appropriateness of work commitment measures within different cultures.
Besser (1993) highlighted cultural norms as influencing employee commitment to organisations. The importance of the family and the sense of duty attached to those relationships were significant in influencing the employee’s organisational commitment. Contrary to these findings, Randall (1993) found that attitudinal commitment was lower in collectivist national cultures than in individualistic societies. This result was based on a review of 27 studies of organisational commitment.

In research by Kirkman et al. (2001), a higher level of collectivism was found to be associated with greater job satisfaction and organisational commitment. In the research by Chen and Francesco (2000), it was found that in Chinese organisations, it would be expected that complete loyalty to the ‘top boss’ would dominate organisational loyalty. Mavondo and Rodrigo (2001), who conducted a cross-cultural empirical study of the associations between the relationship dimensions and their influence on interpersonal and inter-organisational commitment within the APR, found that Asian business culture supports the ‘collectivist’ attitude. Western constructs of international business research, by being ‘individualistic’, fail to tap into the true essence of international or cross-cultural contextual factors. Finally, the researchers state that social bonds may not have significant direct relationships with commitment, but the indirect effects are worth considering (Mavondo and Rodrigo, 2001).
Relationships play a key role in collectivist cultures. In research focused on China, Chen, Tsui and Farh note that the Chinese are “more loyal to individuals than they are to systems” (2002, p.343). Multiple commitments, such as to co-workers, occupations, top-management, supervisors, customers and work units, were explored. The notion of an organisational type of kinship requires further exploration as a concept. These multiple foci of commitment are of interest to this thesis as it is anticipated that employees in collectivist national cultures will attach commitment to the supervisor and the organisation in the APR. The importance of the supervisor and organisation provide the environment for employees to develop kin-like relationships expressed in their work commitment.

Chen et al. (2002) summarises by stating:

In the US, where individualism and independence held great value, commitment to the supervisor, when it exists, is typically based on shared values and goals, and/or a respect for the supervisor as an individual. In China, where there is a greater value for collectivism and reliance on authority, commitment to the supervisor is typically based on self-sacrifice, duty, and respect for the supervisor’s role as an authority figure. Chen et al. (2002, p.344).

The diversity of the region then, when one considers all the cultures beyond that of China, is deep and complex. Research by Kennedy (2002) found that collectivism or group/family was rated the highest values ‘as is’ and also one of the highest ranked ‘should be’ values in Malaysia. Kennedy’s research supports the approach of this thesis in recognising the importance of loyalty and cohesiveness within family like work units.
The importance of the dimension of individualism and collectivism may be due to the fact that much of the literature is based on Western models of organisational commitment studies which are driven by motives of individualistic self-interest (Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991). Early (1989) found in a study of group performance that an individual’s motives are influenced by that of the national culture norm, be it of self-interest or group interests. Most of the US organisational commitment models, such as that used by Merico, are driven by the self-interest of the individual raising issues of cross-cultural applicability (Cohen, 2003). Cohen (2003) also explored work commitment in a cross-cultural context and argued that employees from collectivist national cultures commit to relationships with others and not the job itself.

Building on the importance of relationships Cohen (2003) also found group membership to be important to employees from collectivist national cultures. These groups are governed by autocratic values and adhere to strict levels of respect. The importance of the group is supported by research conducted by Parnell and Hatmen (1999) who studied US and Egyptian managers. They found the Egyptian managers to be loyal and hardworking. The individual’s high level of commitment was aligned with the collectivist national culture and the selection process which employs in-group applicants. Because the success of the organisation depends on the
survival of the group, there is a high level of commitment to the group (Parnell & Hatem, 1999).

Research conducted by Wong, Hui, Wong and Law (2001) of Chinese and Hong Kong employees found that organisational commitment has a strong influence on job satisfaction and tenure intentions. They note that organisations in collectivist societies are expected to cultivate employee commitment as this supports the importance of the collectivist cultural norms (Wong et al., 2001).

Studies of multiple foci of work commitment in cross-cultural settings are rare, and largely conducted within only one national culture (Cohen, 2003). In a study conducted by Vandenberge, Stinglhamber, Bentein and Delhaise (2001), and as reported by Cohen (2003), 580 English translators located in a Brussels office were studied using the Meyer and Allen (1991) model of commitment with the multiple foci of the organisation, the occupation, the workgroup and turnover intentions. Within the one location 22 different national cultures were identified to study. Research and results presented by McMurray (2003) were also limited by the fact that it was conducted in one geographical location and within one national culture. Employees from individualist national cultures were found to have greater continuance commitment than those from collectivist cultures. Turnover intention was found to be linked to both
organisational and non-organisational factors such as responsibilities and duties to the family. Cohen’s (1999) research of 283 Arab and Jewish nurses in Northern Israel found that culture moderated commitment forms and outcomes, and this supports the work of McMurray (2003), who found that Arab nurses were more committed, noting particularly that they possessed a more positive attitude to work than did the Jewish nurses.

The importance of the dimension of collectivism as significantly influencing the perception of work commitment is clearly supported in the literature. What is not clear is how work commitment is perceived in collectivist national cultures within the APR operating in the service sector. Drawing on the work of Cohen (2003) with additional contributions from Chen et al. (2002), this thesis examines the concept of multiple commitment, identifying the foci of the organisation, and the supervisor as importance to employees in the APR in their understanding of work commitment, as seen in Figure 4.1.
This explanatory framework shows how work commitment might be perceived by employees within collectivist national cultures of the APR. The national cultural dimension which is most relevant to the employees’ understanding of work commitment in the APR is anticipated to be that of collectivism (Kennedy, 2002; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).
The foci of commitment adopted in this study are to the organisation and the supervisor as seen in Figure 4.1 (Cohen, 2003). The drivers of work commitment, as suggested by the literature in collectivist cultures, include the importance of the relationships and respect with a specific focus on the supervisor. The next driver is that of organisational pride and job security supported through studies such as those conducted by Kirkman et al. (2001). Support for the inclusion of the patriarchal-type pride in the organisation exists through studies, such as those presented by Chen et al. (2002). The importance of family responsibilities and duties was also clearly present in the literature in studies such as those by Chen et al. (2000) and Kirkman et al. (2001). Due to these family responsibilities job security is anticipated to be a motivating factor in creating and maintaining work commitment to organisations in the APR service sector. The issue of the ever-changing industrial relations systems of the developing APR societies adds to the importance of job security in creating work commitment to the organisation. Having reviewed the proposed drivers of work commitment in the APR, the possible outcomes are presented next.

The outcomes of work commitment are affiliation and identification as seen in Figure 4.1 and are adopted from Cohen (2003). Both identification and affiliation are related closely to the collectivist dimension of national culture according to Cohen (2003). The framework, proposed in Figure 4.1, begins to address the question: How do employees in
collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC, and what are the implications for international performance management practices within the hospitality context?

**Summary**

Areas of commitment and national and organisational cultures ultimately become entwined and their relationship with each other needs to be explored. Potential links between organisational culture, national culture, corporate culture and commitment are important to this research. However it does seem that some aspects are more strongly impacted upon by culture than others. Perhaps commitment, as Tayeb (1994) suggests, is more desirable or more easily achieved within collectivist cultures than individualistic ones. Questions such as these constitute the challenge of this research. Researchers such as Hofstede (Hofstede, 1980; 1984) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) have laid the foundations for cross-cultural studies in MNCs and for this study.

The factors that create work commitment in different national cultures within the APR and how best to measure its dimensions, are explored in this study. Much of the relevance of this work is underpinned by, and focused upon, the exploration of employees’ perceptions of work commitment in collectivist national cultures within the APR operating in one US MNC.
CHAPTER FIVE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This is a mixed methods sequential study, with an applied research focus (Creswell, 2003). The work of Creswell (2003) has been critical in explaining the research approach because it is the most comprehensive account of this methodology, one which he acknowledges is an emerging and difficult approach. This study is exploratory and sequential because the main focus is on explaining and interpreting relationships and testing elements of an emergent theory of work commitment in the cross-cultural context of the APR. To assist this, it draws on the theoretical construct developed in Chapter Four. The mixed methods approach employs strategies that require data to be collected simultaneously or sequentially to understand the problem. Data collected can be both numeric as well as textual, as is the case in this thesis. This approach is also useful when either testing or, in the case of this study, proposing an instrument to measure work commitment.

According to Creswell (2003), theory in mixed methods approaches, such as a sequential exploratory study, can be used as a theoretical lens or perspective that raises questions related to several issues, one of which is race or national culture. The theoretical perspective adopted in the study is
implicit, which is why a theoretical framework has been proposed as distinct from a testable model.

The major form of data collection and analysis is qualitative with the minor form being the quantitative studies, which fits with a sequential exploratory design (Creswell, 2003). As noted by Creswell (2003, p. 216), the sequential exploratory design is also very useful when quantitative results have to be generated for users who would be sceptical of the findings of a study that does not contain large data sets. This is particularly the problem that faced the researcher in producing findings for Merico.

This chapter is presented in three parts. First, it outlines the research approach adopted for this study. Second, the research design is presented showing the two main stages of the study and the sequencing of the methods employed. Third, the chapter outlines the sequence of the studies as they occurred; and how the methodology was modified in the context of emerging findings. Research questions that were developed as a result of the ongoing study are described, and likewise how the integration of the two stages of the study occurred. This is a requirement of a mixed methods approach (Creswell, 2003, p. 212) and, in the case of this research, it occurred after the completion of the majority of studies and before the final quantitative study was conducted. Issues of validity, reliability and generalisability (Easterby-Smith, 2002, pp.52-54) are discussed in terms of
the relativist position, which is where mixed methods is located epistemologically.

The Stages and Studies

There were two stages in the study as shown in Table 5.1. Stage One had three studies. The first involved the mail out Preliminary Investigation Questionnaire (PIQ) and then face-to-face interviews. The PIQ was an open-ended questionnaire designed to explore national culture, the fit of Merico’s corporate culture and national culture, and work commitment. It was also used to uncover themes for more detailed exploration in the interviews. The findings of the PIQ were further elaborated upon in Phase Two of the preliminary investigations, in the face-to-face interviews (as seen in Table 5.1). The in-depth, face-to-face interviews were semi-structured and took place with eight (8) HRMs in the APR and followed the format of the PIQ. The poor response rate in the PIQ necessitated undertaking the interviews. Valuable data was collected in the face-to-face interviews conducted in Malaysia.

The following matrix in Table 5.1 shows the methods and sequence employed in each of the studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage One</th>
<th>Stage Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary</strong></td>
<td>Preliminary Investigations</td>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase One</strong></td>
<td>Preliminary Investigation Questionnaire</td>
<td>of all previous studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Two</strong></td>
<td>In-depth Interviews</td>
<td>Merico’s Employee Opinion Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Groups One &amp; Two</td>
<td>(EOS): WCI vs. WOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Dimensions Surveys I &amp; II (PDS I &amp; II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Panels I &amp; II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of all previous studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N= 19950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) N=28 (2) N=14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) N= 23 (2) N=27 (3) N=26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) N= 58 (II) N= 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Mail Out to: Australia Thailand Philippines Japan Korea Singapore Malaysia China &amp; Hong Kong</td>
<td>Australia Thailand Philippines Japan Korea Singapore Malaysia China &amp; Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)Gold Coast, Australia. (2)Kota Bharu, Malaysia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)Bangkok, Thailand. (2) Malacca, Malaysia. (3) Gold Coast, Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand Philippines Japan Korea Singapore Malaysia China &amp; Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Mid 2000</td>
<td>Early 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early 2000</td>
<td>Early 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Late 2000 (2) Early 2001</td>
<td>Early 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main data type</strong></td>
<td>Open-ended Questions</td>
<td>Late 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured in-depth</td>
<td>Early 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominal group process</td>
<td>Late 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced Choice</td>
<td>Early 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominal group process</td>
<td>Late 2000 Merico Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of focus</strong></td>
<td>National culture - Corporate culture - Work commitment drivers and outcomes</td>
<td>Bivariate correlations and multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National culture - Corporate culture - Work commitment drivers and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Culture - Work Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Frame-work developed: WOK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1. Methods and sequences used in this study.**
The last study in this stage was focus groups, which were conducted in Malaysia and Australia, and used the nominal group process (Grbich, 1999, p.116) to further explore national culture and work commitment. The focus groups were unable to clearly discriminate issues between the dimensions of national culture and this led to developing the second stage of the study.

The second stage had two studies which were called the Preferred Dimensions Survey (PDS) with two versions (I and II) and two Expert Panels before the integration phase and final study. The former studies were quantitative and designed to more clearly discriminate between the dimensions of national culture. It allowed for the preferences to be separated and ranked, according to the means of each factor selected, providing further clarification of the proposed framework of work commitment in a cross-cultural context. The Expert Panels were then conducted in eight countries to further explore the drivers and outcome behaviours of work commitment as perceived by employees. The final part of this stage of the study was to integrate the findings and develop a new framework for understanding work commitment, called the Work and Organisational Kinship (WOK) framework.
Finally the Employee Opinion Survey (EOS) study is presented and was based on data collected from Merico’s 2000 world-wide survey from which APR data was extrapolated. The EOS was used to conduct bivariate correlations and multiple regressions to speculate if the new framework of work commitment, i.e, the WOK, was more culturally sensitive than the approach used by Anon and the WCI. This final stage of analysis was also conducted for the purposes of satisfying Merico, as was required in this applied research study, by providing it with some evidence of a more culturally sensitive way of measuring work commitment in the APR. For Merico’s use, the term WOK Index (WOKI) was coined to differentiate it from the WCI. The research approach adopted for this thesis is explored next.

**The Research Approach**

Triangulation is a hallmark of a relativist design and the mixed methods approach. In each phase of the research a number of methods are used in order to identify and represent the phenomena being studied (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Lowe, 2002). Triangulation, according to Creswell (2003), uses data sources as a means for seeking convergence across qualitative and quantitative methods, such as those used in this study. Triangulation was also recommended by Hofstede (1984) for cross-cultural studies.
Data collection is often diverse including surveys, interviews and field studies. A relativist position means that many viewpoints are sought and “what counts for the truth can vary from place to place and from time to time” (Collins, 1983, p.88 in Easterby-Smith, et al., 2002, p.34). The main strength of the relativist position is that it accepts the value of multiple sources of data (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). The varying sources might enable “generalizations to be made beyond the situation under study” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002, p.42).

Undertaking a cross-cultural study is fraught with problems, not the least being translating questionnaires into other languages, being sensitive to local customs and practices in conducting fieldwork, dealing with the politics of foreign work places, and having to accept that random sampling is often impossible because of the difficulty of gaining access to sites (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). Furthermore, large samples are required for surveys and for generalisations to be made, but are seldom obtained in triangulated studies (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). In this study, the EOS was used to obtain a data set of 19950 respondents. How this was achieved is both interesting and novel and illustrates how insider-based research is more likely to overcome a number of the problems associated with gaining access to sites.
Highlighting relativism again, Creswell (2003) locates relativism within the mixed methods approach. Mixed methods recognise that all methods have limitations. Sequential procedures within mixed methods methodology is the design used in this thesis. By using sequential procedures, the researcher seeks to “elaborate on or expand the findings of one method with another method” (Creswell, 2003, p.16).

Mixed methods bases its knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds, e.g., such as being problem-centred (Creswell, 2003). As an Applied Research thesis, answering the questions asked by the organisation also became central to the study. Applied Research, according to Easterby-Smith et al., (2002, p.9), is “intended to lead to the solution of specific problems, and usually involves working with clients who identify the problems”. This thesis attempts to answer organisational related questions for one International Hotel Chain, though recognising that others face the same issues. A theoretical framework for cross-cultural analysis of work commitment informs the study but is not tested (see p. 113, Chapter Four).

Pragmatic knowledge claims arise “out of actions, situations, and consequences rather than antecedent conditions” (Creswell, 2003, p.18). The concern is with “what works and solutions to problems” (Creswell, 2003, p.11). Rather than specific methods being important, it is the problem that takes priority in determining what methods are employed.
Pragmatism is the philosophical label that many use to describe a relativist or mixed methods perspective (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

Pragmatists are not committed to any one philosophy or reality. According to Creswell (2003) pragmatists believe they have the freedom to choose their methods to suit their needs and problems. Pragmatists do not see the world as an absolute unity, and the truth for them is what works at the time (Creswell, 2003). They also believe that we need to stop asking questions about reality and laws of nature rather, to quote, “They would simply like to change the subject” (Rorty, 1983, p.xiv in Creswell, 2003). Thomas summarises by saying, “Consequently, the significant issue is not whether one method is overall superior to another but, rather, whether the method a researcher employs can yield convincing answers to questions that the investigation is intended to settle” (2003, p.7).

To begin the examination of the methodology of the first studies in Stage One, the preliminary investigations are presented followed by each study in sequence.
STAGE ONE - PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS

Preliminary investigations focused on national culture, the alignment of corporate culture and national culture and work commitment in the APR within the Collectivist Work Commitment Framework (CWCF), as seen in Figure 4.1, page 113. The following research questions were developed to guide this part of the study within the proposed framework:

Q1. How do employees in collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC?

Q2. How do employees perceive the fit between the MNC’s corporate culture, developed within a highly individualistic national culture and their own collectivist culture; and does this affect their perceptions of work commitment?

The preliminary investigations took place in two distinct phases:

(1) Phase One: PIQ pen and paper questionnaire – mail out.
(2) Phase Two: Face-to-face interviews.

Firstly, the questionnaire, which is known as the PIQ (see Appendix D and explained further in this chapter), was distributed via mail out by the researcher to over sixty Human Resources Managers (HRMs) in the eight countries identified in Table 5.1, i.e. Australia, Thailand, China, Korea, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. Prior to the PIQ being distributed to the hotel HRMs within the eight counties, there had been little or no exposure of this research to the HRMs. The mail out distribution of
the PIQ took place in the middle of the year 2000, as seen in Table 5.1. The PIQ was based on the work of Trompenaars and Hampden Turner (1998); however, although not a previously validated questionnaire, its use in an exploratory study is acceptable. Merico played the role of the client and allowed the researcher to use the PIQ in its workplaces.

The PIQ was designed to assist with solving specific problems for Merico, at the same time as suiting the purpose of this study, with its specific research questions. A nine (9) item open-ended questionnaire designed by the researcher, the PIQ was mailed out to sixty (60) hotels and yielded a response rate of eight. The questions, as explained, explored national culture, the corporate culture and national culture fit and work commitment. Sixty (60) HRMs comprised the possible sample population. The PIQ was to be completed by the HRMs in consultation with other managers in their hotels. The eight surveys were returned in various stages of completion, as follows: three participants completed less than two questions, three completed less than six questions, three completed eight questions and one participant completed all the questions. Those who did participate held an average five years length of service with Merico International and were fluent in both English and the language of the country of origin. The relevant data collected was transcribed and thematically analysed.
The responses, albeit deficient in numbers, were of interest. The following is an example of one Japanese participant’s view of the national culture and corporate culture fit. He stated that Merico “…value people and have long relationships” so there was no perceived difference between Merico and Japanese culture by the employee. Another issue canvassed was the importance placed upon the supervisor in relation to work commitment. The following response came from a participant from Thailand who stated that it was because of respect to the supervisor that “…Thai people will move regardless of what the organisation is like.” Such responses helped refine and focus the questions to be used in the in-depth face-to-face interviews. Notwithstanding the low response rate, the PIQ contributed to the design of the interview questions.

Numerous factors contributed to the poor response rate, including the size of the document, its length and the complexity of the questions asked, as well as the terminology being American, thereby decreasing the user friendliness of the questionnaire. Mail in some hotels is very costly to the manager and this may have reduced the number of participating hotels. The PIQ required a written English response and this may have cut into the already overworked HRMs’ time. Finally, it became apparent at a later stage that some of the hotel HRMs were keeping their responses to give to the researcher at the next conference, which the researcher did not attend.
Despite the low response rate, the PIQ instrument requires further elaboration as it laid the foundation for the remainder of the study. Firstly, the participants were requested to write and describe their country and its history, to give some background insight into each culture. Secondly, the participants were asked to answer open-ended questions about explicit aspects of their culture: types of arts produced, clothes worn, music played, food eaten, languages spoken and the religious beliefs of their country. The third area explored the more implicit layer of norms and values. To achieve this, the participants were asked to describe what they considered was ‘good’ and ‘bad’ about their country. For example, participants were asked: “What is considered ‘good’ in your culture?” The participants described the beliefs and values that their country held as important, and then went on to explore these core assumptions. The core assumptions were explored through writing about the similarities and differences between their national culture and others. Experience narratives, such as those sought here, focused on a limited time period and on specific subject matter, as suggested by Thomas (2002, p.38).

Having reviewed the layers of cultural norms and values in accordance with the model of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, participants were then asked to explore the area of work commitment. Nine (9) open-ended questions were related to the participants’ perceptions of their national and corporate cultures as well as a combination of these
cultural dimensions. Participants were then asked to describe what they believed created work commitment to the employer in their country. Next, participants were asked to describe Merico’s corporate culture.

In the next section of the PIQ, the participants were asked to write down how they and others, from a similar cultural frame of reference, perceived Americans. The descriptions of the corporate culture provided for their selection were sourced from Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) as described in Chapter Three, Figure 3.3. Participants were asked to explain how American culture differed from their own and, from a list of choices, to circle the best description of their organisation’s culture as they perceived it. The use of only Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s corporate models is a potential limitation of this research, though it was specifically designed for the organisational context. At this stage, however, the researcher wanted to see if participants from the APR could relate to the corporate culture typologies presented and what they meant to them.

As noted earlier in Chapter Three, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) used three components on which to build their models of corporate culture: 1. the relationship between employees and the organisation, 2. the system of authority defining superiors and subordinates (hierarchical system or vertical system); and 3, the employees’ views of the organisation’s destiny, purpose and goals and their places in it. To
incorporate insights into this part of the study, and take account of cultural differences, the participants were asked to select the organisational image, from a set of pre-given ones that best suited their own. The images were not subject to testing nor were they operationalised (see Appendix D). All of the participants selected the ‘family’ type corporate culture as representing Merico.

**Phase Two: Face-to-face in-depth interviews.**

The second phase of the preliminary investigation involved one-on-one interviews by the researcher with key contacts from each of the eight countries (as seen in Table 5.1). The interviews used the same set of open-ended questions used in the PIQ, though with the ability to explore areas in depth with each participant. Given the poor response rate in Phase One, and before the second phase commenced, an e-mail of further support was sent to each hotel from the Senior Vice President of Human Resources International

Each of these countries has a designated Area Director of HR (ADHRs) and these were the key contacts used in the study. Merico International considers ADHRs to be the key contact point for any human resource related issue. Convenience sampling was the only way to proceed given that ADHRs were nominated by Merico to assist with the further stages of the research, and this situation was unavoidable because Merico
determined who the researcher could access. The ADHRs report to the Senior Vice President of Regional Human Resources, the regions being APR, Europe, UK, Americas North and South and Latin, and the Middle East. The Senior Vice Presidents Regional HRs report to the Senior Vice President of Human Resources International, the researcher’s employer. The interviews with the eight key contacts were conducted in Kota Bharu, Malaysia, in early 2000.

Despite their own unique backgrounds, the ADHRs did share several common characteristics. All ADHRs had worked in the field of human resources for at least five years, and all had at least three to five years service with Merico International. All the males were married with children while the female group contained married and single members, some with and some without children. Finally, all spoke their native language and were born and raised in their country of origin. Therefore this could be considered a convenience sample with three males and five females. Convenience sampling is the least desirable of the purposeful sampling strategies, according to Patton (1990), as it may result in information-poor interviews. Easterby-Smith (2002) argues that given the difficulty in gaining responses in cross-cultural studies the use of convenience sampling in this context is justifiable.
The interviews were conducted on a face-to-face basis. The interviewees all spoke English fluently and therefore translation and interpretation did not appear to present a problem. The interviews were designed to cover the same topics as the PIQ and to allow for follow-up responses that would help the researcher clarify and expand areas of particular interest. The interviews were tape recorded. As already stated, the pre-planned questions used to guide the interviews came from the PIQ (Appendix D). Although the questions were developed prior to the interviews, each interview took a different direction at various points, due to the probing and follow-up questions used by the researcher.

The interviewees’ perceptions of what created commitment to an employer was the starting point for the discussion. Next, as per the PIQ, the layers of culture, as described by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) were revisited, proceeding from the explicit outer layers to the middle and more implicit layers, and then finally the core layer of assumptions and beliefs. Greater focus was placed by the researcher on implicit values and beliefs rather than on the explicit, namely artefacts.

The differences between the interviewee’s culture and American culture were discussed. Information was collected through questions relating to Merico and how specific values and norms of the company’s corporate culture did or did not fit with those of the participants’ national
culture as per the PIQ. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) cultural orientations were explored and included: orientations to the collective or individual, emotional or neutral preferences, short or long term relationship patterns, past or future orientation, ascription or achievement, as well as inner or outer directed environment orientations. The interviewee’s perception of whether national or corporate culture had a greater influence in their life and in their country today was also explored. Next, the interviewee’s perception of the ways in which Merico values employee’s national culture was explored. To conclude the interview, participants were encouraged to ask any questions and to seek clarification of the research process. The data was organised for analysis thematically. The themes were manually coded by the researcher from the transcripts of the interviews and used in an exploratory manner to examine the research questions.

**Ethical Considerations of the Preliminary Investigations.**

Both the PIQ and the face-to-face interviews required the informed consent (Appendix D) of participants. Other than identifying their country of origin, the identity of participants was to remain anonymous and this was explained in the consent letter given to them. It was agreed that neither the names of the participants nor the names of their hotels would be used in the reports. Participants’ rights to both voluntary participation and freedom from coercion, or any other form of subtle pressure, was ensured by their
being informed about their rights to withdraw from the project at any stage, without penalty and without needing to offer an explanation. Participants were also offered the opportunity to validate the information collected from them, including viewing transcripts of the interviews. The role of the researcher, as a member of Merico’s management, did not appear to influence the participants’ responses as they responded very candidly in the in-depth interviews. However as she was a senior member of Merico’s management and a Western woman the participants’ responses may well have been influenced by the researcher’s insider role, among other factors, but this could not be ascertained or obverted.

Participants in all studies were notified of the requirement to store the data collected from them for the duration of the research and a further seven (7) years from the date of its completion. It was explained to them that access to the data during this time would be controlled and limited, to strictly comply with Griffith University’s ethical standards and that Merico would receive a copy of the thesis upon completion with all names removed. This was the process adopted for all subsequent research in this thesis. The next stage of the study involved conducting focus groups in Australia and Malaysia.
STAGE ONE - FOCUS GROUPS

A number of issues arose from the preliminary investigations; firstly, the need to delineate the dimensions of culture more clearly, and secondly, to further define the drivers and outcomes of the behaviour of committed employees. Further clarification was sought through the forming and use of focus groups to examine the national cultural dimension of preference, and the drivers and outcomes of work commitment. The drivers, according to the CWCF, were the relationship with supervisors, organisational pride and job security that lead to affiliation and identification. Two focus groups were used, one in a collectivist national culture and one from within an individualistic culture. Focus Group One was conducted firstly in Australia, in a Gold Coast property during late 2000, and then a revised version called, ‘Focus Group Two’, was run in Malaysia in early 2001. The following questions were explored in this part of the study:

Q1. How do employees from collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC?

The design of the focus groups most closely matches that of the nominal group process as described by Grbich (1999, p.115) The nominal group process tool used requires a small group of participants to deliberate on issues where there may be disagreement on possible outcomes and solutions (Easterby-Smith, 1999). This approach has been used extensively
in business and government according to Grbich (1999) and encourages participants to confront issues on a problem-solving basis. The disadvantages of this approach include the need for extensive prior preparation and can be limited by its focus on one topic. As noted in this chapter, there are methodological strengths and weaknesses in the nominal group process and these are addressed in the next section. For the purposes of this research, the nominal group process is called a focus group. This is a term more widely used within Merico International and so, on the advice of the Regional DHR, was likely to be better understood by potential participants.

The following instruments were developed, in part, from the preliminary investigations and by drawing on the literature cited in chapters three and four, and the fundamental issue raised in the literature relating to the dominance of national culture over corporate culture (e.g. Laurent, 1986).

The findings from the preliminary investigations indicated that there were differences between groups in relation to work commitment and cultural dimensions. The ability to discriminate between the two opposite extremes being scored on the scale for any one cultural dimension proved difficult. Focus Group One was therefore designed to gain a better understanding of the two extremes of each dimension of culture and to
explore work commitment. Focus Group One used a nominal group process which aimed to sort cultural dimensions into order of preference, and examine work commitment. Focus Group Two was a revised version of Focus Group One and also used the nominal group process where participants, as a group, were required to sort the preferences of national culture and work commitment into categories rather than list them in rank order (see Appendix G). The major benefit of using this particular method was the ability to expand on previous themes that had been identified, including the importance of collective orientation and leadership, in the preliminary investigations on culture and commitment.

The themes of collectivism and leadership needed to be confirmed and the cultural dimensions, which were still presenting ambiguous outcomes, needed to be isolated so that a better way could be found to discriminate between variables.

Focus Group Two was conducted in a Merico Hotel in Kota Bharu. The instrument’s design was revised based on the outcomes from Focus Group One. The location of Focus Group Two allowed for a different culture to also be studied, thereby highlighting any potential differences between them.
Focus Groups Participants

The twenty-eight (n=28) participants involved in the Australian research were predominantly line level hourly employees rather than managers. The change in the composition of the sample group was deliberate. There were two main reasons for this. Firstly, the researcher’s access enabled two Focus Groups, one in Australia, and one in Malaysia, to be used. Secondly, as the final study involves data collected from all levels of the organisation, this composite of employees needed to be explored rather than just the ADHRs. Ethnically, the group was composed of twenty-two Australians, one German and five Filipinos. All of the Australian participants had English as their first language, while as would be expected, the German and Filipinos participants did not have English as their first language. An equal number of males (14) and females (14) were included in the study, with twenty-one (21) participants being under the age of forty and the remaining seven over forty years of age. Their average length of service with Merico International ranged from between three and six years.

For Focus Group One, the participants were brought together in early 2000 at the Merico International on the Gold Coast. They were seated at tables in self-selected groups of five or less. Although from various departments, the participants appeared to know at least two other people at
their tables. The job descriptions of the participants varied from chefs to cleaners to the Director of Sales and Marketing of the hotel.

The participants for the second phase of the research in Malaysia, Focus Group Two, came from the Merico Hotel located in Kota Bharu. The group comprised managers (n=8) and supervisors (n=6), with three being senior managers, and the others being of apparent equal rank. The group, who had been attending a ‘train the trainer’ program, had volunteered to take part in the Focus Group Two exercise. The group was made up of fourteen (n=14) participants, none of whom spoke English as a first language. Three of the participants were female and the remainder were male. While all of the participants were Malaysian, only five were from the State of Kota Bharu. The other participants came from various parts of the country.

**Instruments used in focus groups**

The focus group processes used in Focus Group One and Focus Group Two respectively are shown in Appendix G. A purpose-designed instrument was used to help uncover groups of factors that could be considered important to employees in the development of their work commitment to the employer as well as national culture.
The tools required for the focus group included one flipchart with the following statement written on it: “What makes you committed or would make you more committed as an employee to an employer or organisation?” as well as a prepared set of cards on which were written twenty different statements. The statements were as follows:

**Table 5.2: Statements presented on cards for use in the Focus Groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements presented on cards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I am recognised and rewarded for good work. (Anon’s IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I have opportunities for personal growth. (Anon’s IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I have job satisfaction for the work I do everyday. (Anon’s IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) There is a balance of work and personal life. (Anon’s IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I know what direction the company is heading. (Anon’s IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) There is a good work environment. (Anon’s IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) What I achieve in the future is more important than what I have done in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) My past achievements are recognised as more important than my future goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Rules are more important than relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Relationships are more important than the rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) What I achieve as an individual is the most important thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) My family status is recognised as important to who I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) This company is in harmony with the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) This company recognises the business is more important than the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) I do not have to be emotionally attached to those I work with and do business with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I am able to be emotionally attached to those I work with and do business with. Business is business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) The welfare and prosperity of my work group is the most important thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) The relationships I make with my co workers and customers last only as long as the business we do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) The relationships I make with my co workers and customers are involved and important to me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Designed for this study based on the literature of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) and Anon 1999.

These statements (as seen in Table 5.2.) were designed using Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) dimensions of culture, as well
as Anon Consulting’s (1999) independent variables of work commitment. The focus groups were exploratory and as such, how and if Anon’s constructs aligned with the other items as shown in Table 5.2, was of interest.

In addition to these statements, Focus Group One participants each had five blank cards. The five blank cards were to be used by participants to add their own statements about what they perceived to be important in developing and maintaining work commitment to an employer. However, the blank card resulted in too many additional items and confused the results.

To reduce the potential number of responses, and thereby reduce the variability in them, the participants in Kota Bharu were provided with only the prepared cards. These contained the same twenty statements as those used in Australia. As a revision of the first focus group, Focus Group Two were provided with large tablemats upon which were drawn four boxed squares that were used for sorting responses labelled as follows:

1. I strongly agree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organisation.

2. I agree that if a company had/has this in place I would be committed to that organisation.
3. I disagree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organisation.

4. I strongly disagree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organisation.

The table mats were designed to further distinguish the participants’ responses. The same statements were written on the cards in English for both countries. The procedure, however, did alter somewhat between Australia and Malaysia, and these differences are described below. Using different methods of investigation in the two groups reduced the ability to make comparisons between them; however, both exercises uncovered rich data concerning the understanding of work commitment in the APR. Validity in relation to the relativist position has not been widely addressed according to Easterby-Smith (2002, p.53). Yin (1994) suggests using multiple sources of evidence will help construct validity; internal validity can be assisted by conducting studies over time, reducing alternative explanations, and external validity from a relativist’s position should rely on analytic rather than statistical generalisations, as is the case here.

**Data collection procedures: Focus Groups**

A participant-researcher/participant-participant role was used (Gans, 1982) allowing the researcher to switch roles and both conduct the nominal
group process but also make observations. This type of role is often adopted by researchers working in their own work environments (Grbich, 1999). The purpose of Focus Group One, as described to the group, involved uncovering groups of items that were considered important to employees in the development of commitment from an employee to an employer/organisation.

To commence Focus Group One, participants were directed to read and consider the statement displayed at the front of the room. The statement said: “What makes you committed or would make you more committed as an employee to an employer or organisation?” Participants were given five minutes to think about the statement. They were then directed to write down, on the blank cards in front of them, the five most important factors that they felt were important to create commitment to an employer as employees. The factors may have already been in place in the work environment or the participants thought they should be put in place. The participants were given ten minutes to complete the blank cards. Having completed their list, the participants then shared them in their table group. At this point, if any of the items on the lists were similar they were eliminated. This then resulted in no repetition of the responses. The role of the researcher may have affected the dynamics of the group, as might peer pressure. Neither the researcher’s presence nor peer pressure appeared to
play a major role in the outcomes of the focus groups; however, the possibility of them having done so can not be dismissed.

At the commencement of the next stage of the exercise, the participants were directed to sort through the statements in the centre of the table to eliminate, once again, any of the cards that were replicated in the prepared set. Once this was completed the table group was directed to sort through the statements, putting them in order of importance to them as a group. The participants were allowed twenty minutes to complete this stage. The final stages involved writing up on their flipcharts the five most important factors that create work commitment from an employee to an employer based on the group results. Once this was completed, all the participants discussed the similarities and differences in the factors among the whole group. There were no apparent problems with the groups sharing their responses with each other. The cards were then numbered in their rank order (1, 2, 3 etc.) and collected and the participants thanked for their time and efforts.

Focus Group Two participants were asked to form three groups around large prepared tablemats that were placed in the centre of three rectangular tables. The participants were then directed to read the statement on the flipchart displayed at the front of the room: the same as posed to Group One. The question read: “What makes you committed or would
make you more committed as an employee to an employer or organisation?” They were then asked as a group to read through the pile of cards in front of them. The cards contained the twenty statements used in Focus Group One. The participants were then directed to discuss the significance of the statements and decide into which box on the mat these should be placed. Issues regarding peer pressure and other interesting observations are discussed with the nominal group process outcomes in the results discussion.

The final stage involved each table group discussing and agreeing on the ranking of all the statements from the most important to the least important factor. Once the participants had completed this stage to form one pile of cards from the original four piles on the mat, they then numbered them from one to twenty, using a red pen. The cards were then collected and the participants thanked for their time and effort. The data was then recorded in rank order as seen in Appendix F and examined for themes. There were no apparent problems with the lack of anonymity, group pressures or politics, although this possibility can not be dismissed. The next stage of the research involved a further exploration of the dimensions of culture.
STAGE TWO: PREFERRED DIMENSIONS SURVEY (PDS)

The challenge of obtaining a very clear and distinctive preference for each of the extreme ends of the continuum of the culture item proved to be problematic. For example, gaining a clear preference for collectivism over individualism often resulted in the two supposedly opposite dimensions being ranked closely together. Critical to the development of a more culturally sensitive WCI was the need to uncover each cultural dimension. Therefore, the purpose of this phase of the study was to further explore and refine the national culture dimensions of preference as shown in Table 5.1. The following section explores the concept of a forced choice questionnaire, called the “Preferred Dimensions Survey” (PDS), which was designed to explore the following:

Proposition 1: The ‘collectivism’ dimension of national culture will be the most selected by employees in the APR.

The PDS study was conducted within two collectivist countries, Malaysia and Thailand, and one individualist country, Australia. The Malaysian and Thai findings are contrasted with findings from those in Australia. The surveys were conducted in early 2001, with the researcher present at each of the locations.
The first PDS survey was completed in Thailand with the participants located in one of Bangkok’s leading six star hotels. The hotel’s staff number at the time of the research was six hundred. Twenty-three (23) staff participated in the study and were of mixed ages and all were nationals. Only small sample sizes were accessible through Merico at this stage of the research. Another significant selection criterion which influenced the sample was that each participant had to have a reasonable ability to read English. As the majority of the staff were line level employees they were unable to read English and therefore they did not participate in the survey. A cross-section of employees participated in the PDS.

The second country in which the survey was completed was Malaysia. The research was conducted in a hotel in Malacca, in Eastern Malaysia. The hotel staff numbered three hundred and thirty and a total of twenty-seven (27) employees took part in this study. All of the Malaysian participants were nationals and fluent in English. A mix of ages and levels within the organisation was also represented. The hotel had a strong union presence and the employees were eager to clarify what the research was for and how the findings would be used.
The final stage of the research was conducted in Australia at one of Merico International’s four star properties in Queensland, where 200 staff were employed at the time of this study. Twenty-six (26) employees participated in this PDS. The Australian participants from the Queensland hotel were in equal proportions from line level and management positions. The participants were from a range of departments within the hotel and represented various age groups. The nationality requirement for participation was that they be born in Australia. The limitation did not, therefore, exclude employees from families of various cultural backgrounds.

Participants were selected by each hotel’s Human Resources Department, which was directed by Merico to supply a sample of approximately twenty people. Firstly, for reasons of convenience and access, the HRMs chose to approach all employees who happened to be attending a Merico training program, and offered them the opportunity to participate in the survey. As previously stated, once employees had agreed to participate, they were informed of their ethical rights. The response rate was 100% of those who were approached to undertake the PDS. The sample was non-representative and small because ease of access was largely the reason for conducting the PDS in Thailand, Malaysia and Australia. Thus, convenience sampling was used as the participants merely happened to be attending a training session within Merico. The PDS, in
fact, was incorporated into this training session. This raises the question of generalisability. However, generalisability is not an aim of this exploratory qualitative research and this is acceptable according to Easterby-Smith et al. in a study such as this (2002).

The PDS I and PDS II

While the instruments were used to uncover the preferences of participants for the dimensions of culture, they were also designed to force participants into selecting one dimension over its opposite. For example, a participant would have to select either a) individualism or b) collectivism (as seen in Appendix G). Separation of the dimensions in this manner was deemed necessary because a clear choice must be made between one of the points, rather than along a continuum where many Asian respondents score in the middle. The PDS is an instrument not previously tested or used by others and was designed for separating dimensions of culture using dichotomous or forced choice questions (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

The advantages of using dichotomous or forced questions are that they are easier to answer and easier to score. As there are only two choices they are usually very different from each other and therefore the likelihood that participants have interpreted the items in a similar manner is decreased. Dichotomous questions can therefore be a highly reliable and valid measure
Their disadvantages are that participants may be frustrated that their view is not represented by either of the alternatives presented. This decreases the power to explore subtle relationships between variables. Dichotomous or forced questions were used in this study, as they were critical to the development of a culturally sensitive work commitment construct and potential measure in the APR. They also led to a more complete understanding of cultural dimension preferences.

The list of statements presented for each dimension had two sets of bi-polar statements for the dimension of collectivism and individualism, as shown here and in Appendix G. One set of statements was contained in each of the two versions of the PDS, called here PDS I and PDS II.

**PDS I**
A) My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing.
B) The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing.

**PDS II**
A) I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
B) I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and or team than as an individual.

Having two sets of paired statements for each dimension allowed for two versions of the PDS to be developed. Two versions of the survey were used because having all the items in one questionnaire made the length inhibitive as opposed to two surveys. From each dimension one set of
paired statements was placed into each of the PDSs to form PDS I and PDS II (Appendix G). Each pair appeared together once and was then displayed against all other dimension statements. Each version contained statements representing each of the eleven dimensions explored i.e.; ‘collectivism and individualism’, ‘universal and particular’, ‘affective and neutral’, ‘specific and diffuse’, ‘ascription and achievement’, ‘future and past’, ‘internal control and external control’, ‘power distance’, ‘masculinity and femininity’ and ‘uncertainty avoidance’. An additional dimension, that of ‘job satisfaction and remuneration’, was added as it was raised in the preliminary investigations as being of significant importance to employees and was also identified by Anon. The corresponding questions for each dimension can be seen in Appendix G. The PDS I and PDS II each contained two hundred and seventy paired force choices.

In Thailand eleven (11) PDS I and twelve (12) PDS II were used. In Malaysia thirteen (13) PDS I and fourteen (14) PDS II was used. In Australia thirteen (13) of each were used. The implications of uneven numbers was somewhat reduced by the data being analysed together.

In addition to uncovering the cultural preferences in each dimension within each culture, it was desirable to develop (in the PDS), an ability to provide a ranking of the dimensions; for example, to determine if the selection of ‘collectivism’, from the dimension of ‘group versus individual’,
was a more important dimension than a particularist one. The choice could be demonstrated through the selection of the ‘collectivist’ dimension over the ‘particularist’ dimension for how we apply rules. Thus it could be determined that a participant preferred ‘particularism’ to ‘collectivism’, but it could also be demonstrated by ranking which dimension was more important in relation to all other dimensions. To do this, the ‘particularist’ and ‘collectivist’ statement had to be paired.

Therefore, the instrument paired each of the statements against every other question. The pairs were then presented randomly within the two versions of the PDS questionnaire to reduce response set bias. The two versions of the PDS therefore contained a representative paired question of each dimension, which was paired against every other statement (See Appendix G for surveys).

The two questionnaires contained two hundred and seventy paired statements each. Participants were required to select A or B for each of the two hundred and seventy pairs, in essence forcing a choice. The forms were handed out alternately as participants arrived at each of the locations to ensure both versions of the PDS were used. The dimensions of particular interest to this study were that of collectivism and individualism and how they ranked in relation to the other ten dimensions.
In addition to the dimensions of national culture the final statement in the survey related to the two-factor model of motivation (Hertzberg, 1968). This was designed to determine if the preference for remuneration over satisfaction in the workplace was in any way related to the dimensions of culture or, as suggested by the preliminary research, could be linked to one dimension over others. Statements were included to explore this possibility, as shown in Appendix G.

**PDS: Procedures Used in Collecting the Data**

Once participants were fully aware of their rights, the survey was explained to them as being a forced choice design. In Australia, the participants were most interested in why they were completing the survey, with the main questions relating to where the data would go and what it would be used for. It took them approximately twenty minutes to complete the survey. In Malaysia the participants also showed concern for the outcomes of the survey. Nevertheless, they completed the survey, taking thirty minutes to do so. In Thailand the participants had a great deal of difficulty with the translation of some words and so needed continual translation assistance by their HRM. The survey took them considerably longer than their Malaysian and Australian counterparts taking, fifty minutes. The data analysis was conducted using SPSS cross-tabulation and is presented in the results chapter. The findings supported the use of the collectivist dimension of culture as used in the proposed framework of work commitment. The next step in this sequential exploratory study was
to further explore the drivers and outcome behaviours of work commitment, with the Expert Panels, which focused specifically on the understanding of work commitment in the APR.

**STAGE TWO - EXPERT PANELS**

Determining the variables which may be more relevant to the APR, as shown in Table 5.1, was the central aim of the next part of the study and was designed to address the following questions, as described in Chapter Four, to explore the framework of work commitment:

Q3. Do the drivers of WCI used in the US differ from those of the APR?
Q4. Do the outcome behaviours of the WCI used in the US differ from those in the APR?

The Expert Panels were conducted, again using the nominal group process. Two panels were held in each location as described in Table 5.1. The first panel was formed to determine the drivers of work commitment, and the second to explore the outcomes of work commitment in the APR. The same participants who formed Expert Panel One were used in Expert Panel Two. The two panels were held one month apart from each other. This allowed the researcher to process the results of the first before the commencement of the second panel. The participants who took part in the Expert Panels are described here, as well as the instruments used in the two different stages of its use, including how they were implemented.
Using the EOS Questions for the Expert Panels

The data collection instrument used in the Expert Panels was made up of the questions asked within the current EOS which Merico International conducts annually. There were a number of reasons for adopting this format. In discussions with one key contact from Thailand it was decided that the current EOS would provide a familiar tool for the Expert Panels to refer to. As the majority of the current employees used in this sample had served for more than one year they would have completed the EOS in their service with Merico International and would be familiar with its layout and questions. The fact that all of the countries had translated EOS forms aided in the comprehension process.

Of most relevance was the fact that within the fifty-two-question survey were located the questions used to calculate the WCI; the index of commitment used in the US (see Appendix B). None of the participants were aware of the make-up of the WCI or, indeed, its existence within the EOS. The aim was to design a new framework of work commitment that was more culturally appropriate to the APR, and to be able to locate it within the existing survey as a potential new measure. The final benefit of using the existing EOS was that it allowed a low cost method of potentially replacing the WCI in the APR. If a potential new measure could be achieved, it could then replace the existing index developed by Anon Consulting (1999) in the US, by using the same questionnaire, but with
different questions. The limitation of using Merico’s questionnaire was a design constraint which was unavoidable because this was a part of the negotiation process which took place in Washington to obtain access to the organisation.

Because of this limitation, the nominal group process was selected as the most appropriate method to be used within the Expert Panels. The nominal group process is used to tap a diversity of expert opinions in cross-cultural contexts (Grbich, 1999, p.116). The number of participants was brought into line with Grbich’s recommended optimum of Grbich for a nominal group, namely five to nine. English is a standard requirement of Merico’s top International Hotels and employees are often provided with ongoing language training. The instructions were written in English, as seen in Appendix I, and the panels were in conducted in English. The process of completing the Expert Panels took on average 60 minutes, which is slightly lower than that of the recommended 90 minutes (Grbich, 1999). The panels used a live round-table method. This is explored next, along with the use of the nominal group process.

**Research Participants: Expert Panel**

Data was collected for the APR countries, but this time Australia was not included because in the earlier phases of the study it had distinguished itself, as expected, on a number of key cultural dimensions,
such as being highly individualistic. This is discussed further in Chapter Six. Table 5.1 describes the eight participating countries. Each participant was born in the country they represented in the research. And all gave their informed consent and were told of their rights to withdraw at any stage of the research. All had volunteered to take part in the study. Expert Panels were made up of employees who were already attending training sessions within the hotel. The HRMs conducted the panels, and although their involvement did not appear to affect the other participants in any adverse manner their potential influence cannot be dismissed. One HRM was present at each of the eleven panels conducted. All participants could read and write English and could translate fluently. Additional translation assistance was available from other regional employees, located in Hong Kong, who are all fluent in English as well numerous other languages if required. The Expert Panels were conducted in two sittings in late 2001 one month apart as seen in Table 5.1.

**Research Context: Expert Panels**

The physical environments in which this phase of the study took place were accordingly similar yet geographically different for each group. The number of Expert Panels held in each country varied. The average number of participants per panel was five. Following is a breakdown of the Expert Panels:
Table 5.3: Countries and number of participants in Expert Panels I and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees from the country conducted the Expert Panels and thus no outside (or Western) facilitators were present. The researcher remained in Australia for this study meaning no observations could be made of the groups, and data interpretation was limited to the findings returned by the panels. The aim was to allow for an open and culturally unbiased discussion about what created work commitment and how it could be defined within each of the unique national cultures being explored within the APR.

**Data Collection: Expert Panels**

The facilitators of the Expert Panels were selected because of their roles as trainers within Merico International. In addition all were born in the country in which they had to conduct the panel, giving them the ability to assist with translation. The nominal group process was detailed for the
facilitators to use in the panels (see Appendix I). To help to decrease the bias, the facilitators were not aware of the make-up of the WCI at any stage of the Expert Panels. To reduce the likelihood of politically correct answers being given, it was stressed that Merico was seeking to examine work commitment within the participants’ national cultures. The facilitators of the Expert Panels were trained by the researcher via teleconferences and by written instructions in the nominal group process (see Appendix I). Having gathered the target groups together for training, the facilitator explained the purpose and process of the research and introduced the Expert Panels to their task.

Phase One of the Expert Panels Data Collection

Panels were asked to select from the questionnaire the questions they considered to best represent the drivers that affected work commitment within the EOS in late 2001. The most frequently selected questions as presented by the Expert Panels contributed, along with the previous studies, to the WOK framework of culture. From the EOS, panels ranked the questions in order of what they considered to be the drivers of work commitment in the APR.

Phase Two of the Expert Panel Data Collection

One month later, after the ‘drivers’ of work commitment had been selected, the facilitators were asked to again participate in Expert Panels
using the nominal group process with the same panels. The second phase of the Expert Panels was designed to uncover what was considered by the participants to be the indicators, or outcome behaviours, of work commitment. The approach used to uncover the outcome variables in the second Expert Panel was almost identical, and most importantly, the questions remained the same as for the previous component of the study, except that its focus was on outcome behaviour. The written instructions for both parts of the Expert Panel are shown in Appendix I, indicating the differences between them. The same facilitators were used once again to conduct and collect the responses from the second Expert Panel and used the nominal group process to rank the outcomes of work commitment. The results of the Expert Panels, along with the findings of the preliminary investigations, PDS I & II and focus groups, were used to generate a new more culturally sensitive framework of work commitment for the APR.

INTEGRATION OF THE STUDIES

The integration of the data in a sequential exploratory mixed methods study might occur at several stages in the research; during collection of the data, at the analysis stage, or in a combination of places (Creswell, 2003). The integration of the studies in this thesis occurred after the completion of Preliminary Investigations involving the PDS forced choice questionnaire, face-to-face interviews and focus groups and the Expert Panels, i.e. at the interpretation stage.
The Preliminary Investigations provided valuable information regarding the fit of the corporate culture and their national culture, the national dimensions of culture and commitment, as seen in Table 5.1. The PDS provided confirmatory evidence that collectivism was the dimension of preference for the employees in the APR. The Focus Groups indicated there were differences in the drivers and outcomes of work commitment for the employees in the APR compared with those of the WCI (as seen in Chapter Six). The Expert Panels then further explored the differences in the drivers and outcome behaviours. The major findings of these studies were then used to develop a new framework for understanding work commitment in the APR, as seen in the integration section of the next chapter. The CWCF, derived from the literature, used to guide the study was also integrated into the new framework where supported by these studies.

The resulting framework was called the WOK and is described in detail in the next Chapter. This new framework, WOK, was made up of somewhat different drivers and outcome behaviours of work commitment, more closely related to the collectivist dimension of culture than the WCI. Exploratory statistical analyses were then used from the data collected in the EOS, to use the new framework, the WOK, to see if a more sensitive potential measure of work commitment could be extrapolated.
EOS: WOK VS WCI

The WCI was established as a measure of the relationship between employees and their employers. Employees who give ‘their best’ to an employer, and who help the organisation meet its business goals are characterised as committed. As previously discussed, Anon Consulting developed the WCI from research commenced in 1996, and as also previously noted, one of the limitations of this research is that it places much store on how the consultants have modelled work commitment.

The research produced by Anon Consulting (1999) reported on the validity of the index. The correlations in their findings were .53 and stronger. The study appears valid in its methodology, although, this assessment is made in the context of the limited access provided by Anon to their research data and methodology. To develop the WCI, 2,020 U.S. workers were interviewed in June 1997. Given that the WOK is embedded in the EOS, it was possible to test the assumptions regarding national cultural values and work commitment within the normal Merico International survey. The rationale for adopting this method was discussed previously (see introduction to this chapter).

Research Context - EOS: WCI vs. WOK

The data used in the final phase is based on the Merico EOS survey conducted in the later part of 2000 within the eight countries involved in
this research (see Table 5.1). That was the last time that all hotels managed by Merico International participated in an EOS. Prior to the EOS being conducted all employees were notified that their participation was voluntary. All hotels in the chain are required, however, to participate by making the surveys available and ensuring the appropriate information regarding the process and confidentiality are provided for employees. Each hotel was given a window of time to complete the survey and on average, data was collected over five days. A total of 19,950 employees took part in the study with a high response rate, most hotels reporting higher than 80% participation rates. As one of Merico’s key measurement instruments linked to the bonuses of managers, participation rates are monitored by headquarters and encouraged to be high. The EOS was completed during paid working time, which also encouraged participation. All levels of the organisation were represented; 51% were general employees, 8.3% were supervisors, 4.7% Managers, 2.2% Department Heads and .2% were General Managers. Fifty-one per cent were male and 31% female with the remainder unknown. Tenure demographics showed: 6.7% had served less than three months, 5.8% had served more than three and less than six months, 10.2% six months but less than one year, 23.7% one year but less than 3 years, 16.5% three years but less than five, and 29.8% had served more than five years with Merico International.
The Research Participants - EOS: WCI vs. WOK

Employees volunteered to complete the EOS and were advised by Merico of their right not to participate. Each participant completed the survey during paid working time. To the knowledge of the researcher those who did not complete the survey were not in any way disadvantaged or in fear of reprisal for not participating. The regulations and rules surrounding the survey were displayed in each of the participating hotels and the process explained in detail.

Procedures used in collecting the data - EOS: WCI vs. WOK

The procedures used in distributing the EOS and collecting the data from the eight countries in the APR are explained to the Human Resource and General Managers by literature distributed by Merico International. The data collections describe a method used by Merico to enhance consistency of delivery. A comprehensive folder available in 24 languages was delivered to every hotel and included the following: an overview of the program, administration guide, action planning guide and best practices guide. The managers and employees were provided with a rationale for participating in the survey, i.e. the EOS is a tool used by Merico to measure organisational climate in its operating units. As mentioned before, the EOS is designed to gather input from employees about their jobs, their supervisors and managers, and the way they feel about the company. The purpose is to measure associate satisfaction in the key areas mentioned
above (customer service and environment) and other areas such as communication, development and opportunity. It is stressed to managers that the EOS, and the results from it, must be treated with extreme caution in relation to guarding confidentiality of responses and ensuring there is no fear of reprisal from managers.

The procedures include ensuring a Human Resources representative is present when the survey is distributed to answer questions and monitor security. The surveys are sealed by employees and then placed into a locked document box. The box is then returned unopened to a neutral data recognition firm which processes the surveys into statistical reports attempting to ensure complete confidentiality for the participants. Training is supplied to the employees prior to them completing the form so that there is clarification on each question and about what happens to the results. Once the reports are returned, feedback groups are conducted in each hotel to examine its results. Action plans are then developed to be implemented over the next twelve months to improve problematic scores. Employee involvement is then ongoing in reviewing the implementation of each action plan. Once the EOS is collected the data is compiled by computer to produce statistical reports including the production of the WCI for each hotel. The procedures involved in the distribution and collations of results will now be discussed.
**EOS Instrument used in data collection**

As shown in Appendix B, Merico’s EOS is delivered in twenty-four languages including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Malay, Thai, and Tagalog. The international translation company responsible organised local translation so that the questionnaire was comparable in all countries. The employees within the study would have completed the questionnaire in the appropriate language. The questionnaire comprises fifty-eight (58) fixed response and five (5) open-ended questions (see Appendix B). In the set section, questions cover broad topics such as: your overall opinion, the work environment, the people you work with, the leadership at your property, your work and your career, the guest, the company, your leadership team, communication, in your opinion and your career plans.

The scoring is conducted using a Likert type scale as seen in Figure 5.1:

![Figure 5.1. Employee Opinion Survey scoring](image)

Source: Merico International’s EOS of the year 2000.

As the researcher received the original data file, it was possible, in the same way, to calculate a score for the questions identified as forming
the WOK. These could be compared directly with the WCI. The WOK, developed as a result of the integration of the previous studies, was calculated for the eight APR countries excluding Australia, and independently for Australia. This way, both WCI scores and the new WOK scores were available for APR and for Australia.

**The Sample: EOS**

As mentioned previously, given the variance on the culture dimension of Australia and the Asian countries on the communitarian – individualism dimension, the Australian group has been analysed independently of the other countries. The responses from Australian properties (n= 2327) were excluded from the analyses. This yielded a total sample of 17,623 for the other APR countries. The breakdown of the sample is provided in Table 5.4.

While a large number of the responses came from China, they still represent less than half of the total sample. Issues arising from this are discussed in the results chapter. The reasoning for the large Chinese sample size is related directly to the large number of hotels Merico has in China. Many of these hotels contain over 1000 rooms and employ thousands of employees.
Table 5.4: Frequencies of responses - APR sample only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7896</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical analysis was used in an exploratory way to compare the WCI and the WOK. Bivariate correlations and multiple regressions were used to determine if the new dimensions of the WOK was a more culturally sensitive framework of work commitment than that currently employed by Merico, the WCI. Correlations enable the researcher to demonstrate relationships between variables; however, this does not indicate any causality in the relationship (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002, p.141). This study concluded the data collection for this thesis. The next chapter reports on the findings and interprets the results of the study.

**Issues of Reliability, Validity and Generalisability**

Reliability and validity in mixed methods studies, such as this one, are discussed by Easterby-Smith et al. (2002, p.53). Validity is determined
by whether a sufficient number of perspectives have been used. In this study a number of perspectives have been sought to explore work commitment in collectivist cultures in the APR within Merico. Despite the small number of participants in some of the findings presented, the array of studies used to explore work commitment increases the validity according to Easterby-Smith et al. (2002). Reliability, according to the latter, is attained if similar observations would be reached by other observers. As noted, the insider role of the researcher allowed access to Merico’s employees; it is unlikely an outsider would achieve such access. However, should access be granted it could be expected that similar observations to those gathered in this study would be obtained. Generalisability, as described by Easterby-Smith et al. (2002, p.53) is the likely probability that patterns observed in this sample will be repeated to the general population. They note this definition is similar to the more traditional definition of external validity. Given the large data set obtained within the Merico context it is likely that similar patterns as those found in this research will be observed in the general population. It is also noted by Easterby-Smith et al. (2002) that issues of validity have been less frequently addressed for the relativist approach within mixed methods studies.

**Summary**

Each of the studies conducted in this mixed methods sequential study added to achieving a greater understanding of and development of a
more culturally sensitive understanding and proposing a more sensitive index for further testing and development as a measure of work commitment in the APR (see Table 5.1). Multiple sources of data have been used, including the PIQ, face-to-face interviews, focus groups, the PDS, forced choice questionnaires, Expert Panels, and an organisational climate survey in the EOS. This has been achieved while operating within the constraints of Merico. Merico’s senior management influenced the choice of methods the participants, and the sample sizes in each stage of the research. While their contribution could be said to be generous, their restrictions resulted in a low volume of data being collected initially. Sampling bias is also inherent in this study however, it was not designed to be generalised beyond the organisation. Such limitations and restrictions occur when working within the boundaries of a MNC, and on applied research such as Merico, and they are made more complex when researching in a cross-cultural context. Chapter six presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER SIX

RESULTS

Introduction

The results of Stage One and Stage Two of this study are presented in this chapter, along with a discussion of how each study contributed to answering the following question: Q1. *How do employees in collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC?*

The findings of the study are presented sequentially and reflect how the study unfolded. Not all stages of the study were successful and the quality of data collected varied, as did the sample sizes. At each stage the role of Merico loomed ever present, as did the problems and advantages of being an insider conducting applied research. The most significant parts of the study were arguably the Preferred Dimensions Survey (PDS), Expert Panels and the use of the Employee Opinion Survey (EOS). In each of these stages important an important break through finding was made.

PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS RESULTS

The preliminary investigations involved the use of the PIQ (Preliminary Investigations Questionnaire) and in-depth face-to-face-interviews to address the following:
Q1. How do employees in collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC?

Q2. How do employees perceive the fit between the MNC’s corporate culture developed within highly individualistic national cultures and their collectivist culture; and does this impact upon their perceptions of work commitment?

The PIQ required the participants to complete nine (9) open-ended questions. The final question related to the type of corporate culture participants believed best described their hotel. While several broad themes have been found from responses, the open-ended nature of the questions meant that the answers varied between countries. Consequently, the information gained from the PIQ was to have been viewed by country. However, due to the low response rate, only a limited analysis was done. The questions answered were nevertheless still important, and these were incorporated into the interview transcripts of the second phase of the preliminary research.

The second phase of the preliminary investigations involved conducting face-to-face interviews with the ADHRs, providing the opportunity for the researcher to clarify and probe, where necessary. The themes within the answers were interpreted from the interview transcripts by the researcher after the sessions by simply highlighting ‘like’ answers.
(see Appendix E for transcripts). As a result of the probe questions contained in this part of the study, not all of the interviews covered exactly the same questions.

As noted above, while similar topics were raised in both the written PIQ and the interviews (refer to Appendix E), the latter allowed for more detailed questioning of participants. A thematic sorting process was performed on the transcripts of the written surveys and the recorded interviews of the participants. Each theme that was found to be common to all countries from both data sets is addressed first, followed by those themes that are unique to individual nationalities.

**Core Values and Beliefs**

The first area addressed by the PIQ and interviews concerned what were considered to be the core values and beliefs of the participants’ country of origin. The majority of Asian respondents addressed two themes: the importance of the family and the importance of having respect for elders. Other themes that were mentioned by more than three of the seven Asian country participants were the importance of humility, harmony and teamwork. The following Thai response was representative of the Asian countries:

*The number one value foreigners need to learn of ‘Guanxi’ or respect...Let’s say for example you want to eat Thai food but I don’t like Thai food but because you are my boss I will eat the food*
because I won’t speak out. Thais are communal and you don’t want to stick out of the group, this is important.

Another response from a Thai participant was:

Respect for elders is very important, piety, honesty, humility, being humble, valuing differences, trying to work in harmony, saving face, very very important, they pride themselves on teamwork.

Respect for elders and superiors is very important throughout the majority of Asian cultures as noted by several researchers (Mavondo & Rodrigo, 2001; Tayeb, 2003; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). However, in some Asian cultures, it was stated that while individuals may seem to agree with a manager, they might actually disagree, be very angry or even be humiliated. The Australian participants’ themes were quite different from the Asian ones. The main Western themes were a strong sense of equality; ‘mateship’ and being ‘anti-authoritarian’; importance of leisure and sport or ‘work to live not live to work’; and the importance of the immediate family rather than the community. As expected, the Australian and Asian responses differed.

Perceptions of Americans

The next area the participants addressed was how their culture perceived Americans in general. A significant majority of the respondents said that Americans were perceived as outspoken and loud. Another recurring theme was that they had a relaxed, casual manner. For example, the Korean participant reported:
Whenever we talk about the American way we are referring to it being very casual rather than polite. Like when they say to call the guest and staff by their first names, which is very impolite. We have one Associate who went to school in the United States and so when we tell her our mission statement is to provide very casual service from the bottom of your heart, she thinks of the American way and so is very casual and she called the General Manager and guests by their first name which is unacceptable to the local culture. That is one of the challenges we are facing of how Koreans perceive American culture.

Similarly negative responses from other participants included such things as extroverted, crude, challenging and individualist. However, these were matched by a number of positive perceptions of Americans, such as contained within the following Thai response:

Americans are a bit loud a little bit crude in some sense but overall Thai people have a lot of liking for Americans because America is seen as the land of opportunity, freedom where they can break away from some of the cultural norms of Thailand. They see it as a place of new trends, new technology, and advancement so it has a pretty positive perception despite the fact that sometimes their behaviour clashes a bit with Thai behaviour.

The interviews then moved from the broad topic of Americans to more specifically Merico International and its management.

**Merico International’s Corporate Culture**

When responding to how Merico International and its management were accepted, a Japanese respondent replied:

They brought a lot of procedures and checklists. Some procedures were very basic and nothing new and I think that the way that they told us was quite shocking because there was no explanation or trying to understand the local culture.
However, not all participants had such negative responses. Most participants agreed, in theory, with the principles Merico espoused. The difficulties in the transference from theory to practice, however, did become a recurring theme. It was noted that, while Merico’s ideas in theory were considered to be very good, sometimes they did not fit in the local national cultures. For example, a Korean participant noted that:

...when you talk about speaking your mind and coming forward and saying things it is seen either as a lack of respect for those in a senior position or that I have a free hand to do anything over those in a lower position...in this culture which is very respect oriented to really emulate it (Merico’s culture) and move over will take some time.

In several examples, national cultures were stated as fitting with Merico’s corporate culture. This was illustrated most clearly by the Korean participant, who stated:

There were several examples of the attempt of national cultures to try to fit with Merico’s corporate culture. When we opened our hotel the main thing that we communicated to our employees was the importance of trust. When we started they had a really high expectation of us. But they went through the same process with other companies like Hyatt. There was a lot of applying to the local culture but then after some time this stopped happening from the top. So we have been open 6 months and Merico corporate culture is being applied and whether we make it or not will depend on how we can keep on applying the philosophy on a daily basis, whether our managers can be role models will also affect if we are successful or not. When they see the General Manager or the Directors they say oh that is the Merico Culture that is the Merico way. It is considered that the two cultures can be mixed together but the challenge is actually how we practise this.
As the literature shows, this view is not uncommon (Adler and Jelinek [1986]).

**Employee Opinion Survey**

The Employee Opinion Survey (EOS) was discussed in the interviews. As stated previously, the EOS is the annual satisfaction survey of employees within Merico International. One of the major themes to arise from the Asian group regarding the EOS was the reluctance of employees to give either very high or very low scores. A Filipino ADHR summarised this reticence by saying:

*Our people always stay in the middle ... in Asia they could remove the 3.*

The ‘3’ refers to the middle score in the EOS. It appeared that the majority of the ADHRs had difficulty in moving their employees from scoring a three. On the one hand, the ADHRs commented that employees did not want to give the managers a high score because of the belief that the managers would stop trying to improve ‘things’ for the workers. On the other, the employees did not want to give the managers a low score out of respect for their official position. The Australians, however, indicated that they would rather score high or low to ‘get the message across’, once again highlighting the expected Western and Asian differences.
**Work Commitment Index**

The Work Commitment Index is the Index embedded within the EOS as a set of questions. Interviewees’ thoughts about the WCI coalesced around the driving factors of work commitment and expected behavioural outcomes. Again, in practice, there was some doubt about the American WCI’s applicability given the variations in the national culture revealed in the preliminary research.

In addition, factors such as tenure and length of employment were not seen by some as ensuring a committed employee. The Malaysian participant stated:

*An Associate can be committed without having them serve for a long time so I would have to put a question mark on this.*

Money was seen as a motivator of employee commitment with the understanding of its importance in many of the countries negating the tenure aspect. Tenure was less important as an outcome of commitment because employees were loyal to their leaders. Because leaders tended to move in order to seek further experience, their employees often followed them.

**Cultural Dimensions**

As noted in Chapter Three, the cultural dimensions of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) are: individualism versus collectivism,
Ascription versus achievement, universalism versus particularism, specific versus diffuse, neutral versus emotional/affective, past versus future focus and inner directed versus outer directed relationships with the environment. With regard to the dimension of ‘individualism versus collectivism’, all but the Australian participants chose the latter as the preferred dimension. The result was by far the clearest of all in terms of supporting evidence gained from the PIQ and interviews. The majority of participants chose ‘affective or emotional relationships’ over ‘neutral relationships’. The majority also selected the importance of the ‘past over future orientation’. In relation to harmony with the environment, all but the Thailand and Philippines participants selected ‘inner harmony’ over ‘outer directed harmony’. The Korean participant stated:

...in Korean culture we are said to be working at a higher level if we get in harmony with each other and the environment and if they do this with good teamwork then they can go further beyond their target or their goal.

Another area supported by the majority of respondents was the importance of ‘ascription over achievement’. Thus, the role of the family continued to be a concern for the majority of respondents, while individual achievement was of secondary importance. In respect of the preference for ‘specific over diffuse relationships’, a Thai respondent summarised the majority response by saying that:

In order to do business with the Thai people relationships are extremely important, so you can’t just fly in and make an appointment and expect to close the deal, you have to go out for
dinner together, you have to be able to create that comfortable environment then you are able to do long term business more easily.

Unlike the previous topics, the responses to ‘universalism and particularism’ were equally split. Even in their final choice, nearly all the participants noted the relevance of both universalism and particularism to them. While participants stated that one rule should fit all of the people all of the time, they also acknowledged that there are exceptions to the rule and vice-versa. The Singaporean respondent was by far the most dominant in showing a preference for universalism. He told the following story:

*A boy who came from America was beaten because he disobeyed our laws regarding the outlawing of chewing gum. The law is an attempt to decrease pollution of our public places. We tend to be very clear on what is right and wrong but in America they tend to debate such things.*

Interestingly, a theme that emerged for the participants from Thailand, Singapore and China showed a generational divide. Younger Singaporeans, Chinese and Thais valued different types of rewards and celebrations within an organisation, as demonstrated by the following statement from the Chinese participant:

*Culture in China is fading away like Chinese New Year was very important but recently the younger generation has been celebrating Christmas. It is relevant to the older generation but the younger generation really try to follow the Western ways and try to have the things they have.*

As suggested by Redding (1995), the area of generational variances in influencing what creates and maintains work commitment will no doubt become a very important issue in the next decade. While the theme of
generational differences is beyond the scope of this thesis, it merits future research.

Two other themes mentioned by more than two respondents as creating commitment from an employee to an employer were the provision of benefits, which extended to the family, and the company’s values. In China, the acquisition of material goods was very important to employees. For example, the Chinese participant stated:

They are just interested in lucky draws and nothing else. Once our hotel provided only snacks instead of a sit-down dinner (for the employees’ annual party) and that was fine because the employees wanted management to spend more money on gifts and not on food.

The importance of the family has been a reoccurring theme of importance with the participants from the APR as evident in the literature (Chen et al., 2002; Cohen, 2003; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001). Having reviewed the preliminary investigation findings, themes of significance are now discussed in detail.

DISCUSSION: Preliminary Investigations

The key findings, as gathered from the preliminary PIQ and the interviews, included a clarification of the core values and beliefs. A strong pattern emerged regarding the importance to the Asian participants of family and group values, therefore supporting the CWCF. Perceptions of Americans indicated that cultural differences did occur, with both negative and positive connotations, between the participants’ national culture and
Merico. Merico International’s corporate culture was explored and, despite cultural differences, the adoption of the corporate culture appeared on the whole, to be positively received. Finally, the role of the EOS and the WCI raised areas of concern and differences that were largely attributed to national culture. These specific findings are now discussed further.

Discussion – Core Values

The core values of the societies were the first theme that emerged. The strong emphasis of the Asian participants on the values of family and respect of community were clearly evident. In contrast, the Australian individualism and the ‘work to live’ outlook were clearly demonstrated. The results fit well with the dimensions of culture as proposed by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). In other areas it was more difficult to analyse the results. The sample size played a limiting role here. A larger number of interviews may have enabled a greater clarification of participants’ perceptions and thoughts, in addition to the interpretation of the descriptions of certain dimensions, specifically individualism and communitarianism.

For some of the respondents it was difficult to clearly separate the dimensions. Some cultures, according to the perceptions of the participants, appeared to want to embrace both dimensions; for example universalistic and particularistic. The strong presence of the collectivist
dimensions was by far the most interesting outcome of these findings. The outcomes lend support to what others (e.g. Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998) have been saying for some time. Not only does this work support the importance of the dimensions, and add to this knowledge by proposing that collectivism is the single most important cultural dimension, to which corporate culture should be tailored. In supporting the dimensions for culture, the findings of this study also indicated to the researcher that collectivism plays a key role in work commitment in the APR.

Discussion – Perceptions of Americans

Americans, and the participants’ perceptions of them, was the next theme explored, with marked similarities amongst the participants’ responses. A strong individualistic and independent nature was attributed to Americans. However, negative characteristics such as loudness,crudeness and being highly demanding, were common themes. Nevertheless these characteristics were matched by the more positive characteristics, such as being likable, relaxed, advanced technologically and a rich resource of wealth and power. The result corresponds closely to the dimensions of culture attributed to Americans by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) and Tayeb (2003) in the way that Americans could be ‘classified’ in terms of their dimensions.
Discussion – Merico International’s Corporate Culture

The main theme arising from the Asian participants’ views of Merico’s culture was that, in principle, it was good. However, participants reported that the translation of the theory into practice caused difficulties at times due to their own national cultures. An example of this was the ‘Speak Up’ program, which encouraged disgruntled employees to write to Mr. Merico himself. The program, however, goes against the Asian respect for those in senior positions and therefore is not a useful tool in this region, as supported by Wong, Rindfleisch and Burroughs (2003). It was noted that the reference to Merico was seen in two distinctly different ways. Firstly, when discussing Merico some participants interpreted ‘Merico’ as being interchangeable with ‘American’. Some of the concerns addressed regarding Merico’s Managers appeared to be more directed towards their being American than to their being from Merico. For example, many reported that their employees felt that if they were managed by an American company then they should receive those benefits that Americans receive, such as freedom, good pay and rights. It was reported that commitment was negatively affected when these benefits were not delivered, increasing perceptions of themselves as ‘second-class’ employees.

Secondly, when referring to Merico, many viewed their organisation as part of the ‘Merico family’ (see Chapter Two). It appeared as if they felt
there was Merico, then their Managers, and then themselves, and that their obligation to make Merico succeed was because of their sense of duty to the ‘family’. An organisation such as Merico identifies itself as a ‘real live’ family group. Perhaps greater work commitment can be extracted in the APR due to the collective orientation of employees, especially when this translates as a cultural preference related to kinship and family ties, that is selective isomorphism between the host organisation and natural cultural traits of employees.

**Discussion – Employee Opinion Survey**

The next major theme was the discussion of the role of the Employee Opinion Survey (EOS). The most common theme was the difficulty in persuading employees to score either a high or a low mark. The Australian participants, however, indicated their preference to score high or low to ‘get the message across’. Potential design modifications are discussed later in this chapter in relation to addressing this problem.

**Discussion – Work Commitment**

The WCI does not place importance on relationships, yet the relationship to the leader was the area of greatest specific concern raised by participants. Given the strong relationship between the employees and their leaders reported by Asian participants, it was almost a given for them that, should the leader leave, it would not be considered unreasonable for the
employee to follow them. In this way the Asian group found it very
difficult to consider tenure as a sign of a committed employee. There
appeared to be a degree of understanding, if not respect, given to those
employees who honoured these relationships by leaving with their leader.
Consequently, job satisfaction, and even commitment, may be more closely
linked to the leadership relationship of employees than to an organisation in
the APR. The importance of relationships may be linked back to the strong
collectivist dimension of culture that was displayed in that region, though
the collectivist nature has subtle differences across cultures. From the
responses analysed so far, it seems that corporate culture is most influenced
in relation to work commitment through the national cultural dimension of
collectivism versus individualism, though each is a multi-faceted construct;
e.g. collectivism and leadership relations. For example, in Australia, in
accordance with the relevant labour legislation, moving would not
necessarily alter an employee’s remuneration, so it was not considered by
them to be a motivating factor driving commitment. An expected outcome
in Australia was that, even though leadership relationships were seen as
important to work commitment, most employees would not consider
moving simply to follow a good manager, unless it suited them personally.

Understandably the second major theme relating to the sources of
work commitment was thought to be money. Money, by way of
remuneration or benefits for the employee and extended family, was seen as
important in retaining and gaining employee commitment. The strong concern for extended family may have been related to the level of economic development of each area, as reflected in the standard of living, the remuneration systems and the standing of the industry within each country. Tayeb (2003) states that commitment and trust are heavily influenced by the industrial relations systems and labour markets of a country. The level of economic development of countries in the APR appears to have an impact on this factor. The importance of the relationship to the leader was a major factor noted by the researcher as missing in the WCI model but highlighted in the CWCF (see Figure 5.2).

Discussion – Generational Frames of Reference and National Culture

Finally, an area currently gaining prominence in research and again highlighted in this study was that of the generation gap in Asian countries. It would appear that, with increasing exposure to Western culture, there is a greater desire among the young to embrace Western ideas and values. The desire to have what the West has by way of clothes, music, fast food, and to an extent, freedom is being embraced in every country visited as a part of the research. It is an interesting concept, however, that these are only the explicit layers of culture as described by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). An interesting question is raised about whether these outer layers affect the core assumptions and beliefs of the culture. In the researcher’s opinion, at the time of this study, this did not appear to be the
case and this view is supported by the literature (McIntosh, 1999). The appearance of the explicit layer of culture may lead to a misconception by the West that, because ‘they’ now eat KFC and wear Levis, Asians are becoming more the ‘same’ as Westerners themselves. The role of corporate culture from the West may also be embraced as the outer layer, but does it affect the core? If the outer layer being imposed were in conflict with the inner core, would there be a rejection, apathy, or incorporation and merger towards the explicit layer?

The results from the PIQ and the interviews served several purposes. Firstly, they established important links with the eight countries participating in the research and the key contact representing each of them. Secondly, they lent support to the existing research findings, especially in confirming the importance of relationships to the cultural dimensions of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) and for work commitment. Significant dimensions, such as collectivism, were proved important. Other dimensions were more difficult to measure using the interview format, for example, universalism and particularism. Finally, the research did support the belief that there were differences between America and the APR in explaining what creates work commitment of an employee to an employer. It should be noted that Australian culture is very different to the rest of the group explored from the APR and more closely matches the national culture of the US.
CONCLUSION: Preliminary Investigations

The completion of the PIQ, combined with the meeting of the key contacts in Kota Bharu in Malaysia for face-to-face interviews, proved to be a valuable beginning to this research. The research participants and the key contacts ensured a comprehensive representation of the staff of their hotels within Merico International. The use of a PIQ, followed by the interviews, allowed for a more in-depth and expanded coverage of the research topic. The study also allowed for the building of relationships between the researcher and participants, which proved to be most helpful in obtaining the further data for this study. The interviews also allowed for the exploration of new and potentially interesting areas of research not previously considered by the researcher, such as generational differences and the concept of organisational kinship.

In addition, further refinements were made to plans for the next stage of the research as a result of the interviews. An initial exploration of the key points in the findings indicated a closing of the perceived gaps between West and East, especially by the younger generation within Merico. The results also indicated that an embracing of Merico’s Western ways by the upcoming employees was a likely outcome. It was therefore apparent that the influence of age and tenure in relation to national culture and other factors, and the types of commitment, merit further research in the future.
Finally, independent areas that are emerging that may also impact upon work commitment and national culture are age and religion. Religion, which Tayeb (1994) considers a social factor, appeared to have a large impact on the type of drivers, creating affective-based work commitment between an employee and an employer in some of the national cultures. There is also a mixing of the traditional and rational/legal authority roles by employees.

The findings from the study appeared to fit the CWCF, adopted for the research. However, there were a number of variances to the framework, along with the discovery of some strong preferences of certain dimensions of culture over others. This raised interesting questions for possible future research beyond this thesis, such as has been mentioned, the generational divide. The results from the PIQ were used to contribute to the development of the focus groups discussed next. The results of the first stage of the research led to the development of the second phase, conducting Focus Groups, which is explored next. The Focus Groups were designed to further examine the cultural dimensions and factors of work commitment, while attempting to divide them into clearer choices to further clarify the issues within the theoretical constructs of the research.
FOCUS GROUPS RESULTS

The Focus Groups were designed to be the platform from which to seek higher level explanations, or corroborating evidence. Focus groups were used to further explore national dimensions of culture and work commitment in the next stage of this thesis and sought to help answer the following research questions:

Q1. How do employees in collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC?

Focus Group One was conducted in Australia late in the year 2000 with twenty-eight (28) participants. The data in Focus Group One was analysed for each of the four (4) table groups that participated. Thematic analysis was also used to analyse this data set. The top five factors that denoted commitment, as described on the flipcharts, were recorded (see Appendix F). The similarities across the groups were then determined from these factors. The way in which cards were collected and numbered was of importance as this process located the original twenty (20) statements. The preference position of the original statements, along with the new themes, was confused through the use of the blank cards, as discussed in Chapter Five. Allowing the participants to develop their own statements, on the blank cards, added a great deal of ambiguity to the results due to the range of topics raised. However, this could also be regarded as a collection of rich data. Potentially there could have been a total of an additional one
hundred and thirty-five (135) statements added to the original twenty (20) in Focus Group One. This number of responses was unmanageable because it could not be usefully grouped and analysed. Furthermore, the process of eliminating cards with similar statements was also problematic. Deciding how similar two statements had to be before the elimination of the statement proved difficult for participants. Elimination was further confounded by the complication of having strong and dominant participants within the groups. In addition, some items which were not replicated were eliminated when others, which possibly should have been eliminated, were not. Such decisions were often made by the most influential participants. Since there was an attempt to determine a preference of, for example, collectivism over individualism, the location of the two corresponding statements in the preference ranking was important. Additionally, there was an exploration of the preferences given to the statements by each of the groups.

In Focus Group One the group size of twenty-eight (n=28) participants was definitely too large because it greatly increased the number of responses. As recommended by Grbich (1999, p.108), the ideal size for a focus group is six (6) to twelve (12) participants. Twelve (12) participants in the total group would have been the ideal size. The groups of statements were very diverse, as seen in Appendix F.
Before the next stage of the research commenced, the clustering of statements into sets was a revision of the processes of Focus Group One. The method of Focus Group One was revisited to reduce the number of potential responses. As a result of these changes, the Focus Group Two method was different.

Focus Group Two in Malaysia was made up of three (3) small groups. The pre-prepared statements were placed into one of four different boxes on tablemats as described in Chapter Five. Then all the statements were ranked from first to the last preference. The data was recorded in terms of the box within which it was placed, as well as in order and ranked preference. The group results as they appeared in the boxes and their rank order are listed in Appendix F. The qualitative thematic analysis of the data from both Focus Groups One and Two was enhanced by observations of the behaviours of the participants made by the researcher. Significant or subtle behaviours, which might have influenced or altered the outcomes of the Focus Groups, and therefore the data, were recorded. The observations add value to the research findings and will be discussed.

**DISCUSSION: Focus Groups**

The most interesting outcome from the results of Focus Group One was how different the results were for the four groups. The first group from Australia reflected a day-to-day sense of working in an environment that
was friendly, flexible, ‘a family’, as well as being oriented towards identification to the organisation. The second group in Australia appeared to focus on what they would get from the hotel as an individual by way of recognition, satisfaction and opportunities. In addition, they were more future-oriented. The third Australian group seemed more interested in the immediate benefits, such as pay and recognition. The fourth group in Australia also appeared to focus on identification and direction areas, in addition to benefits and opportunities. The overall outcomes of Focus Group One were useful in the revision of the method being used to gather the data. However the range of outcomes from the different groups reduced the quality of the data. The results allow for factors to be clarified, including the clarification of some statements; that the table groups were too large; and that, within the groups, strongly opinionated participants appeared to be highly influential in determining what the order of statements should be by vocally promoting their choices to the group.

In Focus Group Two held in Malaysia, factors that were ranked as the most important in creating work commitment by the first group were (as seen in Appendix F): ensuring group welfare, having good remuneration, getting recognition, job satisfaction and the opportunity for growth. The participants also saw relationships as a very important factor, placing it sixth in their preferences. Items which ranked as least important included having a balance of work and life; being judged on their future rather than
their past and the dimension of ascription versus achievement. These results match well with Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) cultural typology, as proposed in the CWCF, which states that collectivist societies place high importance on groups and family relationships (Hofstede, 1980; Redding, 1995; Triandis et al., 1988).

The second group also ranked as most important the areas of job satisfaction, relationships and remuneration. In addition, they ranked the importance of kinship or collectivism as very important, as well as having the work/life balance and being judged on past not future performance. The third group (as seen in Appendix F) placed a work/life balance as a highly important factor, in addition to job satisfaction, group welfare, relationships and remuneration. Clear similarities between the groups appeared when analysing the data. The most obvious was the high ranking of job satisfaction, involved relationships with co-workers and clients, and the importance of the welfare of the group and remuneration.

Other outcomes of interest from Focus Group Two came not from the written statements and their ranking but from the researcher’s observations of the participants. As noted earlier, the researcher adopted a participant-researcher/participant-participant role during the study so that during the activity observations were made of the groups. Focus Group
Two groups displayed distinct behaviours which correlated with their written responses. Observations of the dynamics of the group indicated decisions were being made largely by the most influential participants. As noted by Grbich (1999, p.110), placing senior members and junior members of an organisation together can minimise responses. Grbich also notes gender as an influence on potential outcomes in group research, which did not appear to apply here.

In Focus Group Two one of the Malaysian group was a senior manager, male, and older than the others, who were predominantly supervisors. The other members of the group would conduct a discussion of each statement and debate where it should be placed. Having made their decision, they would then turn and ask the senior person if this was correct. It is interesting to note that the participants did not ask if the ‘senior’ agreed with the decision, but rather if the outcome they had reached was correct. In most cases he simply stated the result was correct, and the team placed the statement down accordingly. On one occasion, however, he did not agree with their outcome and, after giving a one-sentence explanation of why they were ‘incorrect’, the other members immediately, and without any further discussion, placed the statement in the location he selected. The same type of group behaviour, deferring to the more senior participant, appeared to be taking place in the other groups, though to a lesser extent. The age and rank differences between the participants in the other groups
were often more narrow, which appeared to allow for more general
discussion.

Overall, however, it could be said that there were dominant
participants, who were so because of their age and rank. These
observations of the Malaysian participants highlighted how different the
Australian groups were. The Australian group discussion involved all
participants. Often it was the youngest and most junior ranking employees
who were the most vocal in seeking to have their views agreed to by the
group.

One marked difference between the two countries was that the
Malaysian group needed a translator’s assistance. While translation was not
required for the reading of the English, it was needed for explaining the
concepts. Unfortunately, in some cases the translators had difficulty in
finding an appropriate Malay translation. This was an important
unexpected outcome as these concepts were the same concepts that are
currently used by Merico International in a wide range of instruments,
including the most relevant to this study, the Employee Opinion Survey
(EOS). This indeed has implications for the effectiveness of the EOS used
by Merico as discussed later in this chapter.
Despite its limitations, Focus Group Two proved to be a superior instrument to Focus Group One by reducing the number of potential responses. The ranking of the statements alone did not define which items were considered important or not considered relevant. An item coming last on a rank list of a group did not necessarily mean that the participants did not consider the item extremely important. It became apparent that a method to determine which groups of items could be ranked according to importance was required. Nevertheless, both activities proved valuable in reinforcing the findings of the preliminary research, which highlighted the importance of both the collective and kinship-like relationships. This also supported the CWCF, and further added to it. The focus groups allowed for an exploration of the critical themes, which emerged even more frequently in this discussion.

As already described in Chapter Five, in Focus Group Two a clearer picture emerged of the preferences of the extremes of each dimension through the use of tablemats to further rank choices. However, the addition of tablemats to the instruments still did not clearly separate all the dimensions. The emergence of these problems in Focus Group One, led to the refinement of the method in Focus Group Two.

The most common outcome from Focus Group Two for two of the three groups was the importance that the participants placed upon the
collective and, hence, the relationships of the employees and, specifically, their relationship to their superiors and its effect on job satisfaction. The relationship was evident from the results of the study, as well as from observing the process. It may thus be possible to argue that if little importance is placed upon relationships, and less emphasis on the collective, job satisfaction will be affected. However, it may not be possible to draw this conclusion from such a small sample. The drivers in the focus groups also supported the CWCF, through the importance placed on relationships. The drivers of job security and organisational pride were also apparent, in addition to the importance of growth opportunities and benefits for employees and their families. The outcomes of work commitment emerged as affiliation, identification and job satisfaction as supported by Cohen (2003).

CONCLUSION: Focus Groups

Some results from Focus Group One indicated that there was a lack of clarity in discriminating between the two extremes of any one dimension, as proposed by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). According to previous research (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998) the two options of each dimension, such as individualism and collectivism, should have been clearly discriminated from each other, based on the national culture. However, this separation did not appear to be the case. For this reason, the dimensions of culture needed to be further
explored. Building on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turners work (1998), a quantitative study, in the form of a forced choice questionnaire, was proposed.

The PDS forced-choice questionnaire, discussed next, is a new tool designed by the researcher that tests for preferences based on both Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) cultural dimensions, along with additional items deemed important arising from the preliminary research and focus groups, e.g. the importance of relationships with direct superiors.

STAGE TWO – RESULTS OF THE PREFERRED DIMENSIONS SURVEY (PDS)

The PDS was designed to explore the cultural dimensions of national culture as used by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). The following proposition was put forward: Proposition 1: The ‘collectivism’ dimension of national culture will be the most selected by employees in the APR.

As described in Chapter Five, the PDS was presented in two versions, the PDS I and PDS II. The following section of this chapter explores the analysis of the PDS forced choice questionnaires.
Analysis of Forced Choice of Critical Pairs

The items presenting a forced choice between critical pairs of the concepts were identified in each of the two versions of the questionnaire. The responses of all the participants were combined into a single data file. A comparison of the responses of respondents from each of the three countries, Thailand, Australia and Malaysia, are presented below. Sampling bias may have played a role in these outcomes, but was made unavoidable by the context in which this research was conducted within Merico. The following contingency analyses, reported with a corresponding chi-square statistic for the PDS.

Significant differences were found between the three countries as regards their responses to the item ‘Individual versus Collective’ ($X^2 = 14.139, p < .005$) as seen in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Individual versus Collective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant difference was found between the groups in their preference for the dimension of the collective. The Australian participants selected the cultural dimension of individualism over the collective alternative.

No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Ascription versus Achievement’ ($X^2 = .446, p > .05$) as seen in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2: Ascription versus Achievement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Ascription</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Ascription</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three groups showed a preference for the culture dimension, Ascription over Achievement.

No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Specific versus Diffuse’ ($X^2 = .741, p > .05$) as seen in Table 6.3.

**Table 6.3: Specific versus Diffuse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Diffuse</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Diffuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the groups demonstrated a preference for diffuse relationships over specific contractual ones. Again the findings suggest Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s view of this dimension are not supported in the findings on the Australian groups. The traditional Western view of specific relationships would have been expected in the case of Australia but the sample had many non-Anglos in it. Merico International’s emphasis on the importance placed upon diffuse relationships in relation to customers and fellow employees may have influenced this finding.

Significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Neutral versus Affective’ ($X^2 = 9.613$, $p < .05$) as seen in Table 6.4.

**Table 6.4: Neutral Versus Affective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral Affective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Count</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thailand’s participants showed a preference for affective or involved relationships, while Australia’s participants, and to a lesser extent those from Malaysia, showed a preference for neutral detached relationships. These findings do not support previous findings
(Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998), which would have expected Malaysia to fall closely beside Thailand.

No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Past versus Future’ ($X^2 = 1.835, p > .05$) as seen in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5: Past versus Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Thai group’s preference was for the cultural dimension of placing greater importance on the past than on the future/present. In contrast, the Australian and Malay groups showed a preference for the future dimension when placing importance upon events. As an ex-colonial country, Malaysia shows a more typically Western outcome here. The outcomes here conform with the findings of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1999), and are therefore confirmatory findings.
No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Inner versus Outer’ ($X^2 = 2.148$, $p > .05$) as seen in Table 6.6.

**Table 6.6 Inner versus Outer Directed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Inner vs Outer</th>
<th>Inner Count</th>
<th>Inner % within COUNTRY</th>
<th>Outer Count</th>
<th>Outer % within COUNTRY</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All groups demonstrated a preference for the ‘outer directed’ dimension over the ‘inner directed’. Although this was expected for Malaysia and Thailand it was not typical for Australia. An increased desire to work with the environment and a heightened awareness of ecological conservation in Australia may have influenced this outcome.

Significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to this item: ‘High Power Distance versus Low Power Distance’ ($X^2 = 8.825$, $p < .05$) as seen in Table 6.7.
Table 6.7 High Power Distance versus Low Power Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HPD vs LPD</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within COUNTRY</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within COUNTRY</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within COUNTRY</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thailand selected the High Power Dimension clearly over the Low Power Distance alternative. This outcome was significantly different to that of the Malaysian and Australian groups who chose the Low Power Distance in preference to the High Power Distance dimension. Previous research (Tayeb, 2003; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998) would suggest that the Malaysian group would have aligned more closely to the expected Thai result. The radical environment of the heavily unionised hotel from which the sample was sourced may have again resulted in an atypical outcome. Hence, the perils of cross cultural research that is context specific in its sampling.

No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Universalism versus Particularism’ ($X^2 = .624, p > .05$) as seen in Table 6.8.
Table 6.8: Universal versus Particular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal vs Particular</td>
<td>Universal Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within COUNTRY</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within COUNTRY</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within COUNTRY</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of three groups selected the universal dimension of management where one rule is applied to all people regardless of the particulars of the situation. No significant differences were found between the group’s outcomes.

Significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item High Uncertainty Avoidance (HUA) versus Low Uncertainty Avoidance (LUA), ($X^2= 8.793, p < .05$) as seen in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9: High Uncertainty Avoidance versus Low Uncertainty Avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUA LU HU Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As expected, Malaysia and Thailand selected the HUA dimension, while Australia clearly adopted the LU dimension.

No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the Masculine-Feminine item (\(X^2 = 3.102, p > .05\)) as seen in Table 6.10.

**Table 6.10: Masculine versus Feminine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), Australia would have typically produced a strong Masculine outcome while Thailand and Malaysia a Feminine dimensional preference.

No significant differences were found between the three countries in terms of their responses to the item ‘Satisfaction versus Remuneration’ (\(X^2 = 2.370, p > .05\)) as seen in Table 6.11.
Table 6.11: Satisfaction versus Money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction vs. Money</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimension Preferences

The first dimension explored in the survey instrument was connected to the way we accord status to people through the ascription of position and power or the achievement of it. The results showed no significant differences between the countries of Malaysia, Thailand and Australia ($X^2 = .446, p > .05$). Ascription, the provision of status and title through family status and position, was the preferred dimension in Thailand, with Ascription being chosen 69.9% of the times it was offered with Achievement. Malaysia selected it 70.4% of the times it was offered, while Australia selected the concept 61.9% of the time.

The dimension of how far a person gets involved in a relationship was measured as being either ‘Diffuse’ or ‘Specific’. No significant differences were found between the countries ($X^2 = .741, p > .05$). When Diffuse and Specific were presented together, Thailand selected it 73.9% times, Malaysia 81.5% and Australia 71.4% times. The majority of
participants indicated through their selections that they had Diffuse relationships with those they worked and did business with, allowing the relationship, once established, to cross over into other areas of their lives.

In the dimension of ‘Feelings’ and ‘Relationships’, the participants chose from either an ‘Emotional’ or ‘Neutral’ approach. There were significant differences between the three groups ($X^2 = 9.613, p < .05$). Thai participants selected the emotional approach 69.6% of the times it was presented. Malaysian participants chose a neutral approach 59.3% times and Australian participants selected neutral 76.2% of the times it was presented.

How we order the needs of the group and the individual dimension determines a ‘Collective’ or ‘Individual’ approach. Significant differences were found between the groups in this dimension ($X^2 = 14.139, p < .005$). The Thai participants selected collectivism 73.9% of the times presented, with the Malaysian participants choosing it 70.4% of the times. Australian participants selected individualism 76.2% of the times presented. The results support the findings of the preliminary research in which this dimension clearly separated the Asian or Eastern countries from the Australian or Western paradigm.
The relationship with leaders is the dimension which explores ‘High Power Distance’ (HPD) and ‘Low Power Distance’ (LPD) orientations. There were significant differences found between the groups. Thai participants selected the HPD dimensions, embracing a hierarchical traditional model, 60.9% of the times presented. Malaysian (77.8%) and Australian participants (71.4%) selected the LPD dimension.

For the dimension of how rules are applied, there were no significant differences between the groups. All groups selected the ‘Universal’ dimension. The number of times ‘Universalism’ was selected was: Thailand 69.6%, Malaysia 59.3% and Australia 66.7%.

In all cultures, how change is accepted by that culture can be defined by the country’s level of Uncertainty Avoidance (UA). There were significant differences found between the groups for this dimension. ‘High Uncertainty Avoidance’ (HUA) or viewing change as a threat was selected, when presented, 52.2% of the times by the Thais and 66.7% by the Malaysians. ‘Low Uncertainty Avoidance’ (LUA) or the viewing of change as a challenge was selected 76.25 of the times it was presented to the Australian participants.

In the dimension of ‘Masculine’ and ‘Feminine’ approaches to culture there were no significant differences found between the groups. A
‘Masculine’ approach was selected by the Malaysians 66.7% of the times it was presented to participants. The ‘feminine’ approach was selected by Thailand 56.5% and Australia 52.4% of the times presented. The Australian participants showed an increase in their selection of the ‘Feminine’ approach over what might be considered to be a more typically Western ‘Masculine’ approach.

Analysis of strength of choice of items and ranking of choices

The forced choice questionnaires were constructed so that, for each item on the questionnaire, a respondent had to simply make a choice between one of two statements (concepts). For each individual, the number of times that individual selected a given concept was calculated. Thus the number of times a particular concept was presented to, and chosen by, the respondent was calculated. A scaled value was then calculated by dividing the number of times the concept was selected, divided by the number of times that concept was presented to the respondent. This was then multiplied by 23. So a value of 0 would represent the concept being selected 0%, and a score of 23 would represent a situation in which the concept was selected 100% of the times it was presented. These scores are presented in the data file “Forced Choice Sum” (Appendix H). The central tendency mean score was used to show the average response to each item from each country enabling them to be compared at national levels. The
mean scores for each of the three countries included in this study are presented in Table 6.12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions Selection</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>15.1341</td>
<td>10.7994</td>
<td>14.6528</td>
<td>14.4038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularism</td>
<td>12.6957</td>
<td>11.3704</td>
<td>9.6667</td>
<td>11.2958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>12.5831</td>
<td>12.2165</td>
<td>8.8899</td>
<td>11.3513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>12.6852</td>
<td>9.3941</td>
<td>7.7562</td>
<td>9.9758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9.1845</td>
<td>11.3377</td>
<td>10.3787</td>
<td>10.3566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>8.7767</td>
<td>6.8316</td>
<td>7.3095</td>
<td>7.6031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse</td>
<td>13.3597</td>
<td>12.0118</td>
<td>11.4004</td>
<td>12.2676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>10.2360</td>
<td>10.9735</td>
<td>10.2358</td>
<td>10.5164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>12.3043</td>
<td>12.0000</td>
<td>13.5714</td>
<td>12.5634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Control</td>
<td>8.8696</td>
<td>8.4815</td>
<td>10.2381</td>
<td>9.1268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Control</td>
<td>13.3714</td>
<td>14.6019</td>
<td>15.2798</td>
<td>14.4038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPD</td>
<td>12.4924</td>
<td>16.1691</td>
<td>16.4825</td>
<td>15.0707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>9.3043</td>
<td>6.5661</td>
<td>6.2676</td>
<td>7.3649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>13.5119</td>
<td>16.5505</td>
<td>15.7857</td>
<td>15.3399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>10.4626</td>
<td>11.6000</td>
<td>11.7924</td>
<td>11.2885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUA</td>
<td>9.9752</td>
<td>14.1386</td>
<td>10.2607</td>
<td>11.6429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.0455</td>
<td>15.6431</td>
<td>14.1883</td>
<td>15.0192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>13.7569</td>
<td>14.2963</td>
<td>12.1883</td>
<td>13.4981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- LPD = Low Power Distance
- HPD = High Power Distance
- LUA = Low Uncertainty Avoidance
- HUA = High Uncertainty Avoidance
Within the following table these values have been reorganised to provide the rank order within each country:

Table 6.13: Ranking of concepts by respondents from Thailand, Malaysia, and Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>LPD</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>LPD</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>16.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>14.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diffuse</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>HUA</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>Diffuse</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Diffuse</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LPD</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ascription</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>Ascription</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>HUA</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>Ascription</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
LPD = Low Power Distance
HPD = High Power Distance
LUA = Low Uncertainty Avoidance
HUA = High Uncertainty Avoidance

From the above table it can be seen that the highest binary or paired cultural dimension that was significantly different was that of collectivism and individualism. This finding supports the work of Trompenaars and
Hampden-Turner (1998) and also permitted the researcher to develop the remaining research upon this dimension.

**Dimension Rankings**

The following section discusses the ranking of the dimensions by the Malaysian, Thai and Australian participants. Two main points of interest are apparent from the data (Table 6.13).

Firstly, money and job satisfaction fall within the top ten items of importance for all three countries. Additionally, they were very closely ranked by each of the three groups. The importance of money was clearly communicated in the preliminary research with Malaysia, while the role of satisfaction and remuneration was raised as strongly in the other two groups.

Secondly, the first dimension which falls within the first ten selections of dimension preferences, and which proved to have a significant difference between groups, was that of ‘Individualism’ and ‘Collectivism’. The dimensions were selected ‘the most’ when they were presented against every other possible question. Again supported by the preliminary research, the Asian participants demonstrated a clearly communitarian approach which was considered to be highly valued. In contrast, the Australian participants also supported by the preliminary research, showing
a clear preference for an individualistic approach. The other dimensions which proved to have a significant ‘between group’ difference, but did not rate highly when ranked in order of preference, were Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance and Emotional versus Neutral orientation.

**DISCUSSION: PDS**

The PDS enables each of the concepts to be examined independently as well as in relation to each other. This discussion section examines some of the contextual factors that might have influenced the outcomes of the survey and produced distortions in the findings.

Thailand presented what could be called a more typical cultural profile in alignment with the work of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998). Thailand was significantly different to Australia and Malaysia, showing a preference for affective relationships over detached neutral bonds. Earlier research supported the importance of loyalty to supervisors and other people, as previously explored by others such as Westwood and Everett (1987). Thailand was also significantly different to Malaysia and Australia on the dimension of importance of the past as opposed to a focus on the future.

The strong presence and importance of Thai tradition is still demonstrated through their pride in their royal family. The fact that
Thailand has never been colonised has elevated the importance of the royal family’s role. Factors such as whose family you came from were also mentioned in the interviews and, although some expressed a belief that this was changing with the future generation, the ties to valuing the past were still evidently strong. In line with the traditions of high levels of respect for elders and seniors, the Thai responses were significantly different to Australia and Malaysia on the dimension of Power Distance. The Thai participants showed a preference for the more traditional, hierarchical, respect oriented dimensions of High Power Distance whilst Malaysia and Australia preferred the more team oriented, casual Low Power Dimension. Finally, and importantly, Thailand was more like Malaysia on the preference for Collectivism over Individualism and here they were significantly different to Australia who selected the individual dimension.

Malaysia showed greater similarities to Australia on a number of dimensions. As discussed earlier, a significant union presence was noted in the sample group. Industrial action was ongoing and the union was aggressive in its marketing to employees. So much so that the management had a union representative posted outside the staff exit five days a week and staff had been asked to not wear their pro-union T-shirts in and out of the building. The union presence may have affected the results which saw the Malaysian participants electing to take a more neutral and detached approach to relationships with those they did business with, a focus on the
future and a preference for a less hierarchical method of management similar to Australia. Malaysia was more like Thailand on the dimension of collectivism over individualism. This is more in line with what would be expected in an Asian setting; however, given the union strength and other findings, the union influence may have impacted upon the results of this group. Collectivism was viewed as very important to the Malaysians in the preliminary interviews, and loyalty and commitment to their supervisor and groups were also shown to be important.

Australia was more similar to Malaysia than Thailand in a preference for neutral relationships, a future focus, and a preference for a less power oriented, more team like approach to management. Such dimensions support the findings of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) in presenting a typical Western profile. Ascription in Thailand and Malaysia was also a strong theme through the preliminary research findings in this study. Hotel staff do not hold status positions in the West and accordingly the age, gender and levels of education would affect the results. The outcome is of interest for the Australian group, as it demonstrates that more importance was placed on the ascription of status than on the achievement of it. Possibly this was the result of the mix of the participants within the Australian sample, which included a significant number of Australians of Asian background.
Finally, it should be noted that overall collectivism was related to the area of ‘loyalty to the supervisor’, as was uncovered in the interviews and throughout the group activities. The importance of the work group in Thailand and Malaysia was also considerably more evident than in the Australian sample. Having determined in this section that the dimension of collectivism and individualism creates a fundamental cultural difference, the finding formed the foundation of the remainder of the research.

**SUMMARY: PDS**

To date, research on cross-cultural influences had only loosely clustered the dimensions. Of the dimensions that were found to have a significant ‘between group’ difference and were highly ranked, ‘individualism’ and ‘collectivism’ emerged as the most significant finding. The way people prioritise needs in relation to other people is a dimension of great interest to this research. As noted by Lowe (1998), culture may be accentuated in collectivist societies and less so in others. Thus, having explored national cultures and their importance to the participants the research moved into the exploration of work commitment.
EXPERT PANEL RESULTS

Expert Panels were conducted in eight (8) countries in the APR, again using the nominal group process, as discussed in Chapter Five. The Expert Panels were designed to explore the drivers and outcome behaviours of work commitment. This study explored work commitment guided by the following research questions:

Q3. Do the drivers of WCI used in the US differ from those of the APR?
Q4. Do the outcome behaviours of the WCI used in the US differ from those in the APR?

The Expert Panels were conducted in two phases. The first phase explored the drivers of work commitment as perceived by employees in the APR while the second phase explored the drivers.

Phase One of the Expert Panels Data Collection

Panels were asked to select from the questionnaire the questions they considered to best represent the drivers of, or independent variables that affected work commitment within the EOS. The drivers of, or independent variables of work commitment in the APR uncovered by the Expert Panels were as follows: having the opportunity to advance and develop a career, having a competitive benefits package, having job security, having pride in the company, and finally, having a supervisor who treats employees fairly (as seen in Appendix J). These findings supported
the CWCF, as derived from the literature; e.g. the importance of the relationship with the supervisor.

**Phase Two of the Expert Panel Data Collection**

Having selected ‘drivers’ or independent variables of work commitment, the same facilitators and participants were asked to again participate in Expert Panels using the nominal group process to uncover what was considered by the participants to be the indicators, or outcome behaviours/dependent variables of work commitment. The approach used to uncover the outcome variables was almost identical to the panel, and most importantly, the questions remained the same as for the previous component of the study. The outcome behaviours as identified in Phase Two were as follows: that the employee feels like part of the family, they are satisfied with their jobs, they display referral behaviour in relation to guests and they will advance their careers with the company. These results, along with the drivers of work commitment are discussed further below.

**DISCUSSION: Expert Panel**

The results of the Expert Panels need to be discussed in relation to the WCI of Anon Consulting (1999) used to measure its model of work commitment. As already stated, the WCI was developed using only American participants in the research. The outcomes of work commitment, according to Anon Consulting (1999), are team development, referral
behaviour and tenure intentions. The outcome behaviours identified by the APR sample were that the employee feels like part of the family, they are satisfied with their jobs and they display referral behaviour in relation to guests.

Anon’s results contrast in some ways with those found in the APR. Having the opportunity for growth and career development appears to be important to both regions, but that is where the similarities end. As noted in the previous section, the APR identified other independent variables or drivers. This supports the previous research including the interviews and initial surveys showing different cultural values and orientations in the APR. The drivers of the US sample included knowing organisational direction, job satisfaction, recognition and rewards, growth opportunities, work environment, work and life balance. The drivers as identified in the APR Expert Panels included; having a good benefits package, having job security, having relationships with supervisors, and having pride in the company.

**Work Commitment and Collectivism**

As noted in previous research (Adler, 2002; Tayeb, 2003), the obligation of the communitarian cultures to provide and care for the extended family and community makes remuneration an important factor in establishing a sustainable relationship with an organisation. Closely linked
to this is the feeling of job security the organisation can provide. Relationships were selected as being of very great importance to the APR participants.

The importance of the relationship with the supervisor was the second driver identified, and this was reflected in values that emerged clearly in the previous chapters. The importance of loyalties and bonds formed with those in leadership roles indicated that the relationship was considered more important than the role of the organisation in creating work commitment in the APR. The final driver selected by the APR participants was having pride in the company. The selection of this driver was supported by the earlier research which indicated the importance of status and saving face in many of the communitarian cultures (Tayeb, 2003). Having an organisation that the employee can be proud of, and engage with, is seen as an important factor in creating work commitment.

The drivers and outcome behaviours as found by the Expert Panels contributed towards the development of a new concept of work commitment, discussed in the next section of this chapter.

INTEGRATION

Based on the results of the previous studies, a new framework of work commitment was proposed, called here the “Work and Organisational
Kinship” (WOK). The new framework of work commitment, as seen in Figure 6.1, and developed from this study, is discussed next.

The drivers of WOK framework of work commitment in the APR appear to rely upon the benefits and job security an organisation can extend to the employee, ensuring continuance of the support he or she can bring to familial relationships. These findings were supported by the preliminary investigations, Focus groups and the Expert Panels and the literature. The opportunity to advance and build a career with an organisation is matched by the importance of having supervisors with whom these relationships can be forged. This allows for the development of organisational kinship. Finally, the ability to have pride in the organisation was important. The findings of the preliminary investigations, the PDS forced choice questionnaires, the Focus Groups and finally, the Expert Panels support these findings through the identification of the importance of the collective dimension in the national cultures of the Asian countries. This is shown in the national cultural dimension of preference being ‘collectivism’, as seen in Figure 6.1. The presence of this dimension impacts upon the interpretation of all of the other dimensions of the WOK.
The outcome behaviours of work commitment in the APR are organisational kinship, has job satisfaction, and one which displays service loyalty. Figure 6.1 illustrates the outcomes as identified in the APR. Organisational kinship (which is a new term developed as part of this research), job satisfaction and service loyalty (another new term) form the new framework of WOK. ‘Organisational kinship’ refers to the organisation taking on familial tendencies for the employee. An employee who is fully engaged in their role gains a feeling of belonging and forming strong lineage through taking ownership of outcomes (Redding, 1995; Triandis, 1995). Organisational kinship reflects the importance of the
collective dimension of culture in the APR. The national culture dimensions of collectivism are linked to kinship-like relationships within the organisations. Organisational Kinship is based on the affiliation of an employee to an organisation as identified by Cohen (2003). Organisational Kinship is represented by the following items within the EOS: that the employee feels like a part of the ‘family’ and there is a fit between the values of the employee and the company. Organisational Kinship may, in turn, result in job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is considered in this research to be an outcome of work commitment and refers to an employee who gains a sense of satisfaction from their work.

It is speculated here that an employee who has organisational kinship and job satisfaction has the potential to provide a higher level of service loyalty to the clients and guests of the organisation. The ‘service loyalty’ results in obvious benefits to the organisation. Service loyalty is presented using the following items within the EOS: the employee provides quality service and they would recommend the company’s products and services to others. Service loyalty is a concept strongly invoked in the service sector. This research has led to hypotheses about work commitment beyond that previously described in the literature. This research also asserts links between the drivers and outcomes. These assertions can now be tested.
As Applied Research, the importance of this work lies in developing solutions to the problems of management. Merico International sector sought to find how these national dimensional differences impacted on their corporate culture. The next stage of the research explores how the individualistically focused WCI can be re-worked for Collectivist cultures so that a more culturally sensitive measure could be obtained. An understanding of how work commitment is driven in the APR would allow the MNC to make global comparisons of Senior Managers’ success possible. In addition, it could influence the design of their corporate culture and how it is implemented in different national cultures. The next stage of the research used the EOS to compare the WOK, which was developed into a potential index as a requirement of Merico, called here the WOK index (WOKI), with the WCI.

**EOS: WCI vs WOKI**

In the final stage of the study, the EOS, Merico International’s organisational climate instrument, was used to speculate if the WOKI would be a more culturally sensitive measure of work commitment than the WCI. The WOK framework resulted from the triangulation of the data, as seen in Chapter Six at the integration stage of this thesis and developed into the WOKI for this study. To explore the indexes of work commitment data from the 19,950 employees of importance to this research were analysed in two groups: Australia and the APR. The APR sample is made up of China,
Japan, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, China and Hong Kong. As previously stated, the generalisation of the WOK, as derived from the previous predominantly qualitative studies is limited, and should be explored further in future research. In addition the use of single questions to represent any one dimension as shown in the WOKI is unreliable statistically and is a limitation of the study but it was a requirement of the MNC. The use of the EOS in the final study was to address the following:

Proposition 2: The dimensions of the WOK will account for more of the variability in work commitment in the APR than the WCI.

**RESULTS – EOS: WCI vs WOKI – APR Sample**

**The APR Sample**

The responses from Australian properties (n= 2327) were excluded from the following analyses. This yielded a total sample of 17,623. The breakdown of the sample is provided in Table 6.14.

**Table 6.14: Breakdown of the APR Sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7896</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sections evaluate the strength of the relationships between ‘driver’ variables and ‘outcome’ variables for the WCI. Second, the WOKI will be generated and a similar analysis will be conducted for this index as had been conducted for WCI.

It has been asserted by Anon Consulting that the driver variables they isolated (job satisfaction etc) co-vary with the outcome variables (intention to stay etc.). Table 6.15 shows the bivariate correlations between the ‘drivers’ (or independent variables of the WCI), and (a) the ‘outcome’ dependent variables, and (b) the WCI itself. The WCI total is negatively correlated as the WCI is reported as reverse scored to aid the comprehension of the managers using it. The following is an examination of the data analysed from the EOS collected in late 2000.

**WCI: Correlations between ‘drivers’ and ‘outcomes’ for the WCI**

**APR Sample**

Table 6.15 shows the bivariate correlations between the ‘drivers’ of the WCI, and (a) the ‘outcome’ variables, and (b) the WCI itself.
### Table 6.15 Bivariate correlations (Pearson r) between Drivers and Outcomes for WCI – APR Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>WCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Part of a ‘family’</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Understand/appreciate differences between people</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Understand company goals</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 Associates are motivated through recognition and rewards</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Q17 When needed co-workers make special personal efforts to help our property to be successful.
- Q19 My co-workers make personal efforts to improve their skills so they are able to do their jobs better at this property.
- Q32 I would stay with this company even if offered a similar job with slightly higher pay at another company.
- Q33 I intend to stay with this company for at least the next three years.
- Q35 I would recommend this company’s products and services as the best that a guest could buy.
- Q37 I would recommend this company as one of the best places to work in my community.

As can be seen from Table 6.15, all the correlations between ‘driver’ and ‘outcome’ variables are significant \((p < .005)\). With respect to the correlations between the ‘driver’ variables and the WCI itself, not only are all of the correlations statistically significant, but each is of a relatively high magnitude, ranging from \(r = -.537\) for item 49 and the WCI (accounting for 28.8% of the variance) to \(-.697\) for item 16 and the WCI.
(accounting for 48.6% of the variance). The various items of the EOS contribute to the various dimensions which in turn produce the WCI.

**Multiple Linear Regression analysis predicting WCI scores from the ‘driver’ Variables – APR Sample.**

The six independent ‘driver’ variables and the WCI were then entered into a multiple linear regression to further investigate the relationships between these variables. The WCI score was entered as the dependent variable and the six ‘driver’ variables (Q6, Q13, Q16, Q24, Q42, and Q49) were entered as the independent variables. A significant relationship was found between the set of predictor independent ‘driver’ variables and WCI score ($F (6, 10378) = 3397.076, p < .0005$). As would be expected from the bivariate correlations presented in Table 6.15, a high multiple correlation was found (R = .814) with 66.2% ($R^2 = .662$) of the variation in WCI scores explained on the basis of the responses to the six ‘driver’ items.

Table 6.16 presents the standardised regression coefficients for each of the driver or independent variables.
Table 6.16: Standardised Regression Coefficients from Multiple Linear Regression using the 6 ‘driver’ variables to predict WCI scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>396.325</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-26.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-17.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Part of a ‘family’</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>-38.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Understand/appreciate differences between the people</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-19.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Understand company goals</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-21.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 Associates are motivated through recognition</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-11.962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this table, each of the six ‘driver’ items contributed a significant unique variance to the regression.

**WOKI: APR Sample**

From the WOK framework a new index, WOKI, was developed using the following variables as ‘drivers’ and ‘outcomes’.
Table 6.17: ‘Drivers’ and ‘Outcomes’ for WOKI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 9    Associate Benefit Package</td>
<td>Q 6    Overall job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10   Job Security</td>
<td>Q 16   Part of a ‘family’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13   Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>Q 31   My values and company values fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15   Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly</td>
<td>Q 34   Quality of service property provides to guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22   Trust in supervisor</td>
<td>Q 35   Recommend company’s products and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 36   Proud to work for this company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 37   Recommend this company a one of the best places to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WOKI was developed using the following variables as ‘drivers’ or independent variables and ‘outcomes’ or dependent variables as shown in Table 6.17. Table 6.18 shows the bivariate correlations between the ‘drivers’ of the WOKI, and (a) the ‘outcome’ variables, and (b) the WOKI itself. As the calculation of the WOKI was for research purposes only, there was no need to present it for use. Hence it was not reverse scored and therefore correlated positively with the items.
Table 6.18: Bivariate correlations (Pearson r) between Drivers and Outcomes for WOKI – APR Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>WOKI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 Associate Benefit Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .528</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Job Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .524</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .505</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Providing an immediate supervisor who deals fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .446</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Trust in supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .455</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Proud of company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .589</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Recommend this company as one of the best places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r .580</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 6.18, all the correlations between ‘driver’ and ‘outcome’ variables are significant ($p < .0005$). With respect to the correlations between the ‘driver’ variables and the WOKI itself, not only are all of the correlations statistically significant, but each is of a relatively high magnitude ranging from $r = .513$ for item 22 and the WOKI (accounting for 26.3% of the variance) to $.747$ for item 37 and the WOKI (accounting for 55.8% of the variance).
Multiple Linear Regression analysis predicting WOKI scores from ‘driver’ variables – APR Sample

The seven ‘driver’ variables and the WOKI were then entered into a multiple linear regression to further investigate the relationships between these variables. The WOKI score was entered as the dependent variable and the seven ‘driver’ independent variables (Q9, Q10, Q13, Q15, Q22, Q36, and Q37) were entered as the independent variables. A significant relationship was found between the set of predictor (independent) ‘driver’ variables and WOKI score (\( F(7, 13256) = 4907.139, p < .0005 \)). Again, as would be expected from the bivariate correlations presented in Table 6.18, a high multiple correlation was found (\( R = .849 \)) with 77.2% (\( R^2 = .722 \)) of the variation in WOKI scores explained on the basis of the responses to the seven ‘driver’ items.

Table 6.19 presents the standardised regression coefficients for each of the predictor variables.
Table 6.19: Standardised Regression Coefficients from Multiple Linear Regression using the 7 ‘driver’ variables to predict WOKI scores – APR Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>33.597</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9  Associate Benefit Package</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>18.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10  Job Security</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>18.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13  Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>19.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15  Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>10.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22  Trust in supervisor</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>10.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36  Proud to work company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37  Recommend this company as one of the best places to work</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>52.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this table, each of the seven ‘driver’ items contributed significant unique variance to the regression.

**WCI: AUSTRALIAN SAMPLE RESULTS**

The Australian sample (n=2327) had been excluded from the APR analysis as, on the basis that the earlier studies focussing on cultural values where the Australian sample had behaved more like a US group. This was not entirely the case. While the Australian sample showed a
preference for individualism over collectivism in the previous study, they also, for example, oriented to ascription rather than achievement. It is predicted nevertheless that the commitment of the Australian sample will be better represented by the WCI index than the WOK index. Sample bias was discussed earlier as a potential explanation for the ascription preference amongst this sample.

**Bivariate Correlation between ‘drivers’ and ‘outcomes’ for the WCI – Australian Sample**

Table 6.20 shows the bivariate correlations between the ‘drivers’ of the WCI, and (a) the ‘outcome’ variables, and (b) the WCI itself.
Table 6.20: Bivariate correlations (Pearson r) between Drivers and Outcomes for WCI for Australian sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q32</th>
<th>Q33</th>
<th>Q35</th>
<th>Q37</th>
<th>WCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>-.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>-.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Part of a ‘family’</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 Understand/appreciate differences between people</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>-.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Understanding the company goals</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>-.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 Associates are motivated through Recognition</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>-.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this table, all the correlations between ‘driver’ and ‘outcome’ variables for the Australian sample are significant ($p < .005$). With respect to the correlations between the ‘driver’ variables and the WCI itself, when compared with the other APR countries, five of the six correlations between ‘driver’ variables are in fact of lower numerical magnitude for the Australian sample. The only ‘driver’ variable which
displays a numerically higher correlation with WCI, when compared with the other Asia-Pacific countries is item 49 “Associates are motivated through recognition or rewards to achieve this property’s performance goals”. As noted previously rewards especially those of value to the family are held in high regard in the APR and this may have attributed to this finding.

**Multiple Linear Regression analysis predicting WCI scores from ‘driver’ variables – Australian Sample.**

The six ‘driver’ variables and the WCI for the Australian sample were then entered into a multiple linear regression to further investigate the relationships between these variables. WCI score was entered as the dependent variable and the six ‘driver’ variables (Q6, Q13, Q16, Q24, Q42, and Q49) were entered as the independent variables. A significant relationship was found between the set of predictor (independent) ‘driver’ variables and WCI score ($F(6, 1615) = 479.598, p < .005$). As would be expected from the bivariate correlations presented in Table 7.20, a high multiple correlation was found ($R = .800$) with 64.1% ($R^2 = .641$) of the variation in WCI scores explained on the basis of the responses to the 6 ‘driver’ items. Table 6.21 presents the standardised regression coefficients for each of the predictor variables. As can be seen from Table 6.21, each of the six ‘driver’ items contributed significant unique variance to the regression calculated on the Australian sample only.
Table 6.21: Standardised Regression Coefficients from Multiple Linear Regression using the 6 ‘driver’ variables to predict WCI scores for Australian Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>144.531</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>-11.374 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>-7.572 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 Part of a ‘family’</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-14.404 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24 Understand/appreciate differences between the people</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-6.285 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 Understand the company goals</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-7.799 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 Associates are motivated through recognition and rewards</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-8.228 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, there would appear to be a slightly weaker relationship between ‘driver’ variables and WCI for the Australian sample than was found for the other Asia-Pacific countries treated as a single sample. This would appear to be in contradiction to the predictions and will be discussed further in Chapter Seven.
WOK Correlations between ‘drivers’ and ‘outcomes’ for the Australian Sample.

Table 6.22 shows the bivariate correlations between the ‘drivers’ of the WOK, and (a) the ‘outcome’ variables, and (b) the WOK itself – for the Australian sample.

Table 6.22: Bivariate correlations (Pearson r) between Drivers and Outcomes for WOK for the Australian sample only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 Associate Benefit Package</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Job Security</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Trust in supervisor</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Proud to work for company</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Recommend this company a one of the best places</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this table, for the Australian sample, all the correlations between ‘driver’ and ‘outcome’ variables are significant (p <
With respect to the correlations between the ‘driver’ variables and the WOK itself, 5 of the 7 correlations between ‘driver’ variables and WOK are numerically smaller than the corresponding correlations for the other Asia-Pacific countries. The two correlations that are numerically larger for the Australian sample; item 36 ($r = .694$, and $r = .685$, respectively), and item 37 ($r = .750$, and $r = .747$) demonstrate only minor differences when compared with the other APR countries.

**Multiple Linear Regression analysis predicting WOKI scores from ‘driver’ variables – Australian Sample**

The seven ‘driver’ variables and the WOKI were then entered into a multiple linear regression to further investigate the relationships between these variables for the Australian sample. WOKI score was entered as the dependent variable and the seven ‘driver’ variables (Q9, Q10, Q13, Q15, Q22, Q36, and Q37) were entered as the independent variables. A significant relationship was found between the set of predictor (independent) ‘driver’ variables and WCI score ($F (7, 1908) = 607.836, p < .000$).

Again, as would be expected from the bivariate correlations presented in Table 6.22, a high multiple correlation was found ($R = .831$) with 69.0% ($R^2 = .690$) of the variation in WOKI scores explained on the basis of the responses to the 7 ‘driver’ items. Table 6.23 represents the standardised regression coefficients for each of the predictor variables. As
can be seen from each of the seven ‘driver’ items contributed significant unique variance to the regression.

Table 6.23: Standardised Regression Coefficients from Multiple Linear Regression using the 7 ‘driver’ variables to predict WOKI scores for the Australian sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.701</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 Associate Benefit Package</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>5.458 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Job Security</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.971 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>7.033 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>5.255 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Trust in supervisor</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>3.668 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 Proud to work for this company</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>13.585 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Recommend this company as one of the best places to work</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>19.353 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, there would appear to be a slightly weaker relationship between ‘driver’ variables and WOKI scores for the Australian sample with respect to the other APR countries taken as a single sample, although as with the APR sample, the WOKI is a better predictor of work commitment than the WCI. While this result in part supports our prediction, it is confused by the earlier results from the WCI showing the WCI a poorer predictor for the Australian sample than the APR, and the additional finding that the WOKI is a better predictor than the WCI for the Australian sample (despite the WOKI being a poorer predictor for the Australian sample than
the WCI). The implications of this finding are discussed in the final section of this Chapter.

**DISCUSSION – EOS: WOKI vs. WCI**

As stated previously, analyses were performed on the Asian countries for China, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Hong Kong only and then Australia separately. Strong relationships were found between those items in the survey that were purported to be ‘drivers’ of ‘outcome’ variables which were used to generate the WCI. Direct correlations between ‘driver’ variables and WCI scores were all in the range of $r = -.537$ to $-.697$. When the relationship between ‘driver’ variables and WCI scores was examined in a multivariate analysis, 66.2% of the variation in WCI scores was found to be explained by the ‘driver’ variables acting in concert. Each one of the ‘driver’ variables was found to explain a significant unique portion of the variation in WCI scores for the Asian scores.

The WOKI was designed to be more culturally relevant to the sample at hand. Again, strong relationships were found between those items in the survey which were proposed to be ‘drivers’ of ‘outcome’ variables used to generate the WOKI scores. Direct correlations between the WOKI ‘driver’ variables and WOKI scores were all in the range of .513 to .747.
When the relationship between ‘driver’ variables and WOKI scores was examined in a multivariate analysis, 72.2% of the variation in WOKI scores was found to be explained by the ‘driver’ variables acting in concert. This value is somewhat higher than the similar comparison made between the WCI and its ‘drivers’. Again, each one of the ‘driver’ variables was found to explain a significant unique portion of the variation in WOKI scores.

Overall, for the APR sample strong relationships were found to exist both between WCI scores and the ‘drivers’ of the variables used to generate the WCI. Somewhat stronger relationships, however, were found to exist both between WOKI scores and the ‘drivers’ of the variables used to generate the WOKI. Given the stronger relationship the WOK, it is possible to argue that the WOKI is a better potential measure of Work Commitment in the APR because it has been made up of dimensions that are more culturally relevant than that of the WCI based on American dimensions.

Comparison of Results between the Australian sample and other Asia-Pacific countries

The sample from Australia was analysed separately from the APR. In sum, the Australian sample was expected to show a closer relationship
with the WCI and a lesser one with the WOKI. This prediction, however, was based mostly on results for the cultural dimension of individualism and collectivism. Earlier research (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998) did suggest that a more complex result could have been obtained. When the relationship between ‘driver’ variables and WCI scores was examined in a multivariate analysis for the APR sample, 66.2% of the variation in WCI scores was found to be explained by the ‘driver’ variables acting in concert. A slightly weaker relationship was found to exist between these variables for the Australian sample, with 64.1% of the variation in WCI scores explained by the ‘driver’ variables. For both samples, each one of the ‘driver’ variables was found to explain a significant unique portion of the variation in WCI scores.

When the relationship between ‘driver’ variables and WOKI scores was examined in a multivariate analysis, 72.2% of the variation in WOKI scores was found to be explained by the ‘driver’ variables acting in concert for the APR sample. The corresponding values for the Australian sample was slightly lower (69.0%). Overall, slightly stronger relationships were observed between ‘driver’ variables and both WCI and WOKI for the APR sample when compared with the Australian sample – although any differences were minimal in magnitude.
The fact that lower predictions are found for the Australian sample on both the WCI and WOKI suggests another factor at work. The smaller sample size may have been an influence by reducing the power (although 2327 should have been an adequate number). Alternatively, work commitment in Australia may be affected by features different from both the US and APR. This tantalising hypothesis is not the subject of this present research but could be tested further, especially if based on preliminary work on cultural orientation which has already been done.

SUMMARY

The relevance of these findings can be discussed at several levels. Firstly, it is important to MNCs who are planning to enter the diverse and culturally different APR. The ‘one way’ rule of motivation will no longer provide a competitive advantage in the market place to those who adopt it. It may, in fact result in more and more negative results. As can be seen by this research there are cultural differences between what drives and the outcomes of work commitment in the APR from what applies in America. The WOKI may be a better predictor of work commitment when applied in the Asian countries of this study than the US derived WCI. The full potential of the WOKI, the limitations and the implications of this research are discussed in the following chapter.
The implications for Merico International organisational culture is also discussed as the findings of this research will no doubt impact many levels of the organisational strategy along with hypotheses for testing in a future study.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study explored the employee work commitment within one large MNC within the hospitality industry with the purpose of developing a more culturally sensitive framework and index for understanding work commitment in the APR. This chapter reviews how the aims of the study have been met and the questions posed have been answered. The use of mixed methods with multiple methods has been something that has not occurred in any other study that the researcher is aware of. The new model of work commitment i.e. the WOK, is discussed in terms of its contributions and future applications. The limitations of this research are outlined as well as recommendations for future research.

The use of multiple mixed methods is a unique aspect of the study but it also raises issues relating to its ability to be replicated, as does the insider status of the researcher. A key feature of mixed methods is that it supports sequential studies in which research questions can emerge as the research proceeds and this is what occurred in this study. It even allows for the research questions and propositions to be posed at the end of a study as well as hypotheses (Creswell, 2003). Hypotheses are developed at the conclusion of the chapter. While the majority of studies in the cross-cultural
context rely on traditional survey methods and tools, the approach adopted in this research sought to triangulate data where necessary and possible to overcome cultural and methodological biases. The approach allowed investigation of complex questions over a two year period using a company site in which senior staff and company support was essential. It allowed access to company generated data which is pertinent to the operations of the MNC in its management of HR in the APR. The applied nature of the study meant that data collection and findings had to comply with company protocols and needs.

The Aims of the Study

The aims of the study are re-considered here in terms of how each one has been addressed. The aims and outcomes were as follows:

1. To investigate how service employees from collectivist cultures working in a large MNC in the APR perceive work commitment. Collectively, the studies contributed to achieving a better understanding of work commitment in the APR through the development of the WOK and two new constructs derived from it – i.e. ‘organisational kinship’ and ‘service loyalty’.

2. To develop a more culturally sensitive approach to the indexing of work commitment in the APR. A potential measure, called the WOKI, was developed from the study, and particularity for Merico’s purposes.
3. To inform Merico and other companies like them of a more geocentric approach to understanding work commitment and its effect on HRM practices and performance measures, in particular. The findings of this study support the need for a more geocentric approach to understanding and measuring work commitment by showing how the ethnocentric WCI does not sufficiently account for cross-cultural differences and in doing so, will negatively impact on employees’ performance in the APR, including rewarding and recognising their achievements. Merico, and organisations like it, have a new to use within the APR.

4. To add to the body of literature and the knowledge on work commitment in collectivist cultures within the service sector. The work of Cohen (2003) in particular, has been extended in this study to show the importance of other dimensions of work commitment, such as supervisor factors, ignored in other research. By developing the CWCF, it was also possible to identify modernizing factors (see also Nelson & Gopalan, 2003) in the cross-cultural context, such as benefits, growth opportunity and job security that are likely to hold across all cultures. Importantly, the study has elaborated on the isomorphic tendency (see also Nelson & Gopalan, 2003) of collectivist culture and family corporate culture as being critical to creating work commitment in the APR service context. Furthermore, by adopting multi-methods within a mixed methods approach the thesis also contributes to this emerging methodology by demonstrating its use in a particularly difficult
and hazardous context of a cross-cultural study. In addition, publications from this thesis have contributed to the literature (see p. xvi).

**Stages of the Study**

The findings in Stage One of the study revealed that employees from collectivist national cultures placed a strong emphasis on the values of the family and respect for the community as supported by the literature (Hofstede, 1980; Kennedy, 2002; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). While this study confirms previous studies (e.g. Chen et al., 2002), it signalled that collectivism might be the single most important cultural dimension in collective national cultures as show in the WOK (see Figure 6.1).

The preliminary investigations proposed that relationships were of great importance to APR employees, specifically in relation to their supervisor, as supported by Chen and Francesco (2000). Having fairness and trust in the supervisor was seen as important by employees. In addition, benefits and remuneration, which in turn assisted the extended family, was also important to gaining and maintaining work commitment of employees. These finding contributed to answering the main research question about how employees in collectivist cultures in the APR perceive work commitment in the context of working in a MNC.
As already mentioned, this study proposes that collectivism is the dimension to which corporate culture could be most readily tailored to increase work commitment. It was also found that Merico’s family corporate culture aligns with the collectivist national cultural values of the APR hotels’ employees creating a form of cross-cultural isomorphism that is unlikely to occur so easily for other MNCs with differing corporate cultures (Nelson & Gopalan, 2003). Perhaps greater work commitment can be extracted in collectivist national cultures through the adoption of the family type corporate culture and this proposition may form the basis of future research. Employees from collectivist cultures felt an obligation to help the organisation succeed, driven by the sense of duty to the ‘family’. The importance of leadership also emerged clearly as featured in the literature (Chen & Francesco, 2000; Chen et al., 2002).

Focus Groups conducted in Australia and Malaysia were used to further examine cultural dimensions and work commitment. The purpose of conducting this very specific study was to see if the national dimensions, presented by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), had efficacy and could be used to identify cultural orientations in both Australia and Malaysia. In addition, the Focus Groups were used to begin exploring the drivers and outcomes of work commitment (see Chapter Five).
The drivers of work commitment were found to be the relationship with the supervisor, job security and organisational pride, and growth opportunities and benefits which extended to the family. Outcomes were considered to be closely related to affiliation, identification (Cohen, 2003) and job satisfaction. These findings were supported by the CWCF proposed in the literature review. These findings were sufficiently pronounced to suggest that work commitment has a differing meaning in the collectivist APR group of respondents. The following proposition arose from Stage One: Proposition 1: The ‘collectivism’ dimension of national culture will be the most selected by employees in the APR.

Having established the cultural dimensions in Stage One, greater clarity was sought in Stage Two regarding the importance placed on each of the dimensions of culture by participants. To overcome methodological flaws in the previous Focus Groups, as discussed in Chapter Five, a forced choice questionnaire, the PDS, was used to explore cultural differences in Thailand, Australia and Malaysia (see Chapter Six). As already stated, collectivism was found to be the most selected dimension of national culture in the APR.

Expert Panels, as discussed in Chapter Five, were used to explore work commitment in the APR. The following questions, which developed after Stage One, were put forward and addressed:
Q3. Do the drivers of WCI used in the US differ from those of the APR? The drivers were found to be as follows: opportunity to advance career, having competitive benefits packages, pride in the company and having a trusted and fair supervisor, which differed to those found in the US sample. The importance of the supervisor emerged from Stage One of the studies and Stage Two obtained more detail about leadership within the APR (Chen & Francesco, 2000). Leadership aspects were preferred in relation to the degree of trust and fairness displayed by a supervisor confirming the findings of Chen and Francesco (2000). This supported the CWCF and was developed further in the integration phase of the studies to contribute to the development of the WOK.

Q4. Do the outcome behaviours of the WCI differ from those in the APR? The outcomes were found to differ and were as follows: the employee felt like a part of the family, like affiliation (but renamed here as ‘organisational kinship’), identification (but renamed here service loyalty), and job satisfaction, as raised by Anon and described in Chapter Six. Job satisfaction was considered by Anon to be a driver of work commitment whereas in the APR study it was an outcome.

An integration of all the previous studies’ findings were used to propose a new, collectivist framework of work commitment, called the WOK framework. The framework was presented as a descriptive model with no
causality implied. The nature of the study, i.e., being exploratory foreclosed the testing of a model. The final stage of the study involved the use of the EOS to review the WCI and explore the WOK in terms of proposing a new index for work commitment in the APR and for Merico and described earlier as the WOKI. Employee surveys for the APR countries (n=17,623) were used to analyse the degree of cultural sensitivity of the WOKI. The WOKI was then compared with Anon Consulting’s WCI measure of commitment and the following proposition was tested: Proposition 2: The dimensions of the WOKI will account for more of the variability in work commitment in the APR than the WCI.

The relationship between the driver variables and WCI scores was examined using a multivariate analysis and 66.2% of the variation in the WCI was found to be explained by the driver variables acting in concert. Relationships between the new driver variables and WOKI scores were examined in a multivariate analysis with 72.7% of the variation in the WOKI scores found to be explained by the driver variables acting in concert.

Contributions

The WOK framework of commitment was developed to provide a solution to an organisational problem, as is the case with most applied management research. However, the WOK is in itself of much greater significance than simply as a potential framework of work commitment. It
challenges the way we view the relationships between national culture, organisational culture and work commitment. The development of the WOK has shown that a unique combination of forces ultimately determines what creates commitment in employees in collectivist cultures. It can be speculated that work commitment in the APR is influenced by the collectivist national culture sufficiently strongly to create a different construct of work commitment. It may be that, if the organisational culture of the host organisation, in this case it was Merico, has an aligning corporate culture then some level of isomorphism might occur in relation to collectivism. The complicating issue for future research is to more fully explore how this isomorphism works and to what degree is has to align for it to influence work commitment. Merico has a particularly strong family based corporate culture.

Anon’s model contrasts in several ways to that found in the APR. The opportunity for growth and career development appears to be important to employees in both regions, and this has been explained by Nelson and Gopalan (2003) as evidence of convergence around modernising tendencies that arise from the spread of MNCs and progressive work practices. However, that is where the similarities end because, as noted in the previous section, the APR respondents identified other independent variables or drivers of commitment. This supports previous research (Cohen, 2003) cited in Chapter Five, including the PIQ, the face-to-face interviews and the PDS
that all show different cultural values and orientations in the APR. As already stated the drivers of Anon are: knowing organisational direction, job satisfaction, recognition and rewards, growth opportunities, work environment, work and life balance. The drivers as identified in the WOK included: having a good benefits package, having job security, having relationships with supervisors, and having pride in the company.

In the WOK remuneration was found to be an important factor in establishing a sustainable relationship with Merico. Closely linked to this was the feeling of job security the organisation can provide. Relationships were also selected as being of importance to the APR participants, as discussed in the literature in Chapter Three (Chen & Francesco, 2000; Chen et al., 2002; Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001).

The importance of the relationship with the supervisor was the second driver identified, and was reflected in values that emerged clearly in the previous chapters. The importance of loyalties and bonds formed with those in leadership roles indicated that the relationship with the supervisor is considered more important than the organisation itself in creating work commitment in the APR. The relationship of the supervisor was found to be critical in terms of trust and fairness (Chen et al., 2002). The final driver selected by the APR participants was having pride in the company. The selection of this driver was supported by the earlier research which indicated
the importance of status and saving face in many of the communitarian cultures (Tayeb, 2003). Having an organisation that the employee can be proud of, and engage with, is seen as an important factor in creating work commitment in the APR context.

The behavioural outcomes of work commitment, or the dependent variables according to Anon Consulting (1999), have not been supported in the study except for referral behaviour. In terms of tenure intentions, the WCI defined it as the intention to stay for several years with the company and an intention to stay even if offered a similar job with slightly higher pay. Tenure proved problematic as an item when measuring outcomes of work commitment, especially in the APR. The penalties and costs of absenteeism, and the relevant importance of tenure, changed from country to country making it less useful as a dependent variable. Continuance commitment may also affect tenure due to employees maintaining ongoing employment, motivated by a lack of alternatives to leave rather than a desire to stay because of an emotional attachment to the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Turnover was considered to be positive in Malaysia where, due to the smaller number of international hotels, it was perceived that if people did not move learned less. Thus natural attrition was seen as healthy to keep a procession of new ideas from new employees, coming through the hotel.
When question 57 of the Merico International employee survey was analysed (see Appendix B), some interesting outcomes were identified. Question no.57 asks ‘If you plan on leaving the company why would you leave?’ The results, as seen in Appendix M, indicated that 25.5% (n=16,596) of respondents indicated a lack of career advancement would be their main reason for leaving. Secondly, with a 21.1% frequency of selection, leaving to attain better pay was the next highest response. These findings are supported by the WOK, which identifies benefits and an opportunity for providing growth as key drivers of work commitment in the APR within Merico International.

The outcomes, as identified in the APR, present organisational kinship, job satisfaction and service loyalty, as forming the basis of the potential new index of work commitment, the WOKI, using selected questions from the EOS.

**Organisational Kinship and Service Loyalty**

‘Organisational kinship’ is related to a sense of belonging to a family-like organisation and is built upon affiliation (Cohen, 2003). It relates specifically to feeling like a member of the organisation’s kin or family (Chen et al., 2002). In addition, there is a feeling that there is a good fit between the values of the individual and that of the company. The
outcomes of these feelings impacts positively on both the employee and the company. The family model of organisational culture proved to best support organisational kinship (Chen & Francesco, 2000; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

Through this research it was found that service loyalty, in the service sector, is one of the behaviours demonstrated by a committed employee in the APR and is built upon identification with the organisation. Service loyalty relates to identification. It is an alignment of the employees’ and the organisations’ objective in taking care of the customer and it is represented on two dimensions. It is speculated here that organisational kinship, job satisfaction, and service loyalty are necessary for work commitment but future research will need to be undertaken to investigate how variables influence each other causally.

Service loyalty is exhibited by individuals who are prepared to work as a team to achieve the company goals. Secondly, the individual is not simply prepared to endorse, but actively recommends, the company’s products to guests because of a genuine belief that the quality and service provides excellent value and the best on offer in their local area. The constructs of organisational kinship and service loyalty may serve to further knowledge in the area of work commitment in the APR. Through further exploration, links identified within this research will also serve to gain even
greater insight into what constitutes work commitment and how to measure it in other contexts or cultures. Having presented the contributions of the thesis, the following discussion addresses the limitations of the study.

LIMITATIONS

The generalisability of the findings is the most obvious limitation of this study though this is not the stated aim of most relativist approaches (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). Given that the population was limited to Merico International employees within eight countries, it would be unwise to attempt to label all people within these countries in all industries as having the same work commitment, however, extrapolating the findings of the WOKI in the EOS suggest similarities may be found. Merico International’s corporate culture, the family model, has been well received in the highly collectivistic APR. Not all MNCs will match this organisation’s culture profile. This research will, however, be of great value to Merico International in relation to its globalisation strategy because of the concerns it raises regarding the ‘one size fits all’ approach to understanding work commitment. Merico remains one of the world’s largest hotel chains.

Another limitation of the research is the need to accept Anon’s claim that the WCI was the best measure of work commitment to use in the US. In addition, the WOKI used seven items rather than six items used in the WCI, therefore a greater level of predicability could be expected with an additional
item in the WOKI. Once again, to confirm or dismiss this concern would require further testing of Anon’s data. Further statistical testing is also required as the WOKI used only one item to represent the different dimensions of work commitment and these could be expanded.

Other limitations, including the age and gender of respondents, need further exploration in the context of cross-cultural research on work commitment. The unexplored role of gender is an area requiring further research. Exploring the relationship of collectivism and individualism in the APR to determine if there is a gender relationship to this specific dimension was beyond the scope of the current study. Age is a similar variable worthy of further research. In much of the preliminary research, specifically, in the interviews, it was identified that some of the dimensions of culture, as proposed by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), may be affected by the attitudes of the younger generation. This may be especially so to Asian youth, as many of the consumer behaviours of the West are more common within their national culture. Dimensions such as age, gender and religion, have been found to create reciprocal opposition in how sub-cultures are formed in organisations acting as potential intervening variables in a work commitment model (Nelson & Gopalan, 2003, p. 1121).

Although it would be of interest to further explore these demographics, it should be reiterated that the general feedback from Expert
Panels and interviews was that although an employee may dress in Western clothes and eat take away food, this may not affect the values of the person at the level of their national culture. So to be Malaysian, for example, involves much more than just what you eat and wear to the younger generation, who sometimes appear to be more protective of their national core values than perhaps the older generation has been. Wild, Wild and Han (2003) raise the issue that many cultures in Asia are going through an identity crisis. On one side, there is the traditional value of looking after family members whereas on the other side many people feel the need to move away from family to faraway cities to find employment. A study by Lewis (2003) identified that young graduates in China felt the need to be treated as individuals rather than part of a community. This issue creates enormous tension for graduates as they also feel the need to uphold traditional views (Lewis, 2003). Indeed, Singapore legislation requires children to take care of elderly parents (Wild et al., 2003). Wild et al. (2003) comments that these tensions question raise questions as to whether Asian cultures hold family loyalty too highly.

Access to Merico International was agreed upon in detail in the year 2000. The researcher’s previous role as a Director of Human Resources and current role as a continuing member of the Asia Pacific Training Cadre assisted with the successful negotiation of access to the hotel, its employees, and the survey outcomes. It is proposed that research will continue in the future between the company and the researcher. As already stated, access
was negotiated directly with Merico International’s Headquarters in Washington DC, US with the Senior Vice President of Human Resources International. It was due largely to the researcher’s relationship with Merico International that access was negotiated and it is unlikely that the general population would receive access to such detailed confidential information, such an extensive source of data, or obtain such a close degree of cooperation at all levels.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The following section discusses the potential for future research which has been identified as a result of this work. More stringent statistical testing should be used to causally test the new model proposed, using more than one item for each dimension. Several opportunities exist for exploration of the relationships between independent variables, the predictability of WOKI scores based on financial and guest score results, and the format of the survey document itself for cultural appropriateness.

It is suggested here that future research investigate potential relationships within the WOK. Firstly, potential research could hypothesise that there is a relationship between leadership and organisational kinship. The familial like relationship the employee feels towards the organisation would seem to be aligned within these constructs and warrants further investigation.
Secondly, future research may hypothesise that there is a relationship between organisational pride and service loyalty. It could be speculated from this research that the importance of organisational pride was found in this research to be linked to service loyalty. The importance of the organisations’ reputation was very important within the collectivist cultures of the APR who related closely to Merico’s family type corporate culture. With pride in the organisation the employee may feel obligated or motivated to deliver a superior level of service.

Thirdly, future research may hypothesise that there is a relationship between benefits, opportunity for growth and job security and job satisfaction. It emerged in Stage One and Stage Two of the studies that the importance of benefits and remuneration in the collectivist culture of the APR was motivated by the importance of family responsibilities. It is possible then to speculate that job security and an opportunity to progress within an organisation, in addition to good benefits and remuneration, may lead to greater job satisfaction.

Finally, the potential role of intervening variables of age and gender, require future examination. Findings in this research and others (Kennedy, 2002; Wild et al., 2003) raise the generational divide as of importance in
future research in the APR. In addition issues of gender should also be considered equally importance.

The database provided by Merico International includes the financial results and the guest satisfaction scores for each of the cooperating hotels. Future research will explore the reliability of the WOKI as a predictor of financial and guest satisfaction scores. Future research could also examine the cultural sensitivity of the Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 1996) as a management strategy within the APR.

As a result of this research, there is also the opportunity to explore the appropriateness of the current survey format used by Merico. Through the preliminary research, specifically the interviews, it was discovered that the Likert type scale permitted the employees to select an option of ‘neither agree nor disagree’. The concern with this item is that it was perceived in Asia, for a number of reasons, as ‘sitting on the fence’ and not committing to giving feedback to the organisation. As one of the Asian HR representatives explained when he commented on the need to eliminate the ‘3’ (see Chapter Six).

It may therefore be pertinent for an exploration of a different style of survey to capture greater information from the APR. A recent study by Wong, Rindfleisch and Burroughs (2003) assessed the applicability of using
the Material Values Survey (MSV) in the APR. The findings of their research support the concerns raised by this thesis in relation to the use of the Likert format stating that its use is problematic in cross-cultural settings. In the future it is also possible that a web-based survey may be implemented to decrease excessive costs and consumables and increase confidentiality.

The external environment now consists not only of local, but also foreign influences, creating cross-cultural concerns. Therefore, consideration among differing national cultures must be evaluated, deciding upon how, and to what degree, sensitivity measures toward international cultures will be met without diluting the company’s own core values and corporate objectives (Tayeb, 2003). Therefore management’s challenge is to be aware of cultural aspects and turn them into an advantage where possible (Tayeb, 2003).

Finally, one of the greatest potential research opportunities would be to expand the current program to include all of the other countries and regions in which Merico International currently operates. If what creates and drives work commitment from an employee to an employer in the APR, based on the collectivist national cultural dimension, is different or converges with that of America, then it follows that there will also be variances globally (Nelson & Gopalan, 2003). Exploration of the UK, the Arabic nations, the Mediterranean, Southern America, and Africa, among
others, offer opportunities for the development of more accurate frameworks of work commitment within regions. They could still be embedded within the current survey, making them applicable culturally and yet affordable and easily implemented.

A copy of this thesis will be sent to Merico’s headquarters for their examination upon its completion and it remains to be seen what their senior management will decide to do as a result of the findings. The future research potential of this work is exciting.

CONCLUSION

The relevance of these findings can be discussed at several levels. Firstly it is important to MNCs who are planning on entering the diverse and culturally different APR. The ‘one size fits all’ approach to management no longer provides a competitive advantage in the market place and in fact may result in increasingly negative results.

Secondly, as can be seen from this research, there are cultural differences between the drivers and the outcomes of work commitment in the APR from those in America. The WOKI has proved to be a significantly better predictor of work commitment than the WCI when applied in the Asian countries of this sample.
It is naive to think that Western Managers can enter South East Asia with an armoury of motivational techniques that have proved useful domestically. It is time to challenge these prior misconceptions and develop more culturally accurate work commitment frameworks and measures globally.
Appendix A
CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

THIS CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT is made and entered into by and between __________ INTERNATIONAL INC., with offices at __________, __________ and __________, a research student and consultant having her principal place of employment at __________ and __________, Queensland 4217, Australia ("Consultant Researcher").

WHEREAS, __________ and Consultant Researcher mutually desire to engage in discussions which may lead to or are currently part of a business relationship; and

WHEREAS, __________ may, in the course of its dealings with Consultant Researcher, furnish to Consultant Researcher, Confidential Information as defined in Paragraph 1 below, and does not wish to convey any interest or copyright or other proprietary right therein or make such Confidential Information public or common knowledge; and

NOW, THEREFORE, __________ and Consultant Researcher agree as follows:

1. Subject to Section 4 below, "Confidential Information" shall mean any non-public information of __________ that is designated as confidential or proprietary, that Consultant Researcher knew or reasonably should have known was confidential or proprietary, or that derives independent value from not being generally known to the public, including but not limited to data, documents, reports, interpretations, forecasts, records, demonstrations, viewings of screen layouts, software, tools, methodologies, procedures, and records, whether oral, written or in the media. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing; Confidential Information shall include information regarding __________, customers, sales, marketing, personnel matters, means of doing business, other non-public information obtained directly or indirectly by the Consultant Researcher from __________ in the course of discussions and/or business relationship, the arrangements between __________ and Consultant Researcher (including this letter agreement), and other information obtained directly or indirectly by Consultant Researcher from __________ or in the course of services to __________.

2. Consultant Researcher and her respective employees, students, agents, and Griffith University employees, officers or staff (collectively "Employees") agree that during the period of their discussions and/or business relationship with __________ and thereafter, they will not at any time disclose to any person or use for their own benefit or the benefit of anyone, Confidential Information without the prior express written consent of a corporate officer of __________. Consultant Researcher shall limit disclosure of Confidential Information to those Employees who have a need to know related to the discussions and/or business relationship, provided such Employees have agreed to maintain the confidentiality of Confidential Information in accordance with this Agreement. Consultant Researcher shall instruct her Employees that Confidential Information is proprietary to __________ and to be held in confidence by said Employees. Consultant Researcher shall ensure that all Employees whom the Confidential Information is disclosed take reasonable precautions to safeguard the confidential status of the Confidential Information. In addition, for a business arrangement in which particular Employees obtain access to sensitive strategic information, such Employees may be required to execute a separate Confidentiality Agreement containing a non-compete provision for that arrangement.

3. Upon request, Consultant Researcher agrees to deliver promptly to __________, any documents reflecting Confidential Information and any copies made thereof which Consultant Researcher or her Employees may have made, may have access to, or may receive or possess during the period of the discussions and/or
Consultant Research. and Consultant Researcher shall not be liable for disclosure of Confidential Information if made in response to a valid court order or order of an authorized government agency; provided that, if available, five (5) days notice be given to the other party so a protective order, if appropriate, may be sought by the other party. This Agreement shall be binding upon and Consultant Researcher as their respective assigns and successors.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been duly executed by and Consultant Researcher as of the latest date set forth below:

RUTH NORTH

Printed Name: RUTH NORTH
Title: DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES
Date: 22nd November 2000

INTERNATIONAL, INC.

By: 
Printed Name: 
Title: VP, ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITIES
Date: Mar. 17, 2000
3. How long have you worked for this COMPANY? (Select the ONE best response)
   [ ] 1 Less than 3 months
   [ ] 2 3 months but less than 6 months
   [ ] 3 6 months but less than 1 year
   [ ] 4 1 year but less than 3 years
   [ ] 5 3 years but less than 5 years
   [ ] 6 More than 5 years

4. Please indicate whether you are: (Select the ONE best response)
   FOR CONTINENTAL U.S. AND CANADA PROPERTIES ONLY
   [ ] 1 Black
   [ ] 2 Asian/Pacific Islander
   [ ] 3 American Indian/Alaska Native
   [ ] 4 Hispanic
   [ ] 5 White (Caucasian)
   [ ] 6 Other
   [ ] 7 No Answer

5. Please indicate whether you are: (Select the ONE best response)
   [ ] 1 Male
   [ ] 2 Female
   [ ] 3 No Answer

Your Overall Opinion...

6. Overall, how satisfied are you with your job at THIS PROPERTY?
   [ ] 1 Very Satisfied
   [ ] 2 Satisfied
   [ ] 3 Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied
   [ ] 4 Dissatisfied
   [ ] 5 Very Dissatisfied
   [ ] 6 Does Not Apply / No Answer

7. Overall, how would you rate this COMPANY as a place to work compared to other companies you know about or have worked for?
   [ ] 1 One of the Best
   [ ] 2 Above Average
   [ ] 3 Average
   [ ] 4 Below Average
   [ ] 5 One of the Worst
   [ ] 6 Does Not Apply / No Answer
The Work Environment At YOUR PROPERTY...

How would you rate this property on each of the following issues, considering your experience here?

- Having the supplies, tools, or equipment to do your job.
- Your overall associate benefits package.
- Your job security.
- Treating you with respect as an individual.
- Providing the same level of service to all guests regardless of race, gender, or where they come from.
- Your opportunity to advance and develop your career.
- Your pay compared to similar jobs in this city.
- Providing you with an immediate supervisor that deals fairly with everyone—plays no favorites.

16. I feel like I am part of a "family" at this property.

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- 4 Disagree
- 5 Strongly Disagree
- 6 Does Not Apply / No Answer

The People You Work With...

- When needed, my co-workers make special personal efforts to help our property be successful (for example, working extra hours, etc.).
- This property is able to keep high quality associates.
- My co-workers make personal efforts to improve their skills so they are able to do their jobs better at this property.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Does Not Apply / No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Leadership At Your PROPERTY...**

20. How often are your contributions recognized at this property?

21. My immediate supervisor gives me feedback on my job performance that helps me do my job better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Does Not Apply / No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. I trust my immediate supervisor.

23. The General Manager at this property provides excellent leadership.

24. Management at this property understands and appreciates the differences between the people we work with.

25. My immediate supervisor gives me guidance on developing my career with this COMPANY.

26. Overall, I think my immediate supervisor does an excellent job managing his/her associates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Work And Career...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. I have been trained to do my daily job tasks well.

28. This COMPANY provides learning opportunities beyond job skills training.

29. My job is challenging and interesting.

30. My job fully utilizes my skills and abilities.

31. There is a good fit between my values and those of this COMPANY.

32. I would stay with this COMPANY even if offered a similar job with slightly higher pay at another company.

33. I intend to stay with this COMPANY for at least the next three years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Guest...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. In your opinion, what is the quality of service this property provides to guests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1 Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 2 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3 Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 4 Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 5 Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 6 Does Not Apply / No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 35. I would recommend this COMPANY’S products and services as the best that a guest could buy. |
| ☐ 1 Strongly Agree |
| ☐ 2 Agree |
| ☐ 3 Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| ☐ 4 Disagree |
| ☐ 5 Strongly Disagree |
| ☐ 6 Does Not Apply / No Answer |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Does Not Apply / No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The COMPANY...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. I am proud to work for this COMPANY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I would recommend this COMPANY as one of the best places to work in my community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Leadership Team...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. I am satisfied with the quality of services provided by the Human Resources staff at this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. My Executive Committee/Leadership Team Member at this property is accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I often see our General Manager around this property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
57. If you are considering leaving this company within the next year, why? (Please select the ONE best response.)

- □ Lack of career advancement
- □ Lack of job training
- □ Don't get along with my immediate supervisor
- □ Don't get along with the associates I work with
- □ Spouse/partner relocating
- □ Family/personal reasons
- □ Pay is better elsewhere
- □ Benefits are better elsewhere
- □ Don't like working in the hospitality industry
- □ Other
- □ □ No Answer

58. I plan on retiring with this COMPANY.

- □ 1 Strongly Agree
- □ 2 Agree
- □ 3 Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- □ 4 Disagree
- □ 5 Strongly Disagree
- □ 6 Does Not Apply / No Answer

![Likenet Scale]

At Your PROPERTY...

59. Please see separate sheet
60. Please see separate sheet
61. Please see separate sheet
62. Please see separate sheet
63. Please see separate sheet
Appendix C
Asia Pacific and US Dimensions of National Culture: Adapted from Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998):

### Individualism versus collectivism dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collectivism</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Universalism versus particularism dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Particularism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Neutral versus emotional dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Specific versus Diffuse dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Diffuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ascription versus Achievement dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ascription</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Past versus Future dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outer versus Inner directed dimension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Outer directed</th>
<th>Inner directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
WORK ORGANISATION COMMITMENT
in the Asia Pacific Region

Please complete the following:

Your Name:____________________________________________________
Your Title:_______________________________________________________
Your Hotel name:_________________________________________________
Headcount:______________________________________________________
Postal address:____________________________________________________
                                                                       _______________________________________________________
                                                                       _______________________________________________________
                                                                       _______________________________________________________
Phone number:_____________________________________________________
E-mail:___________________________________________________________
Number of Associates at your property:______________________________

CONSENT FORM

Please read and sign the following:

I…………………………..agree to take part in this research being carried out by Ruth North of my own free will. I understand all names of people and hotels will be confidential. I am aware I can withdraw from the research at anytime.
I am aware that due to the size of the research I will not be able to view transcripts of interviews however I am aware that I will be fairly represented in any thesis or publication deriving from this study.

All data collected will be confidential and remain for a period of seven years with Griffith University where access will by the researchers discretion only. I am over 18 years old.

Signed:______________________________________________
     Date:____________________________________________
Director of Human Resources

Dear …………..,

My name is Ruth North and I have had the pleasure of working with most of you in my role as the Director of Human Resources at the Surfers Paradise Resort in Australia. I am currently undertaking some exciting research with Merico Headquarters and Griffith University on the Gold Coast. This research is examining the applicability to our region of a work commitment measuring devise currently being used in conjunction with the Associate Opinion Survey (AOS) in domestic USA.

This research is examining the following questions:

1. Is what drives and defines work commitment in USA the same as what it is in the Asia Pacific Region?
2. If not, what does drive and define work commitment in the Asia Pacific Region?
3. How does national culture impact on what creates work and organisation commitment?

These are fundamentally the three areas to be explored. The final outcome will be a more accurate measurement tool for work and organisation commitment of your Associates in the Asia Pacific Region.

To achieve this I will need your support and assistance. I am hoping Andrew Newmark the Area Director of Human Resources and Training Australia will be able to spend a short period of time at the upcoming Asia Pacific Human Resources Conference in Vietnam with you addressing what the next steps will be. Prior to this however I would ask that you complete the attached forms in preparation for this meeting. The information you provide will greatly assist in making the best use of your time in Vietnam. If you receive this information and will not be in Vietnam please return it to me in the self addressed envelope prior to the conference. I will then forward to you all the information that will be discussed there and contact you personally regarding the next steps to take.

Your role will be critical in ensuring this research is successful. The role of Human Resources will be to assist in the collection of information from
Associates through activities and conducting surveys. I expect there will be one activity and one survey conducted with Associates. One survey will be conducted, similar to AOS, so as many participants from your Hotel as possible will be asked to participate. The survey will take place over the next eight to twelve months. You will be invaluable in collecting this information and assisting with translation if required. I appreciate you are already very busy and so this research is designed to collect as much information as possible with the least inconvenience.

I am pleased to introduce this very exciting piece of research to you, which promises to bring benefits to the Asia Pacific Region and International. I thank you in advance for your assistance and support.

Yours sincerely

Ruth North
Director of Human Resources

cc: Ms. xx
SVP Human Resources APA

Mr. xx
Area Director of Human Resources and Training
Australia
WORK ORGANISATION COMMITMENT

BACKGROUND:

The Work Commitment Index (WCI) was established as a measure between employees to their employers. According to Merico employees who give their best to an employer and help the organisation meet its business goals, are characterised as committed. Merico’s background research has shown that committed American employees tend to:

- Work hard to improve themselves, increasing their value to their employer.
- Make personal sacrifices to ensure the employer’s success.
- Recommend their company as a good place to work and endorse their employer’s products and services.
- Believe their workplace is one of the best around, and intend to stay employed with the company.

There are questions relating to each of these in the Associate Opinion Survey (AOS) and they are calculated in America to give each Hotel a “Work Commitment Score”. Merico believes that there is a relationship between job satisfaction, organisational commitment, work performance, and turnover intent.

DRIVERS OF COMMITMENT

An important aspect of this research hinges on the fact that Merico in association with a company called Anon Consulting have identified what drives or causes work commitment in America. America is classified as an individualist country, which places emphasis on individual achievement,
future intentions, it is known as assertive, and holds little value to an individual’s family status and kinship. Given this it is possible to assume that the characteristics which make up the nations of the Asia Pacific Region may have very different characteristics to America and therefore the drivers of commitment will also be different.

If this is so then the Work Commitment Index (WCI) currently in use in America will not be as applicable to our region. We then need to develop a Work Organisation Commitment (WOC) measurement tool which measures what is important to us.

**ASIA PACIFIC REGION**

According to the background research the majority of countries in the Asia Pacific Region could be classified as Communitarian. This means that some of the basic characteristics of these countries are fundamentally different from that of America.

Some of the characteristics from countries in our region are: A focus on the group over the individual, Importance is placed on history and times past, having harmony with the environment is important, your status and family position is important to who you are, caring for the group and others feelings is more important that being aggressive and assertive.
Such characteristics are fundamental to our national cultures. It is from these core assumptions that we are then motivated and committed to an employer. How then is the best way to create this work organisation commitment in our region?

NATIONAL CULTURE

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) designed the model of culture which is used in this research. They said there are three layers of culture. The core is the most deep-rooted element of culture. The core is the basic set of assumptions we all have as a result of cultural conditioning. This layer becomes our attitudes and behaviours.

The middle layer is our norms and values. Our norms are the mutual sense of group, the written laws or social control and our values determine what we consider to be right and wrong.

The outer layer reflects the artifacts and products which are the observable realities of our culture such as clothing, housing, food, language, art and shrines.

In this research you will be asked to discuss these layers of your national culture.
ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

The other type of ‘culture’ that we are familiar with in an organisation such as Merico International is ‘organisational culture’. You will be asked to identify what you believe to be the organisational culture of your Hotel. Merico International strives to create one organisational culture that is applicable to all cultures. Therefore because we are all very similar in many ways the main differences between us should be that of our national culture.

SUMMARY

The background reading is designed to assist you answering the following Questionnaire. Thank you once again for your invaluable input.

Please complete the following questions:

1. Please describe your country and its history. Feel free to attach relevant photocopied information noting the author, date of publication and title. Please feel free to write as much as you like.

2. Please describe the types of arts produced, clothes worn, music played, food eaten, languages spoken and religious beliefs held in your country.

3. What is considered to be ‘good’ and ‘bad’ in your country?

4. Describe what are core assumptions, beliefs or values that your country holds as important (for example: elders must be respected)

5. What do you believe creates commitment from the employee to the employer in your country?

6. How would you describe the organisational culture of Merico International?

7. How do you and others in your opinion in your country perceive Americans?

8. How does your culture and American national culture differ?
9. From the following please circle the group of words which best represents your hotel’s organisational culture:

**Group One**
- Boss is father/mother figure
- Praise is a better motivator to me than money.
- My corporation is concerned about my family and standard of living.
- My work places high importance on doing the right thing rather than on doing things right.

**Group Two**
- Boss is seen as a role not a person.
- Professional qualifications assist in becoming and being a superior.
- Promotion gained by acquiring the skills and knowledge of the role above.
- My company is not responsible for my personal problems/family.

**Group Three**
- The Boss is the person with the expertise in the field being considered and changes depending on the problems being faced.
- In my company we prefer to work in teams or project groups.
- In our teams each of us are equal with specific areas of strength.
- Being paid for achieving personal targets motivates me.

**Group Four**
- The Boss represents the leader of the cause. It is the cause which is important.
- Self expression and self fulfilment should be the purpose of organisations.
- Companies create loyalty through their commitment to change the world, and improve society.
- Motivation to me comes through the creative process of the organisation.

Please complete the above questions on additional paper and attach.

Thank you again for your time and assistance.
Appendix E
Thailand

What in Thai culture would be considered to be good and bad?

Good would be respect, polite, who you know is important, religion Buddhism considered good, the king is good, Thai people are proud of their smile, they are proud of the gentleness of the Thai people. Bad things are yelling in public, being rude, being too expressive, too much flesh, being too provocative.

What do you consider to be the core values of Thai culture?

Thai’s have a lot of unique values. Probably the number one value that foreigners have to learn is that of Gran chai. Probable the closest value to it is like being liked, respect. It doesn’t mean that they like you but they are just trying to be polite. Lets say that for example you wanted to eat Thai food but I don’t like Thai food but because you are the guest or my boss I will eat the food because I won’t speak out. It is the opposite to being assertive, they don’t like to speak out their opinions in public, so in a meeting you might ask does any-one have any opinions or suggestions and they won’t speak out publicly because they don’t want to make the chair person look bad. Thais are communal and you don’t want to stick out the group is important, so that is one of the values. A sense of respect or a following so for example the King has a lot of following so people will listen to him. The Royal family is a figure head Royal family not a political Royal family but people will still listen to him because he has so much following they will listen to him and follow him. It is the same for the managers. If they have a lot of following then they can get their staff to do anything, it is kind of like the emotional bank account and this is important in Thailand. This is two of the main values.
What do you think creates commitment from the Associates to the organisation?

Thai people are committed but I think the commitment factor changes as you go up just because like the hierarchy of needs so if you are just scraping by and just making enough to live and the fact that the other hotel is offering a couple of hundred Baht more may make the difference. I think that the other thing that creates a lot of commitment is how happy they are. Thai people are happy people, they are a fun loving people and if they are able to work in an environment that they enjoy and they are happy and they have good colleagues and that hold a lot of weight. If we look at our AOS score they may lack equipment or the uniform is not good but overall they are happy because they have a happy and fun loving environment. Opportunity, if we are looking at the younger people, the opportunity to be trained and have development and advance in their career. A lot of that has to do with if they progress they will have the respect of their friends and their families so they are drawn to that.

How would you describe the organisational culture of Merico?

I think of things like respect, consistency, fair treatment, I think respect is a big thing, respecting people regardless of level and position is a big part of Merico culture, being customer focused, internal and external and obviously getting the measurable results is important.

How do Thai people see Americans?

A little bit loud a little bit crude in some sense but overall Thai people have a lot of liking for Americans because America is seen as the land of opportunity, freedom where they can break away from some of the cultural norms of Thailand. They see it as a place of new trends, new technology,
and advancement so it has a pretty positive perception despite the fact that sometimes behaviour clashes a bit with Thai behaviour.

**So how do the cultures differ?**

I think the hierarchy, the respect is different. Because in Thailand it is a lot more hierarchical and people show a lot more respect for their elders and a little bit more reserved, they don’t point with their feet, chewing gum is not polite, they don’t sit on the table, they are a bit more poised, a bit more related to the British with a lot more manners and things like that.

**So the work commitment is related to direction, recognition, growth, and a balance then they will sacrifice, better themselves and recommend the hotel’s products, how do you think that would fit in Thailand?**

I think it would all hold true but the thing that is missing is the leadership. The leadership is the driving force of all those other things. In our AOS if a department has a leader that is bias or whatever will have lower scores than a department that has a leader that is fair and provides a lot of training and things like that. You see that in a lot of organisations when a manager moves or a manager changes a lot of staff will move with them. So because of the respect for the manager a lot of Thai people will move regardless of what the organisation is like. So if I am working here and I move to a local chain I might be able to convince a lot of people to come with me.

**If you were given a clean slate what would you do to make them committed?**

If you were starting a new hotel I guess the big motivator is how much are you paying and what position am I getting which is why half the hotel is a
manager. The other intangible part is word of mouth because until you are open it is hard to demonstrate what your about. After that, training, a positive work environment, being treated with respect is important. Thai people can harbour anger for a long time and that is were a lot of time with expatriates they get upset with something and they yell and they shout and even though it is not something personal the Associate was just there and they think well the manager is yelling at me. The next day the when the manager is happy and speaking nicely again I have to explain to the Associates that he is not being hypocritical it is just in their nature to get upset and take it out but whereas Thai people don’t tell you about it until it blows up, so the respect is important. Respect and recognition are important and not necessarily the monetary part just saying than you expressing your appreciation, it makes them feel good.

*When you talk about money and benefits, what culturally is that?*

A lot of time Thai people don’t know what they want in terms of benefits, they just know that they have to get as much as what they had before or what the other competitors are doing. So they will look at other hotels and say they are offering this why aren’t you but they don’t look at maybe the other things we are offering. So for example that hotel is offering medical insurance for families and we are not but they don’t look at other things we are offering, so they look at the best from all. They have the mentality of scarcity that there is not enough to go around so I have to get as much as I can. Like if you watch Thai people eat buffet they will fill up their plates and yet they will not finish it all.
Is it important to treat people as a part of a group or as an individual?

Both, you can’t do too much of the individual you can’t do too much of the praising one person or the other will get jealous. You have to share your love around so you don’t do favourites.

The application of rules is it more important to have them applied based on individual circumstances or same for all?

Normally it has to be the same otherwise people will compare so a lot of time is important to be objective yet on the other hand one of the ways of building this leadership or respect is to be a little bit flexible and bend the rules a bit and that will really go along way. So it is a really tricky balance to how you play it so again you have to look at the situation but I think you have to be as objective as possible and consistent as possible, because of you do something special for one person then others will come along and they will expect you to do something special for them and then it becomes difficult for you.

Individual or group?

Group, it is a very communal and group environment.

Do you think incentive programs should be group oriented?

If you do things for individuals you always seem to have people thinking that it is not fair that I did a good job or someone else did a better job so you have to do a little bit of individual and group. As long as it is well documented then it is very objective.
**Business is it structured or emotional?**

People can get pretty emotional especially on the ties they have, if it is informal environment then it can be pretty emotional and people can make a lot of decisions based on feelings and not based on facts and so purely based on objective issues.

**Relationships continue or end with business?**

In good business dealings a lot of the time the relationships will last because in order to do business with Thai people relationships are extremely important, so you can’t just fly in make an appointment and expect to close the deal, you have to go out to dinner together, you have to be able to create that comfortable environment then you are able to do long term business more easily. One of the things that the vacation club people is that they expect to close the deal on the first shot, well a lot of time it doesn’t happen on the on the first shot, they don’t know who you are, they want their family to feel comfortable with you.

**Recognition based on future or past?**

It is important to celebrate past achievements. The past thing is very important for Thai people, so what you have done in the past, a lot of times people think that carries the weight so if I have done something they will say but look at what I have done in the past all the other times, I have worked so hard so it is held onto.

**Is it important to be in harmony with the environment or to cohabitate?**

Thai aren’t very environmentally friendly people when you look at pollution. People are still very ‘take the easy way out no matter what the consequences are” people are lazy and like we have a walk way above the
road but you’ll see them crossing anyway because they are too lazy to work up.

*Any other points?*

Thai people are very proud of their country because we have not been colonised and we have always been independent. So family what your in is important. No two families are the same so if you see some one with my name you will know they are related to me somehow. Sometimes you can tell if the are Chinese and sometimes you can tell if the are a descendent of the Royal family because in the past the fourth and fifth dynasty kings had may wives and children so they were known by their last names. There were also some Chinese and autocratic families who were big Thai bankers. So each bank is founded by a certain family. So you can tell a lot by peoples last names, so the joke is send your kids to study in Boston or LA so if your from a no name family you send your kids there so they can hang out and marry into a good family. You hear stories about how a family doesn’t want a girl to marry some one because he’s not from a good enough family. It is changing a little it. There is a lot of false rich, people who pretend to be very wealthy, sometimes Thai people can become very materialistic. You’ll find them living in small houses but they wear nice clothes and driving Mercedes. Because they don’t have to bring people home, they can entertain out. Like Thai people will mortgage everything from stereos to cars to everything so it is probably one of the things that has contributed to the economic downfall of the country.

*So what are the fundamental beliefs of the Buddhists?*

Harmony, peace, love, very much of the fundamental beliefs of most religions, they believe in doing good, merit making, reincarnation so to come into a better life the next time. All men become monks for x amount
of times in their life. By law we have to let them out to do it. Usually you do it as a sign of respect for your parents so sometimes when they are in school, or about to get married or sometimes when a parent passes away they’ll do it. By law we have to let them go but if they need more time than that then they might take their vacation leave and things like that. Devoted Buddhist will wake up early in the morning and give food to the monks. That is part of making merit, balancing out you sins. It is a big part of the Thai life. Every year the hotel does a blessing ceremony for the whole hotel. It is also piece of mind so like this year earlier we had a lot of mishaps with out Associates so we had the monk over and he said some prayers and made them feel better.

Anything else?

There will be some trends in Asia. Hierarchy, face, respecting, group dynamics and these things. When I look at Asia there are some of the developed countries like Singapore, Philippines are more developed. Thailand is in the middle somewhere. We can be very emotional people. Thais try to balance some of their traditional ideas. They appear so Western and yet on special days they flip back into their traditional and I guess that has a lot to do with the way they are raised. Because Thai people like to live together, even when they are married they will still often live together.
Thailand (2)

This work explores what creates work commitment in American the same as what it is in Asia. What is considered good and bad in Thai culture?

The good things are that we are not resistant to change because we have been exposed to the world market and global technology to broaden our minds so we are experimental. Before some of the job had to be done by the foreigners but now we can employ the locals. The bad thing is that we still have a very strong feeling and relationships towards small groups. This means that if the person or one of the friends is impacted by something is not right it turns the other friends without them thinking of right or wrong but they all think the same. This is maybe the family value which is very strong, overseas graduates come from and change it so it is not that much strong sometimes. Currently our Associates see they can move around but after one or two years they think of the family and come back. Some areas still have this job rotation we would have more skilled people.

What are the core values?

Harmony is still part of it, being independent I think has got to be part of the key values. Being independent in having their own decision in what they want to do in what kind of education they want to go for. The family value is still important but they know who to balance it out the family must be contacted but they don’t have to stay together. Respect to the leaders to the family, respect to religion, which makes people to try to be good, the value of helping each other is there very strong.
The Buddhist religion is what?
To live our life moderately, don’t have to have the very high everything in life but do not be over confident in our life and that is the moderation of living your life in the way of helping each other.

What creates commitment to the organisation?
Respect of the person and the value of the company philosophy. Many people have changes their requirements from time to time but once they see that the company respects them they will stay for a long time. Three to four year. People tend to think of themselves in their life and of their family so if their work can give them back to be close to what they want and to give the support for them to grow in heir career through training and development and career development. If they have benefits of life insurance and health insurance then they feel honoured by that company.

How would you describe organisational culture of Merico?
The culture of taking care of the Associates I can see this even from the first time I was working with them, I can feel the importance of these words coming into the doing. The managers try to support the Associates and try to understand them even thought the Thai culture still has the senior and the junior in ways we try to be the same as the Associates like having the same place in the canteen to eat. In other companies this is not so well accepted but I see many managers come to eat with them and participate in the Associate activities as much as possible. For the Thai people you don’t have to do much but if you do this then the Thai people feel you are already a part of them.

How do Thai people perceive Americans?
We perceive them as the customer but now we feel they are part of the resources we can learn from. They are friendlier than other nationalities so
we are able to get to know them. They are outspoken but the Thai people are introverted and Americans are extroverted and we are not comfortable to do it that way.

Any other differences?
I don’t think the way of thinking is that different, if they support the decision making process then Thais could speak out more. Americans want to see results first but Thais want to try out first and then make a decision.

The work commitment index in the states is this what about for Thais?
Recognition. Which ever the level the Thais people they want the American bosses to see them and what they do, work and life is also important but American bosses work in Thailand do not bring their Bosses so they think of their life as their work and so they think the local people can do the same and that I think is quite challenging for them because they can work 12 hours a day but the Thais people have the home to go back to and the end process is not getting done.

What is a normal work week?
We like Americans because they have the expertise and they are decisive so we help each other.

If you could start again to create the most commitment employees what would you put in place?
Put in the core values of customer focus and the core theme that we come up with on our own. I would like the young blood, young graduates and let them rule the dress code and uniform, this is very important, we want everyone to know the goals and even the financial to reach the common goal, I want to be a learning organisational.
Is it important to recognise an individual or as a group?
Individual is good to get super staff who will drive other staff but as a group it is also important. The group cannot work separately and it needs a number of people to achieve the group but you need the individuals to be competitive to drive this. I think they want to be seen individually but you still want to be seen with the group.

Is it more important to be dealt with on particular circumstances or one rule for all?
I think they want one rule for everybody but practically it is not possible.

Individual or group?
Group.

Business structured or emotional?
The seniors are structured but if you are one of the members of the team it will be very emotional.

Relationships go on or last only as long as the business?
Relationships go on.

Future or past achievements?
The past they can control but the future they can’t.

Do your Associates work in harmony or cohabitate with the environment?
Cohabitate with the environment.
Any other suggestions for Merico to improve commitment?

Many times people may misunderstand that because we always smile even when we don’t know what you’re talking about but if you are more patient to them and give them training and education then this is a good time for us to learn so I think that what the Merico is doing now is the right direction.
China

In China the culture is very different from my understanding people just do their own thing they have a lack of initiative maybe because there is not enough motivation in money terms not really anything that is related to development and such not they don’t want to have it but they want to have money to motivate them. We have staff that say the less we do the better because we don’t want to make mistakes and we don’t want to get blamed.

Tell me what is considered to be good and bad in your country?
They are humble, friendly and they never tend to be too aggressive to guests. No matter what you do they will always say sorry not just thank you for waiting. Any the bad part is it is a little too conservative, a lack of creativity, not like in the Western world were they are open and they will think of something very dramatic or drastic.

What are the core values and beliefs?
The family. They stress a lot on the family they want to spend more time with the family than the company. In my observation in my company when it is time to go they just leave, they are not willing to work over time and they would like to be with the family.

So what creates commitment from an employee to an employer? (Explained term commitment)
The rewards. As long as we treat them well, good wages, salary and benefits.

How would create committed employees in relation to money?
It is really difficult because we recently did a survey with our competitors and we were low. And we know the problem but it becomes very difficult because whenever we have to get money we have to get it from the owners
and that becomes very difficult to solve because it involves requires a few parties, gratuities during special days, benefits. Basically they are looking for something that is quite material. They would like the opportunity to be sent out of the country for cross training but basically they want the material things.

_When you say materialistic do you mean things other than money?_

Gifts, something they can use, for example during the staff party they are not really looking for what you are giving them to eat they don’t really are what they care for is the lucky draw, refrigerators, DVD, big screen T.V. and stuff like this. They are just interested in lucky draws and nothing else. Once in our hotel we did just snacks and that was fine with them because they want to spend more money on gifts and not on food.

_Why is that?_

Maybe it is the culture. In the past they have never had these things like 10 years ago if you went to visit relatives off from mainland China and you could bring back a television set the whole village would come over. That is why these things are so important even now because they are looking to the West because they are closing for so many years. It has improved quite a bit.

_What are things about the West that they don’t want to embrace?_

People feel ashamed of their past and try to be very trendy so on the streets you will see them wearing very trendy clothes and even dying their hair and so if they were earning $500 they would be spending most of their income on clothing to make themselves up and to look trendy but they don’t feel proud of them own national language. They think they must learn English like Chinese in Malaysia are very proud of the Chinese culture because they are not from China for many generations and they brought over with them
the culture but right now people feel like they have to have their identity because they are from that part of the world too.

So if you are Malay Chinese what are some of the things that you do identify with?
We try to follow whatever the Chinese way of doing things is. The national culture of the practise is the same like the way we live at home is different like the festivals we celebrate. In terms of culture in China it is fading away like Chinese New Year was very important but recently the younger generation have been celebrating Christmas. It is relevant to the older generation but the younger generation really try to follow the Western ways and try to follow to have the things they have.

How would you say that Chinese people are different to American people?
I guess it is the culture the way of living the way of thinking so conservative, just two different cultures one would rather think in their minds rather than saying it out where as the Americans just say it out. Even though they haven’t done anything wrong they would say they are sorry and things like that. They perceive no manners more creative, energetic, more liberal, they think there are no boundary they can very dramatic and drastic. For example for Chinese people when they have a friend over they would do something like give away a lot of things to make the guest feel hospitable, they would rather to have the guest to stay in their bedroom and they would sleep on the couch and Westerner’s I guess they would have their own boundaries, you are guest and this is the best I can give you.

Are there things from Merico you’ve thought wouldn’t work in China?
The big issue is the ethical part. Now we all understand this is the right way to do it but because you are in a big pot you are a very little part of it the situation just won’t allow you to do it but if you don't do it you will lose the competitive edge and puts the company in a bad position to do business.
So I guess in a way in China we are flexible between the company ethics and the society that we have do the business but we cannot go too far against the company policy.

*Do you think that in general Chinese associates want to have one rule that applies to everyone or do they take note of the particular situation?*

Each situation.

*Group or individual oriented?*

It depends on the situation. Sometimes people tend to be very united to do some things and then they can be individualistic. The family will stick together.

*Emotionally or neutral?*

Emotional.

*Does the business relationship last longer than the business or only as long as the business?*

Longer relationship.

*Is it important to be recognised for your family, status or as an individual?*

More towards individual achievement.

*Past or future oriented?*

Both. They look to the future but they think in the past like what they have achieved and how proud they are like we have the great wall and we have this and that but in the future we have to do better.

*Environment harmony or cohabitate?*

People are more and more aware of the harmony but still a large part still is more business.
National culture or organisational culture which has the greater influence?
National culture. The company culture has little on the personal life. If they stay with the company time and culture but when they are off duty they go back to their own culture. For example it is still quite common to spit. But they know that during the company time they are not allowed to spit but right after they finish there work they will just resume as one of the citizens of the society.

Is there anything that Merico could be doing better in relation to China?
Well they have high expectations of Merico in that they think this is an international company and it is rich and it can offer me a lot in terms in reward and salary. Like Courtyard it is a four star and they think well this is Merico and this is why I am here but it is not really related to Merico as who ever owns the hotel and the owners decides how much they get paid but they think Merico is responsible. Merico should influence the owner more like setting a standard like how the Associates should be treated. Unless you are the top guy there are always comparisons and they will always compare from hotel 'a' to hotel 'b' and when they find out they are in a lower position they are not happy and they want to know why we cannot match it.

How could Merico value the national culture?
Right now they are doing find. There is no conflict at all. It is just the way of thinking that are different like to be valued, incentive to the Westerner mean to have training and development but the values are different. People are looking at different value and Merico can’t do anything unless they can convince the owner to spend more and give more material things. Because of China has a different level of needs. You have to satisfy that basic need first. The majority and still living in poverty and you say hey you need more knowledge or what ever and they say hey I’d rather have some bread.
The different values and the way people see things and you may say this is what you need but to me it is it is not.

*What can Merico be doing that would create greater commitment in terms of the family?*

More time. Health what can Merico do in terms of the benefits to the family? A lot of it has to do with the Government policy. If they want to give they can but is going to cost money, who pays Merico or the owner. With lower pay we just expect higher turnover and there is nothing we can do. Like it happened to us with one HR she was offered more and she just went without even thinking.
Singapore

What are some of the core values in your country?
Being humble, family values, being committed to the family, Americans are a lot more vocal but Asians are a lot more reserved, even if they think that something are their right to have they won’t just say it you need to talk to them and find out their concerns they are not so loud. Also being morally upright, in Singapore it is not so bad we are open to certain Western ideas, but we are very interested by the government but when we have Westerners come in and talk about free sex and that sort of thing we tend to be a bit reserved. We banned chewing gum. A person came from America, the boy who was beaten, we tend to be very clear on what is right and wrong but in America they tend to debate about such issues.

How do you create commitment?
Younger or older? The older look more at the balance of the life, family and work and the work environment if it is conducive for them. Younger look for position, career development and some of them according to AOS some are motivated by pay. Our industry is not paid as well compared to other trades, others would be recognition, ok you’ve done a good job and now want an award. Number one would be career development and then pay and then recognition.

If you were to go out and create employees to your hotel what would you do? (explain term commitment)
If they have a very clear plan on how they can be promoted. When we conduct interviews people coming from other hotels are leaving because they have no career development or they will just get out of the industry all together. Money is an issue because the cost of living is higher. They all want to have higher living standards. Recognition, work environment,
company culture, bosses keep them happy so they can do a good job but very strong career development.

*How do Singaporeans view Americans?*

People focus on the Merico hotel so they think of this as American. In general they are very open people, very independent, like here if you are single you can’t own your own flat, you have to be 35 and above. So unless you are very wealthy you have to wait to move in to the government flats. The government has set its priorities to look after married couple because they think of the singles because they can live with their parents. They believe it brings the family together and enhances the family togetherness.

*How could a company demonstrate that this is something of value?*

I think having we are starting the permanent part time package, so you can have housewives and retirees who don’t want to spend all their time at work they want to earn some cash but don’t want to spend all their time at work and quality time at home. So we have a number of people on this package and it makes them feel like they belong to the company and this is one way that we can help.

Mary my DHR is on permanent part time and she has a two-year-old daughter and so she spoke to the GM and to get a balance she can do this. This is quite popular in American to I think.

*Do you prefer to have one rule that applies to all or base decisions made on particular situations?*

The other companies I have worked for are very black and white but in Merico it is a bit different because it is American so if the mother was sick and the person was late the supervisor would discuss this with the Associate.
INDIVIDUALIST OR GROUP ORIENTATED?

The younger generation can be very individualistic and depending on the organisational culture they can move towards group oriented. I do think Singaporeans lack social skills say in comparison to Americans. Like when I conduct interviews and I ask them what do you do out of work and they say they go home and watch TV or they watch the movies. Most of them are individualist especially the younger generation.

Emotionally involved or neutral?
Generally emotional.

Specific contractual business or the whole relationship?
People always look to the relationship.

Past or future orientated?
Past especially for the older generation.

Harmony with the environment or cohabitate?
They are not educated in that area yet.

Do you think the Merico culture has a great influence on the Associates than the national culture?
Tough, for the younger generation the Merico culture is a stronger influence. The older generation tend to live in the past.

Is there anything that strikes you as culturally wrong?
One thing they have this phrase ‘when you are comfortable you can do anything’ and I think that is quite dangerous to promote that to our Associates because here in Singapore they need to be guided along because the government is overprotective it tells you exactly what you can and can’t
do so when you tell them if you are comfortable you can do anything you are opening a flood gate. Because you tell them you have to something about your grooming and they tell you but you told me I could be comfortable and do anything.
Japan

What is considered good and bad in the Japanese culture?
Japanese people focus on being in harmony with the community and their work teams so being polite and not so straight. Sometimes people from other cultures think that Japanese people are not so specific that we are general and that is the way we are trying to be nice to the other people.

What would be some of the values of your culture?
Respecting others even in the working place the elders must be respected and people are very comfortable being supervised by someone older. So if they are supervised by some one younger they are not comfortable.

If you were to look at work commitment they have a work index which says that of associates know what direction the company is going in and if the recognition, rewards, good balance and work environment then associates will make personal sacrifices for the company and they will recommend the company and they will stay with the company and there will be low turnover and high return. In Japan what would create work commitment for your associates? What is important to them to be committed to a company?
Right now talking about our property most people want to have job security and a lot of things have changed very quickly and many of them feel unsure, they like to feel that the company needs me. So the company needs to focus a lot on this. Like regional came and told us to reduce our staff and we let go one Sous Chef and afterwards a lot of associates left because they felt very uncomfortable and nervous and for us it is difficult to say that we can not say that your job is secure. In Japan most companies guarantee employment but in Merico we cannot. It is not only Merico a lot of companies are starting to change to this way.
What is different between Merico and Japanese national culture?
The Merico is not like the American companies I know. They value people and have long relationships so I don’t see much difference between Merico and Japanese culture. Well they brought up a lot of procedures and checklists some procedures are very basic and nothing new and I think they think that the way they told us was quite shocking because there was no explanation or trying to understand the local culture. It was the way they told us was poor. For us Japanese the first thing is to negotiate and then action plan but for Merico it is action plan first and negotiates afterwards. This is not by the culture.

So how do people in your culture perceive Americans?
If you had an opportunity in a new hotel in a Japanese culture to create committed employees what would you do?
Training and have a lot of sessions on understanding us very well like rap sessions so they understand the Merico culture because otherwise they hear rumours. Salary is important.

Is team recognition more important than individual recognition?
Individual and team is also important. We do promotions on a yearly basis and Merico says that if there is a vacant position you can go for this but we need to do core training and a promotion on the fact that we don’t have to wait for just once a year and we can do cross training so we can have a more generalised associate. I would give them a lot of opportunity for promotion. Job security, training, salary respect are all important.

If you could describe Japanese people do they like one rule for everyone or have specific individual circumstances?
Both because. Well I think one for everyone is fair.
Are Japanese more individualistic or group oriented?

Group Oriented

Would you say that relationships are neutral or emotionally involved?

They are trying to hide their emotion.

When you do business is it only for the term of the business or involved relationships?

Involved.

Is it more important to be recognised for your personal achievement or your family?

It use to be your family and we are trying to not focus this so much now.

Would you say general Japanese culture places importance on the future or past?

What they are going to do in the future.

Would you say that it is important for the Japanese culture to be in harmony with the environment or is business more important?

In harmony with the environment.

How does an employee who is really committed to an organisation demonstrate this?

People don’t normally work in accordance with their culture. Their culture shows specific job descriptions and so doing other jobs and responsibilities and they are willing do this then they are committed. Other people would just say no. These people have a high morale to their work and to the company.
Anything else?
People tend to work and try to work for the company for a long time. Of course if they have some other goals like studying then this is different but most try to work a long time.

What motivates them?
If people feel involved they feel motivated, if they receive information and feel that they are important then they are involved.

What would be a good incentive scheme for Japanese culture like in America they have bonuses?
I think the success of the company so they can sacrifice for the company their bonus but if the company lives long this is more important.
Korea

What is considered good and bad in your culture?
We are based on Confucianism very strong Confucianism if you don’t respect the elders this would be considered very bad usually. It is good to respect elders.

What would you consider the core values of your nation?
This also goes back to the Confucianism cultural roots because it is very like Merico culture like integrity, equality, respect and justice.

What do you think creates commitment from the employees to the organisation?
Trust. If they trust the company their loyalty is very high but if they think that the company is trying to hide something then their trust will drop down to the bottom, regardless of how they get paid, they want to be understood and trusted by the company.

How would you describe the organisational culture of Merico?
When we opened our hotel the main thing that we communicated to our hotel was trust. It was acceptable to the associates. When we started they had a really high expectation of us. But they went through the same process with other companies like Hyatt there was a lot of good thing of applying to the local culture but then after some time this stopped happening from the top are not quite applicable or the truth, so far we have been open 6 months and so far Merico culture is being applied and wether we make it or not will depend on how we can keep on applying the philosophy on a daily basis, whether our managers can be role models will also effect if we are successful or not. When they see the General manager
or the Directors they say oh that is the Merico Culture, that is the Merico way. It is considered that he two cultures can be mixed together but the challenge is actually how we practise this.

_How do people from your culture perceive Americans?_

Very individual like, and also very casual, the way of thinking and behaving. So whenever we have a challenge of changing American style in thinking in our culture because when ever we talk about the American way they perceive this as very casual rather than polite. So like when we say to use the guest name they (associates) will go by their first names which is very impolite. Like we have one Associate who went to school in the United States and so when we tell her our mission statement is to provide very casual service from the bottom of your heart. She thinks oh American and so this is very casual and she called the General manager and the guests by their first names which is unacceptable to the local culture. That is one of the challenges we are facing of how Koreans perceive American culture.

_So we have talked about how your culture and American culture differ like manners._

Yes because when people think American culture they think of too many American movies they go very casual like you can say Hi instead of Hello and your welcome instead of my pleasure, so the perception of American culture is that it is very casual.

_The work commitment index which they use in American states that if an employee knows the company direction, they have satisfaction, if they get recognition, if they get opportunities for personal growth and there is a balance between their work and their life they will make personal sacrifices to help the company, they’ll better themselves, they will recommend the_
hotel and the product to friends and family as one of the best hotels in the area and they will stay. How does that model sound to you?

Yes it sounds correct but how are you going to apply it and practise it? Yes recognition is one way to make people to stay longer with the company but can you make it as fair as possible? Are you going to be understood by all Associates say if you just choose one for Associate of the month. Also making the personal balance can the general manager and the other executives ask their associates to go home when they should and get their rest and not think about the hotel business – I am not quite sure. I think that everything that you listed is theoretically correct and it is the way that have to go but the way of applying it to the real world needs to be more flexible and should depend on the culture.

So if you had a clean slate and we asked you to create committed employees what would be the things that would be the most important to them?

They want to have a feeling of trust and also they want to have a feeling of being treated as equally important as others. They want their work to be recognised not in the way of money or promotion but when they do hard work and the general manager stops by and says well done this is what they want. They just want their role to be considered important in the hotel.

Is it important to recognised their role as an individual or as a part of the team?

Both are equally important

If we were talking about different types of recognition and say it is more important for associates to be dealt with based on their particular circumstances or is it more important for there to be one rule and that one
rule be applied to every one regardless. Which one would be preferred in your culture?

I think the way it has to go is one rule applied equally to everybody and we sometimes make a lot of exceptions, so more particular.

Is your culture or about looking after the individual or looking after the group?
Looking after the group.

So do you think group recognition and incentives that could increase commitment?
Yes it could be said that way.

When you do business is is very structure or emotionally involved?
As an HR person I preferred to get people involved and get more emotionally related but in tradition it is more structured it is a time of transition for Korean culture.

When you do business does the relationship go on beyond the business or does it only go for as long as the business?
Goes beyond.

Is it more important for your associates to be recognised for what they are going to achieve in the future or is more important for them to be recognised for what they have achieved in the past?
So in creating work commitment would be important to have program, incentives that gives recognition which looks at the past rather than now?
Yes I think that it is right now we recognise that you have done a good job in the past and now we are going to set higher goals and we are sure you will be successful this is how you can approach Korean culture.

*When we look at time are the associates more past orientated in that they tend to place more of their value on the past of the culture and the hotel or are they more future oriented looking forward not so much history.*

In terms of receiving the company philosophies I would say the past how Merico does the business. But in terms of their career they are looking the future. As a culture they want to know about past.

*If you think at how they look at the environment. Is it a need to be in harmony with or is it something that they cohabit with not an integral part.*

They want to be in harmony.

*So if there were programs in place that deal with this would it create more commitment?*

I think so in Korean culture we are said to be working at a higher level if we get in harmony with each other and the environment and if they do this with good teamwork then they can go further beyond their target or their goal.

*So is it important for you to allow opportunities for your associates to work in teams?*

That would be ideal but it is a transition as the young people who are graduating from college now are moving more towards being individuals.

*So if we look at trust what would a company have to do?*
More communication, everything that happens in the company if it is not confidential has to go down to the bottom of the company structure. Business as well as goals. It is not happening quite successfully. We do have a program, they are observing to see how it works like Speak Out because they had a similar program in their past experience.

*Do you think we have a lot of programs but not one that says we have to give xyz information?*

We could give a flyer and it should go down. Because in Korean culture if they feel they are isolated from the information or ignored that makes them very opposite. The reason we have such a strong labour movement is because of the lack of communication between the top people.

*Anything else about culture?*

Many other companies give a lot of lip service so people are curious and they didn’t have much expectation and so it was hard to create the commitment so we have to work on making it true. Also some of the other managers from other parts of the world and they say this is Merico so we have to do it but other local managers have been through it and know it can’t be done and they don’t listen. Probably we need a program for the expatriates to go through to give them an understanding of the local culture and advise on how to manage the managers in Korea. Our managers want to be respected on their past experience and the desire to be respected is even stronger than in other cultures so the managers have to understand that. Otherwise they lose face and they’ll never come up with any new ideas and they will wait and see after one year but we are losing the business in that one-year.
Malaysia

What is considered good and bad in Malaysian culture?
It is good because it is a multi racial society and bad also because it is a multi racial society. There are a lot of taboos and traditions, all kinds, which are good in nature, which become not so good in nature when you compare it to another culture but as far as Malaysians are concerned they are very good.

What are the core values of Malaysia?
Respect for elders is very important, piety, honesty, humility, being humble, valuing differences, trying to work in harmony, saving face, very very important, they pride themselves on team work.

What do you think creates commitment from employees to an organisation in Malaysia?
Compared to the Westerners Malaysians don’t work forever for the organisation. Not like before my parents when it was generations who worked for the same company. Now the way that you treat me is only one factor but the main factor is what am I getting I might take the risk to join something more adventurous or some company that might not be having such a good reputation but I would like to have a try at it so money is the number one thing that creates commitment. In those days they don’t look at money if someone joins the company they are there for life 30 years ago but today it is different. Like my Mum and my Auntie they have been with one company for 30 years but I don’t think that this concept suits the younger generation because they want to retire earlier, they don’t want to retire at the age of 55 it could be that we are looking to retire at the age of 40 or maybe even earlier, and quit the job and do something that I want but to do that I must earn enough and get enough reserve for myself. Commitment
seems only to be in the area of working for myself, my own company but if I am working for somebody else then it depends on my position, sometimes in the higher levels they are committed to the job, middle level it depends more on the income and lower level even more on the income.

*What else other than money?*

Relationships. Between superiors and line Associates there has to be a good relationship with give and take and with respect people will stick onto a company. Now that this is changing, it a question of income and the benefits they get. I feel that it is like if this is your Boss growing in your hand and all the time I have been growing, say for the past six years so I should go along with you. If you go and join the hotel across the road then I will follow you.

*So it is about loyalty to the leader?*

And also the relationship it is also hard to tell your boss you are leaving but it comes back to the offer. In certain cultures they stick on to you. Like in the hotel in the Chinese restaurant if the Main Chef moves you can bet that at least half of them will move regardless of the income they will move because of the relationship. It is a very strong bond, so you can lose half a restaurant overnight, it may not be so common with the others but it will still happen in smaller numbers.

*What else?*

Stability, secure of the company, a long term relationship like my father had a long term relationship with his father and now we are carrying on, benefits comparatively to companies in the area, so if there is privileges and it is more affordable like housing loans then I will stick onto the company. If there is some benefits for myself like I am moving up like I start as a non skilled person and then after a number of years I move up the ranks through
training development then I will stick with the company. Also the job scope and the responsibility given to them. Say over there you are not challenged but then you come here and the job is very challenging and demanding they may only last three months.

What about facilities for your culture?
It is possible to have the same commitment it depends on the people, things that connected to religion, here some people might look for it but I wouldn’t put too much wait on it like in KL they work happily without it. But in Kota Bharu they have to have it, it is a basic facility to them to have prayer rooms. If we didn’t have it we would have no one working for us.

What about Merico’s organisational culture?
I think it is very good but to a small extent the people in our culture have to be educated to this particular culture and see that like speaking your mind and being open which is very Western and is good is something that this culture has not adapted to and has not accepted and it will take some time for them to accept it because sometimes when you talk about speaking your mind and coming forward and saying things it is seen as either a lack of respect for those in a senior position or that I have a free hand to do anything over those in a lower position so I can say anything I like and I am not accountable for the things I say and do because it is an open culture in that sense so people should be educated. American culture is good it expects an Associate to be accountable and responsible for their actions and it develops them. But in this culture, which is, very respect oriented to really emulate it and move over will take some time I guess.

How do people from Malaysia perceive Americans?
They think they have a very open society that they are heavily involved in human rights, super democratic, Malaysians tend to think of all people
Australian and Americans as foreigners, people from the West are all foreigners, generally they have the utmost response for foreigners, whether they are from the States or from Europe or any part, they could African or Thai they have a lot of respect for them. In fact in my observation and I could be wrong they tend to give more respect to the foreigner than they do to the local. Because with the foreigner and the local is different, and they get treated better.

Malaysians don’t differentiate between and American or an English they are all foreigners. Very rarely would you get them asking are you American at the very most they will ask you is which country are you from and then you say you are here there or wherever and it makes no difference to them if you are American or British or whatever.

*The work commitment index (explained) direction, growth, balance, recognition etc how does this fit?*

They way I look at Associates these are all the basic things you have to give to me I mean you are an international company, you are Merico from the West, but I am looking still for something else. An Associate can be committed without having them serve for a long time so I would have to put a question mark, you have this but if I have something better then I would like to try for it.

*If Merico is trying to keep people and not have them leave how do we do it?*  
If you look at the hotel industry expect for a few properties the trend is that they move every three years, four years they move generally for higher positions a way to get a better income, the view is that by moving you get better experience and you move up the ladder and so because of this movement it is difficult, because people are competing to pay a higher wage in company’s automatically the person who has stuck around in one
company will feel that it is not fair and if I move to another company I am going to move to a slightly higher position and get slightly higher pay and I am going to get something back so people don’t stick around long. You will find people sticking around only if that is the main hotel in town for example the Malacca Renaissance, 17 years old it is the oldest hotel in town been around long before all the others so when this was built people thought it was a white elephant but who ever came saw that it was a good paying job and so they stuck onto it because no-one else could complete and some of them have been here for 17 years but now as other hotels open up people move, there a number of people are moving because they are getting paid more and a higher position but now we see the impact and because of the right Boss people will not move. So as other hotel offer more money people will move.

So what does Merico have to do to make them stay?
A very good question. Merico, Hyatt, Sheraton all these things are being doing all these things too.

What would you do to create commitment?
Pay the most, develop, support, environment becomes a secondary factor, like respect, good Boss. Benefits and training and development which is consistent.

If you were to speak generally is it important to give recognition to individuals or groups?
Both if it is a group effort then group if it is individual and very special effort then individually.
One rule or depending on particular circumstances. Generally they would like one rule but sometimes there are situations when you have to deal individually with them.

*Group or individualistic.*

Groups.

When doing business is it structured or emotionally involved? Very emotionally involved.

When you do business does the relationship go on beyond the time of the business or does it stop when the business stops? It goes on.

Past achievements or future achievements? Past

Environment is it to cohabitate or be in harmony with it? Nowadays there is a growing awareness of trying to get a harmony with the environment.

Teams or individual work preferences? Generally team.

Anything else? The AOS when it was first introduced and it still something still so so new to the culture. They don’t see the purpose of the AOS. Sometimes they see it as a tool to get at somebody or the company and sometimes you might have a challenging relationship with a person and they will colour the
whole hotels perception o it and the culture. So we haven’t really come to the point where they are aware of the purpose or how it is a part to this establishment or hotel. To get people to really see things objectively it is a challenge for them to as even a simple thing having to do the AOS and does this have strict privacy and no one is going to see it and know what you wrote or disclosed and even that people are afraid they might know who is it marking those papers and how I am writing and what I am perceiving the company as and they will be very very cautious. There are a lot of questions like who will read this, is there confidentiality or not, will they be able to trace what I have said or things like this.

*What happens in the scores?*
We have a lot of 3’s neither here nor there. It would be good to do without the 3 and in our hotel we have a huge score in the centre. And also the Associate doesn’t like to be out of the pack they don’t like to be isolated. If everyone agrees that this is one way then I would like to be a part of the team and so I will also mark that score. Like in our last 2 AOS the union know when it is coming up and they start to lobby very strongly and they say you have to say this and you have to say this so that the big bosses know it is going on whether it is true or not true so they must say this and they really drive this and so on one side they are telling them to speak their mind and the importance of being open to help company and the other side are lobbying outside everyday.

*Why do they use it like that when you know it goes to Washington and comes back?*
Well our culture is not that educated yet, they are still in between. They only know ‘ah ha’ this is the tool that Merico is using so this is my chance and they use it use it as a tool to say this or that about a particular person
and it may not be true and probably it is not true and they become the victims and they do it because of peer pressure.

*So they either really like or dislike them?*

It isn’t that but they don’t want to be singled out so if the group say they are going this way then they will whether they agree or disagree and they don’t like to be isolated or left out and it works in that way in this sense. They isolate a person and ridicule them and they don’t want to be seen as different so to save face they just go along. They think if I don’t go too high not say that I am satisfied then they will do something about it. The younger generation and the older are different. We are used to being praised a bare minimum. It is perceive that if I tell you that you did really well in school then you will get a big head and so I don’t do it. So they do praise you but a bare minimum enough to move on further and that is it and that is the same in the AOS they say they don’t like the company but the they too are the ones that you ask if they will be here in the next five years and they YES and you ask them if the are planning to retire with the company and again yes. And so from this you can see if you are going to retire with this company you have another 20-25 years and yet. Even managers we don’t praise because the head is getting bigger. Traditional manger say tell them what they did wrong and just average so next time they will do better. To say they can really accept what the AOS is understand what purpose it has and if they feel they are a part of a system in the hotel is something so foreign. We know it is very good but are we culturally ready for that because it might come to a grey area. What works in Merico is respect.
Philippines

Can you tell me about the Philippines about what are some of the core values and beliefs?

I think number one is the family. Like most of the things they do is because of the family. Like the try to perform well at work so they have a continuous source of income for the family and they try to succeed in their careers so they have more money for the family. Next is the spiritual aspect because generally Philippines are Catholic so religion plays an important part for them so what they can and they cannot do is based on their religion. But like we were talking about a while ago the structure but then people pay a lot weight on their religion in that I think one of the reasons is that they have been through a lot of changes in politics, natural calamities but they are strong in their belief that no matter what happens there is one great being that will be there to look after them. That there is one being that they can ask for things.

What do you think creates commitment from an employee to an employer?
The culture in the Philippines is more lets say personal like in the sense that people tend to be more committed to a person not an organisation so if your boss treats you well and you have a good relationship with your boss they tend to stay because of that rather than because of the company is good. If a good boss moves to another company and who is able to look after them and is a company involves the family and provides activities for the family then it is the company but usually it is the person not the company.

What sorts of things do associates look for in being taken care of?
It is basically money, because now especially in our properties there has not been any pay increases in the last three years and so every time we do an AOS these things come up because you aren’t taking good care of us
because others counterparts are getting more than us. Then comes benefits, hospital, insurance and they compare that, but first it is salary which is the number one motivator.

*Why money?*
Because the standard of living is not very high and commodities are getting expensive and salaries just do not come up and so there is always a shortage of what you can afford and what you want. So food clothing price increases but the salary doesn’t increase. This is why salary adjustments is important.

*Are they supporting family?*
Yes because in the Philippines when I say family I don’t only mean their family but also their extended family so if a couple have children a niece an aunt, uncle, nephew everyone stays in one house and they expect you to help them which is why most of the time money is the primary concern. Most people can’t afford to have their own house so a lot of it goes to rental and electricity and food.

*How does your culture differ from the American culture?*
For one thing American culture is pretty straight forward like something you say what you think. In our culture you aren’t suppose to say what you think because there is always the concern that you may hurt the other person so if there is some thing that you don’t like about him you have to find a way of saying it so it doesn’t sound offensive. For most us it is hard for us to find a way so we just pretend nothing is wrong and just get on with it. On the other hand we also feel quite uncomfortable about a positive comment. I think that is the primary difference.
So how does LPP work?

I think it works well in terms of the business goals and seldom are they behaviour based they are straightforward. It can be a little bit tricky in the competency basis especially as I noticed that under each competency you have something under and sometimes Philippines can be very literal and so they stick to what the definitions is so if you don’t fit they just don’t look at it and so I feel there is very little way for your manager looking at different aspects of your work which may be considered under these competencies. And I feel that as we don’t want to hurt anybody we tend to stay in the middle so we give a 2 rather a 1 which would be uncomfortable as we wouldn’t want to say anything very positive and we also stay away from the 3 because that would be very negative so there also it tend to always be a 2, regardless of the performance. What they usually say as an excuse is that Merico regional say we should limit the number of 1’s except for the very best so we give you a 2.

Lets say about the Pilipino in general do they like to have one rule for everyone or do they like to have each particular situation?

Individualistic or group orientated?

Group.

When they do business are they emotional involved or more neutral?

Emotionally involved.

When they do business is it very specific or is it very holistic and involved?

They build relationships.

Is it more important for people to be recognised for the family they are born into or is it more important to be recognised for what I am?
Family is very important. A good example would be in the hotel when politicians comes in they are usually from very well off family. If the waiter doesn’t know who they are they will be called over and told hey you should know me.”

*Are they more past orientated or more future orientated?*
Past.

*Do you think they place a greater importance on being in harmony either the environment or coexisting?*
Coexist.

*When the Americans talk of commitment they say that associates want to know about the company direction, recognition, balance of work and home and as a result those people will develop themselves and stay longer. As far as the WCI model goes s there something more important for the Philippines?*
I think it is similar but I think money is important and an immediate motivator but it doesn’t motivate them very long. If they get a pay rise now in a month from now you will hear them complaining again.

*If you could do anything to create committed employees in your culture?*
I think the Merico culture is working pretty well with the Philippines culture. Our people like the Merico culture.

*Is there a move by the younger generation to be more Western?*
Yes very true in the younger generation because in the Philippines the younger ones are highly Westernised. The Merico culture is quite permissive and so people tend to be abusive of that freedom. Lets say for
example in HR first there were these policies you can not colour your hair and you have to wear closed shoes and then somehow managers got the idea that well Merico allows this and so lets allow that. For example training classes in some companies if you are told you have to turn up for training then you if you don’t you get a counselling session, some sort of warning. But in Merico we just say OK well that’s OK just come latter. Like when we say, “When you are comfortable” the culture gives a lot of freedom and people tend to abuse it. That is why we say there is only one course so they get there.

**AOS?**

Our people always stay in the middle but now we don’t have the place for them to write things they would be more specific with their scores and we saw how different it was and they would really score as they felt. So they realised now they couldn’t write they thought well Merico cannot help me if I don’t score it so they went for the 1 or the 5. In Asia they could remove the 3.
Appendix F
WORK COMMITMENT ACTIVITY

Purpose of the activity:

The purpose of the activity is to begin to uncover groups of items that are considered important to our Associates in the development of commitment between employees and employers/organisations. It is expected that national culture will play a role in defining these items.

Scope of Activity:

The following activity will need to be completed to gain the information required for this research. The activity should take between one and two hours.

What you will need for the activity:

5 blank cards (provided) for each group.

Approximately 15-20 Associates who represent different types of people in the countries hotels. For example some male/some female, some line hourly direct reports /some Supervisors and Managers, some young/some mature, some new to the company/ some with long tenure and so on.

Flip chart paper, textas.

1 x White board/flip chart with the following printed on it and displayed at the front of the room:

   What makes you committed
   or would make you more committed
   as an employee to
   your employer/organisation?

4 sets of prepared cards. An example set is included with these instructions as well as cards for you to prepare your 4 sets. For reasons of translation unfortunately it was not possible to prepare all sets for you. You will need four identical sets as these will be given
to the four groups in the activity. These should be on the same size cards as the five blank ones given to each group but written by the facilitator as follows (note one phrase per card):

- I am recognized and rewarded for good work.
- I have opportunities for personal growth.
- I have job satisfaction for the work I do everyday.
- There is a balance of work and personal life.
- I know what direction the company is heading.
- There is a good work environment.
- What I achieve in the future is more important than what I have done in the past.
- My past achievements are recognized as more important than my future goals.
- Rules are more important than relationships.
- Relationships are more important than the rules.
- What I achieve as an individual is the most important thing.
- My family status is recognized as important to who I am.
- This company is in harmony with the environment.
- This company recognizes the business is more important than the environment.
- I do not have to be emotionally attached to those I work with and do business with.
- I am able to be emotionally attached to those I work with and do business with. Business is business.
- My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing.
- The welfare and prosperity of my work group is the most important thing.
- The relationships I make with my coworkers and customers last only as long as the business we do.
- The relationships I make with my coworkers and customers are involved and important to me.

**Activity Guidelines:**

1. Ask each Associate to read the Questions displayed (5minutes):

What makes you committed or would make you more committed as an employee to your employer/organisation?
2. Tell the Associates that they will share their items with the group latter but first individually that they are to write down the 5 most important things which create commitment for them on blank paper. They may thing of less than 5 but should have at least 2 or 3. (15 minutes)

3. Have the group divide into four equal teams and go to their new tables with a flip chart at each. (5 minutes).

4. On each table have one set of the prepared cards. Stress that these cards are just some suggestions they are not ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ and should be considered equally with their own.

5. Have the group read their items and the additional cards as a group. Each table has five blank cards. If as a group they feel that any of their items are more important to them as a team than the prepared items then they can add it to a blank card. Each table can do this up to five times. Tell the Associates that they will soon be given time to discuss each item and decide on its importance to them. They need to make the decisions as a team (10 minutes).

6. When they are ready they should take the pile of cards and place them into four (4) categories as follows. They need to agree as a team on which category each falls into. The categories are as follows:

   A) I strongly agree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organization.
   B) I agree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organization.
   C) I disagree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organization.
   D) I strongly disagree that if a company had/has this in place that I would be committed to that organization.

   (25 minutes)

8. Have the Associates write down on a flip chart the three most important items as ranked by their team and report out to the other groups (5 minutes).

9. The facilitator should now facilitate a discussion among all the tables and try to have the whole group come to an agreement on the top three items. (This may not always be possible and if there is disagreement.)

10. Have the groups tie their cards in order and with the number category which they have placed it in clearly marked on each card with rubber bands and place them with their flipcharts in the centre of the table (15 minutes).
11. To close the facilitator may mention Merico is working hard to uncover what will create the most commitment in all countries around the world and we are all very different in what we believe to be important as demonstrated by the activity. The activity is designed to gather Associates ideas on what is of importance to them in creating commitment and will hopefully result in a better alignment of Merico and the needs of our region (5 minutes).

**Last step!**

Collect *all* of the numbered cards from each group (keep in table groups) and keep with the groups corresponding flip chart and (if completed) the overall groups flip chart results. All of these need to be returned together with the following information:

- Hotel name
- HR/Facilitator name

Number in the group and the following information for each participant their age (e.g. 21-30 / 31-40 / 41-50 / 41-50 / 50+), gender( M/F), position (management / non-management), nationality, tenure with Merico (less than 1 year / 1 – 3 years / 4 – 8 years / 9 years + ).

This information could be collated from the associates at the end of the activity or alternatively from the HR department. One method is to have them write this information down on a blank card and have them place this in the centre of the table without their name.

Please forward the information if other than Australia to:

Regional Director of Training

Or if in Australia to:

Mrs. Ruth North
Human Resources Department
PO Box 1342
Surfers Paradise
AUSTRALIA 4217
Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me via cc mail c/o Surfers Paradise Australia GM CY at LDG3_REMOTE or e-mail or fax (617)55920026 or phone (617)55793499. Once again many many thanks for your help!
RESULTS:

**Group One:**

- Friendly place
- Sense of family
- Flexibility of hours
- Best 5 star in region
- Good pay and benefits
- Good job security
- Balance of work and family
- Recognised for good work
- Location to home
- Pleasant surroundings
- Opportunity for personal growth
- Management flexibility
- I know the company’s direction
- Skill development opportunities
- Company size possibility of transfers
- The company cares for the environment
- I can work in teams
- The company helps my group get what we need

**Group Two Results:**

The second group listed the following items in order of importance:

- Satisfaction
- Recognition
- Management that cares for its staff
- I have the opportunity for personal growth (training)
- Good job security, positive environment
- Equality
- Commitment. Respect for the job I do.
- Good pay and other benefits
- I can work in teams
- Career
- I know the company’s direction
- The company helps my group get what we need
- Answers to problems or issues
- A company that really understands the importance of a family
- Big company

**Group Three**

When I enjoy my job.
- Good pay and other benefits
- Good job security
- I have opportunities for personal growth
Admiration of the property/reputation
When the work environment is good
When there is a balance for work and family
Variety in my job
Availability to transfer to other departments (cross-training)
No red tape, not being closely watched all the time
Admiration for my immediate supervisor
I am recognised for good work
Experience
Having realistic budget to keep upgrading and improving department
Stock options
I like being singled out for praise
I know the company’s direction
Associate camaraderie the company helps my group get what we need
The company cares for the environment
I can work in teams

**Group Four**
I know the company’s direction
I like being singled out for praise
Flexibility
When there is a balance for work and family
Good pay and other benefits
I have opportunities for personal growth
A nice place to work
I can work in teams
I am recognised for good work
Good job security
The company helps my group get what we need
When the work environment is good
Management's staff are good
RESULTS
Activity Two: Kota Bharu, Malaysia.

Group One:

A) Welfare of group
   Good job satisfaction
   Recognized and rewarded for good work
   I have opportunities for personal growth
   Good money
   The relationships I make with my customers & co-workers are involved and important to me
   I form strong relationships with those I work with and do business with
   This company is in harmony with the environment

B) I know the direction this company is heading
   The work environment is good
   Rules are there but each individual’s situation will be considered
   My family, kinship, status are viewed as not important

C) Rules are applied to all associates the same regardless of their specific situations
   My past achievements are very important to how I am judged
   My family, kinship, status is viewed as important
   Relationships I make with co-workers and customers usually last only as long as the business we do
   My welfare as an individual is the most important thing
   The environment is not as important as the business we do
   I have formal/detached relationships with those I work with and do business with

D) I am judged on the future not my past
   There is a balance of work/family life

Group 2

A) The work environment is good
   I am judged on the future and not my past
   The company is in harmony with the environment
   I have job satisfaction from the work I do everyday
   I know the direction this company is heading
   Rules are applied the same to all associates regardless of their specific situations
I am recognised and rewarded for good work
I have opportunities for personal growth
I have a balance of work/family life
My family, kinship, status are viewed as important

B) Welfare of the group
My past achievements are very important to how I am judged
Rules are there but each individual’s situation will be considered
Good Money

C) My welfare & prosperity as an individual is the most important thing
The relationships I make with my co-workers and customers are involved and important to me
My family status, kinship are viewed as NOT important
The relationships I make with my co-workers and customers usually last only as long as the business we do
The environment is not as important as the business we do
I have formal/detached relationships with those I work with

Group 3
A) I am recognised and rewarded for good work
I get job satisfaction from the work I do everyday
There is a balance of my work and life
I know the direction this company is heading
The relationships I make with my customers/co-workers and customers are involved and important to me

B) I form strong relationships with those I work with and do business with.
Good money
Opportunities for personal growth
The work environment is good
Rules are there but each individual situation will be considered

C) Rules are applied to all associates the same regardless of their specific situations.
The company is in harmony with the environment.
My welfare as an individual is the most important thing.
My family, kinship, status is not important
I have formal/detached relationships with those I work with and do business with

D) Relationships I make with co-workers and customers usually lasts only as long as the business we do
I am judged on the future not my past
Appendix G
In this research, the following statements, within the survey, represent the dimensions explored in the PDS I & II:

*Universal versus Particular*

**PDS I**
- A) Rules should be applied to all employees the same regardless of their specific situations.
- B) Rules should be applied based on each individual situation.

**PDS II**
- A) Rules at work should be applied to all employees in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
- B) Rules at work should be applied based on each individual situation.

*Individualism versus Collectivism*

**PDS I**
- C) My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing.
- D) The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing.

**PDS II**
- A) I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
- B) I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and or team than as an individual.

*Affective versus Neutral*

**PDS I**
- A) I have formal relationships those I work with and do business with.
- B) I form strong relationships with those I do work with and do business with.

**PDS II**
- A) It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
- B) I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
Specific versus Diffuse

PDS I
A) The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.
B) The relationships I make with my customers are involved an important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

PDSII
A) The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
B) The relationships I make with my co-workers are involved an important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Ascription versus Achievement

PDSI
A) The use of a person’s title is relevant when related to the task.
B) The use of titles and respect for seniors is important to me.

PDSII
A) Seniors should be judged on their effectiveness and performance.
B) A senior should be given respect regardless of performance and effectiveness.

Future versus Past Oriented

PDS I
A) I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.
B) My past achievements are very important to how I am judged,

PDSII
A) Future opportunities are my focus.
B) History and tradition are very important to me.

Internal Control versus External Control - Environment Orientation

PDSI
A) My concern is about my self.
B) My concern is about others.

PDSII
A) I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.
B) I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
Low Power Distance versus High Power Distance

**PDSI**
A) It is right to have elders in more senior positions.
B) Leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

**PDSII**
A) Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
B) There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

Masculinity versus Femininity

**PDSI**
A) I place value on achievement.
B) I place value on relationships

**PDSII**
A) I place value on assertiveness.
B) I place value on modesty.

Uncertainty Avoidance

**PDS I**
A) I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.
B) I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

**PDS II**
A) I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
B) I am prepared to take risks.

Job Satisfaction / Remuneration

**PDSI**
A) I have job satisfaction for the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
B) Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

**PDSII**
A) I have job satisfaction for the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
B) Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
PREFERRED DIMENSIONS SURVEY I (PDSII)

The following questionnaire presents pairs of items. Please read both items and circle either (a) or (b) at the front of the item that is MOST TRUE for you. For example:

1a I make friends easily at work
1b I like to do tasks which have a tangible outcome.

If it is very true for you that you make friends easily at work, but only true for you that you like tasks which have a tangible outcome, then circle ‘1a’.
If it is very true for you that you like tasks with a tangible outcome but only very true for you that you make friends easily at work, then circle ‘1b’. Naturally, if it is true for you that you make friends easily at work, but untrue for you that you like tasks with tangible outcomes, circle ‘1a’.

Sometimes it will be hard to tell which statement is most true for you. There are no right answers. Circle the statement which seems most true for you just at this moment. Work quickly and do not think too hard about each pair. Your first reaction is the response that we want.

If both statements seem equally true for you then please try to determine which one may be just a little more true. You will get another chance latter to reconsider these statements in conjunction with others and can show how true the statements are for you many times. It is important that you circle one statement as being more true (even if there is just a small difference) for you than the other.

If you have any questions about these statements please ask your Human Resources Associates.

Thankyou for your time in helping us with this questionnaire.
1a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
1b The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.

2a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
2b I place value on achievement.

3a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
3b History and tradition are very important to me.

4a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
4b I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

5a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
5b I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

6a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
6b I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

7a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
7b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

8a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
8b My personal time is very important to me.

9a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
9b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

10a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
10b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

11a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
11b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

12a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
12b I place value on achievement.

13a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
13b I place value on relationships
14a The use of a persons title is only relevant when related to the task.
14b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
15a The use of a persons title is only relevant when related to the task.
15b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
16a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
16b The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
17a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
17b The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
18a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
18b It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
19a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
19b I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
20a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
20b Future opportunities are my focus.
21a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
21b History and tradition are very important to me.
22a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
22b I place value on achievement.
23a The use of a persons title is only relevant when related to the task.
23b I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
24a The use of a person’s title is only relevant when related to the task.
24b Future opportunities are my focus.

25a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.
25b I place value on relationships.

26a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.
26b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

27a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
27b I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

28a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
28b I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

29a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
29b I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

30a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
30b I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

31a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
31b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

32a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
32b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

33a A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.
33b My personal time is very important to me.
A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I place value on achievement.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I place value on relationships.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
46a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
46b It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

47a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
47b I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

48a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
48b Future opportunities are my focus.

49a The use of a persons title is only relevant when related to the task.
49b It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

50a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
50b History and tradition are very important to me.

51a The use of a persons title is only relevant when related to the task.
51b A senior should be given respect regardless of their performance and their effectiveness.

52a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
52b I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

53a I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.
53b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

54a I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.
54b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

55a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
55b I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

56a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
56b I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

57a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
57b I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

58a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
58b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

60a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
60b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

61a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
61b My personal time is very important to me.

62a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
62b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

63a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
63b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

64a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
64b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

65a The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.
65b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.
The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

I place value on relationships.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I place value on relationships.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I place value on relationships.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers usually last only as long as the business we do.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Future opportunities are my focus.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

History and tradition are very important to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

My personal time is very important to me.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I place value on achievement.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I place value on relationships.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

The use of a persons title is only relevant when related to the task.

The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
98a The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

98b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

99a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

99b I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

100a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

100b Future opportunities are my focus.

101a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

101b I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

102a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

102b I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

103a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

103b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

104a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

104b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

105a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

105b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

106a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

106b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

107a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
107b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

108a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
108b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age

109a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
109b I place value on achievement.

110a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
110b I place value on relationships.

111a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
111b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

112a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
112b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

113a I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
113b Future opportunities are my focus.

114a I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
114b History and tradition are very important to me.

115a I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
115b I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

116a I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
116b I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

117a I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.
I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

My personal time is very important to me.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.
I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

I place value on relationships.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

Future opportunities are my focus.

History and tradition are very important to me.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

Future opportunities are my focus.
I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

Future opportunities are my focus.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

Future opportunities are my focus.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

Future opportunities are my focus.

My personal time is very important to me.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I place value on achievement.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I place value on achievements.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

I place value on achievement.

Future opportunities are my focus.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
History and tradition are very important to me.
I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

History and tradition are very important to me.
I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

History and tradition are very important to me.
I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

History and tradition are very important to me.
I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

History and tradition are very important to me.
My personal time is very important to me.

History and tradition are very important to me.
I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.
I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.
158b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

159a I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.
159b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
160a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
160b History and tradition are very important to me.

161a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
161b I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.

162a It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.
162b I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and/or team rather than as an individual.

163a I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.
163b I place value on relationships.

164a History and tradition are very important to me.
164b My personal time is very important to me.

165a History and tradition are very important to me.
165b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

166a History and tradition are very important to me.
166b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

167a History and tradition are very important to me.
167b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

168a History and tradition are very important to me.
168b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

169a History and tradition are very important to me.
169b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
170a  History and tradition are very important to me.
170b  I place value on achievement.

171a  History and tradition are very important to me.
171b  I place value on relationships.

172a  History and tradition are very important to me.
172b  I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

173a  History and tradition are very important to me.
173b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

174a  I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
174b  I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and or team rather than as an individual.

175a  I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
175b  I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

176a  I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
176b  I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

177a  I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
177b  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

178a  I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
178b  Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

179a  I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
179b  My personal time is very important to me.

180a  The use of a person’s title is only relevant when related to the task.
180b I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

181a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
181b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

182a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
182b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

183a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
183b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

184a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
184b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

185a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
185b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

186a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
186b I place value on achievement.

187a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
187b I place value on relationships.

188a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
188b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

189a I prefer to be recognised and rewarded for good work as an individual rather than as a group or team.
189b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
190a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
190b I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

191a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
191b I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

192a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
192b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

193a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
193b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

194a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
194b My personal time is very important to me.

195a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
195b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

196a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
196b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

198a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
198b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

199a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
199b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

200a I prefer to get recognition for my whole group/and or team rather than as an individual.
I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

Future opportunities are my focus.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I prefer to get recognition for my whole group and or team rather than as an individual.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I can openly share my emotions with those I work with and do business with.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

It is not appropriate to display excessive emotions with those I work with and do business with.

My personal time is very important to me.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.
210b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

211a I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.
211b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

212a I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.
212b I place value on achievement.

213a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
213b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

214a I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.
214b I place value on relationships.

215a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
215b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

216a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
216a My personal time is very important to me.

216a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
216b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

217a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
217b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

218a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
219b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

220a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
220b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

221a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
221b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

222a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
222b I place value on achievement.

223a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
223b I place value on relationships.

224a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
224b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

225a I have a flexible attitude and will compromise to keep the peace.
225b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

226a Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
226b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

227a The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
227b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

228a The relationships I make with my co-workers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
228b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

229a Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I place value on achievement.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

My personal time is very important to me.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
239a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
239b My personal time is very important to me.

240a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
240b I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

241a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
241b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

242a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
242b I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

243a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
243b I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

244a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
244b I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

245a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
245b I place value on achievement.

246a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
246b I place value on achievement.

246a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
246b I place value on relationships.

247a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
248b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

My personal time is very important to me.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

My personal time is very important to me.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I place value on relationships.

I am willing to have a conflict with another if what I believe is right.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

My personal time is very important to me.

I consider stability and certainty to be very important.

My personal time is very important to me.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

My personal time is very important to me.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.

My personal time is very important to me.

I place value on achievement.

My personal time is very important to me.

I place value on relationships.

My personal time is very important to me.
I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

My personal time is very important to me.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

I place value on achievement.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

I place value on achievement.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

I place value on achievement.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I place value on relationships.

I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.
I place value on achievement.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.
I place value on relationships.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.
I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I believe that it is right to have elders in more senior positions.
Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
I place value on achievement.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
I place value on relationships.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I believe that leaders should be selected for their talents not their status or age.
Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I place value on achievement.
I place value on relationships.

The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
I am happy to dedicate all of my time to the company, if they need me.
278a The use of a person's title is only relevant when related to the task.
278b I am comfortable with a certain amount of change and uncertainty.

279a I place value on achievement.
279b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

280a I place value on achievement.
280b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

281a I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
271b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
PREFERED DIMENSIONS SURVEY II (PDSI)
The following questionnaire presents pairs of items. Please read both items and circle either (a) or (b) at the front of the item that is MOST TRUE for you. For example:

1a  I make friends easily at work
1b  I like to do tasks which have a tangible outcome.

If it is very true for you that you make friends easily at work, but only true for you that you like tasks which have a tangible outcome, then circle ‘1a’. If it is very true for you that you like tasks with a tangible outcome but only very true for you that you make friends easily at work, then circle ‘1b’. Naturally, if it is true for you that you make friends easily at work, but untrue for you that you like tasks with tangible outcomes, circle ‘1a’.

Sometimes it will be hard to tell which statement is most true for you. There are no right answers. Circle the statement which seems most true for you just at this moment. Work quickly and do not think too hard about each pair. Your first reaction is the response that we want.

If both statements seem equally true for you then please try to determine which one may be just a little more true. You will get another chance latter to reconsider these statements in conjunction with others and can show how true the statements are for you many times. It is important that you circle one statement as being more true (even if there is just a small difference) for you than the other.

If you have any questions about these statements please ask your Human Resources Associates.

Thankyou for your time in helping us with this questionnaire.
1a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
1b. I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.

2a. My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.
2b. I place value on modesty.

3a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
3b. I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.

4a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
4b. I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

5a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
5b. I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

6a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
6b. My past achievements are very important to how I am judged,

7a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
7b. My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

8a. I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
8b. I place value on modesty.

9a. The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
9b. My concern is about others.

10a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
10b. The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

11a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
11b. My concern is about myself.

12a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
12b. My concern is about others.

13a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
13b. Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

14a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
14b. Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

15a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
15b. I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

16a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
16b. I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

17a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
17b. I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

18a. I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
18b. My concern is about others.

19a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
19b. I am prepared to take risks.

20a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
20b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

21a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
21b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

22a. I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
22b The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

23a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
23b I place value on assertiveness.

24a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
24b I place value on modesty.

25a The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
25b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

26a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
26b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

27a. I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
27b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

28a. I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
28b The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
29a. I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
29b I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.

30a. I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
30b I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

31a. I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
31b I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

32a I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
32b My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

33a I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
33b My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

34a My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.
34b I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

35a My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.
35b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

36a I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
36b The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

37a I view my family / kinship background as important to who I am.
37b The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.
38a  My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.
38b  I am prepared to take risks.

39a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
39b  The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

40a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
40b  My concern is about myself.

41a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
41b  I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

42a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
42b  I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

43a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
43b  I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

44a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
44b  I am prepared to take risks.

45a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
45b  Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

46a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
46b  I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

47a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
47b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
57a The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.
57b My concern is about my self.

58a The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.
58b My concern is about others.

59a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
59b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

60a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
60b I place value on assertiveness.

61a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
61b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

62a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
62b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

63a The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.
63b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

64a The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.
64b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

65a The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.
65b I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

I place value on modesty.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I am prepared to take risks.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I place value on assertiveness.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I place value on modesty.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my customers usually last only as long as the business we do.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

My concern is about my self.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

My concern is about others.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

I am prepared to take risks.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

I am prepared to take risks.

I place value on assertiveness.

I am prepared to take risks.

I place value on modesty.

I am prepared to take risks.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I am prepared to take risks.
Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I place value on assertiveness.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I place value on modesty.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
93b  I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

94a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
94b  My concern is about others.

95a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
95b  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

96a  I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
96b  Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

97a  I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
97b  I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

98a  I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
98b  My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

99a  I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
99b  My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

100a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
100b The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

101a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
101b My concern is about my self.

102a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
102b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
103a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
103b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

104a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
104b I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

105a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
105b I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

106a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
106b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

107a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
107b I am prepared to take risks.

108a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
108b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

109a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
109b I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

110a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
110b My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

111a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
111b My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

112a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
112b The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

113a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
113b My concern is about myself.

114a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
114b My concern is about others.

115a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
115b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

116a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
116b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

117a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
117b I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

118a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
118b I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

119a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
119b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

120a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
120b I am prepared to take risks.

121a I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.
121b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

I place value on assertiveness.

I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

I place value on modesty.

I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

My concern is about my self.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

My concern is about others.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I am prepared to take risks.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I place value on assertiveness.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I place value on modesty.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.
My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

My concern is about my self.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

My concern is about others.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.

I am prepared to take risks.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.
I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

I place value on assertiveness.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

My past achievements are very important to how I am judged.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

My concern is about others.

My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
164a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
164b I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

165a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
165b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

166a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
166b I am prepared to take risks.

167a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
167b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

168a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
168b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

169a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
169b I place value on assertiveness.

170a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
170b I place value on modesty.

171a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
171a I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

172a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
172b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

173a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
173b My concern is about my self.

174a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
174b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

175a I do not share my private feelings with those I work with and do business with.
175b I place value on assertiveness.

176a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
176b Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

177a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
177b Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

178a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
178b I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

179a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
179b I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

180a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
180b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

181a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
181b I am prepared to take risks.

182a The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.
Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

I place value on assertiveness.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

I place value on modesty.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

My concern is about my self.

My concern is about others.

My concern is about my self.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

My concern is about my self.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

My concern is about my self.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

My concern is about my self.
204b I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
205a My concern is about my self.
205b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
206a My concern is about my self.
206b I am prepared to take risks.
207a Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
207b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.
208a Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
208b I place value on assertiveness.
209a Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
209b I place value on modesty.
210a I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
210b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and the power shared.
211a I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
211b I place value on assertiveness.
212a I do not view my family / kinship background as an important part of who I am.
212b I place value on modesty.
213a My concern is about my self.
213b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
214a My concern is about my self.
214b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.
215a My concern is about my self.
I place value on assertiveness.  

My concern is about my self.  
I place value on modesty.  

My concern is about my self.  
I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.  

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.  
I have strong personal relationships with those I work with and do business with.  

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.  
I am judged on what I can achieve in the future.  

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.  
My past achievements are very important to how I am judged,  

The relationships I make with my customers are important to me and often continue after our business dealing are complete.  
My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.  

My concern is about my self.  
Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.  

My concern is about others.  
I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.  

My concern is about others.  
I am prepared to take risks.  

My concern is about others.  
Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
My concern is about others.
There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

I place value on assertiveness.

I place value on modesty.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

I am prepared to take risks.

Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
236b  Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

237a  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
237b  There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

238a  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
238b  I place value on assertiveness.

239a  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
239b  I place value on modesty.

240a  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
240b  I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

241a  Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.
242b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

243a  Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
243b  I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

244a  Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
244b  I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

245a  Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
245b  I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

246a  My concern is about others.
Rules at work should be applied to all associates in the same way regardless of their specific situations.

My concern is about others.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

My concern is about others.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

I place value on modesty.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.

Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.

I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.

I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
236a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
236b I am prepared to take risks.

237a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
237b I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.

238a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
238b I am prepared to take risks.

239a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
239b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

240a Rules at work should be applied based on each individual’s particular situation.
240b I place value on assertiveness.

241a I am expected to be close and show loyalty to my community and in return they will look after me if something goes wrong, no matter what.
241b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

242a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
242b I am prepared to take risks.

243a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
243b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

244a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
244b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

245a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
245b I place value on assertiveness.

246a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
246b I place value on modesty.
247a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
247b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

248a I am uncomfortable with change and uncertainty.
248b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

249a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
249b Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

250a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
250b There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.

251a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
251b The welfare and prosperity of my group is the most important thing to me.

252a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
252b My concern is about my self.

253a My welfare and prosperity as an individual is the most important thing to me.
253b My concern is about others.

254a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
254b I place value on assertiveness.

255a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
255b I place value on modesty.

256a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
256b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

257a I am not expected to be a close part of my community but need only look after myself and my family.
257b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

258a  I am prepared to take risks.
258b  Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.

259a  Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
259b  I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

260a  Having many layers of management allows for the respect of higher positions.
260b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

261a  There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.
261b  I place value on assertiveness.

262a  There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.
262b  I place value on modesty.

263a  There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.
263b  I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

264a  There should be less layers of management; we should work more as a team and share the power.
264b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

265a  I place value on assertiveness.
265b  I place value on modesty.

266a  I place value on assertiveness.
266b  I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

267a  I place value on assertiveness.
267b  Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

268a  I place value on modesty.
268b I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.

269a I place value on modesty.
269b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.

270a I am satisfied with the work I do every day and this is the most important thing to me.
270b Earning the best money I can earn for the type of work I can do is the most important thing to me.
Appendix H
### RANKALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUSTRALIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missing System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KOREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MALASIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
27th September 2001

Dear HR Colleagues,

I would appreciate your help in completing the following activity for me to assist with my research into Work Commitment in the Asia Pacific Region which I am undertaking for Merico International. As I have already spent time with most of you, you would be aware that my focus is on developing an index which could best measure commitment to an organisation through using our AOS.

In America they already use one version but my hypothesis is that what creates commitment is influenced by national culture and therefore what creates commitment will be different in our part of the world. Following are some of the draft AOS questions as they appear for 2001. I would appreciate it if you could assist me by selecting the six (6) questions in order of preference which you think are the most important factors in creating work commitment from employees to an employer and complete this in the section below. Thank you for your assistance and I look forward to your replies if possible by the 8th of October 2001 by email or to PO Box 1342, Surfers Paradise, Queensland, Australia 4214.

Thank you once again and kind regards.
Ruth North

Considering the following Questions which would you rate as the top six in order as creating work commitment in your country between an employee and an employer:

Ranked First = Question number__
Ranked Second = Question number__
Ranked Third = Question number__
Ranked Fourth = Question number__
Ranked Fifth = Question number__
Ranked Sixth = Question number__

**AOS Questions:**

**Satisfaction…**

6. Overall, how satisfied are you with your job at this property?
Overall, how would you rate this COMPANY as a place to work compared to other companies you know about or have worked for?
The work environment…
How would you rate this property on each of the following issues, considering your experience here?
Having the supplies, tools, or equipment to do your job.
Your overall associate benefits package.
Your job security.
Treating you with respect as an individual.
Providing the same level of service to all guests regardless of race, gender, or where they come from.
Your opportunity to advance and develop your career.
Your pay compared to similar jobs in this city.
Providing you with an immediate supervisor that deals fairly and plays no favourites.

Work and life…
I feel that I am given the flexibility that I need to balance my work and family life.

The people you work with…
When needed, my co-workers make special personal efforts to help our property to be successful (for example, working extra hours, etc).
This property is able to keep high quality associates.
My co-workers make personal efforts to improve their skills so they are able to do their jobs better at this property.
This property hires quality associates.

Leadership at this property…
How often are your contributions recognized at this property?
My immediate supervisor gives me feedback on my job performance that helps me do my job better.
Management at this property understands and appreciates the differences between the people we work with.
My immediate supervisor gives me guidance on developing my career with this company.
I receive sufficient information to do my job well.
I feel like I am part of a “family” at this property.

The Guest…
In your opinion, what is the quality of service this property provides to guests?
I have the authority to make decisions and take action to satisfy our guests.

Your work and career…
My job is challenging and interesting.
My job fully utilizes my skills and abilities.
I know what is expected of me in my job.
I understand how my job contributes to the achievement of the overall goals and objectives of this property.
Associates’ suggestions are listened to and acted upon.
I have been trained to do my daily tasks well. This company provides learning opportunities beyond job skills training.

The company…
I am proud to work for this company.
I would recommend this company as one of the best places to work in my community.
I would recommend this company’s products and services as the best that a guest could buy.
There is a good fit between my values and those of this company.
I would stay with this company even if offered a similar job with slightly higher pay at another company.
I intend to stay with this company for at least the next three years.
Appendix J
Results of the Dependent Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKALL</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of the Independent Variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K
## COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7896</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malasia</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WCI correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall job satisfaction</th>
<th>Opportunities to advance develop career</th>
<th>Part of a &quot;family&quot;</th>
<th>Understand different between people</th>
<th>Understand the core goals</th>
<th>Associates who motivate through recognition and rewards</th>
<th>Co-workers make personal efforts to improve their skills</th>
<th>Intent to stay at least 3 years</th>
<th>Recommend company’s products and services</th>
<th>Recommend this company as one of the best places to work</th>
<th>WCISCOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Corr.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Corr.</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>.551*</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>.416*</td>
<td>.484*</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.460*</td>
<td>.460*</td>
<td>.158*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16917</td>
<td>15819</td>
<td>16278</td>
<td>16073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to advance develop career</td>
<td>.505*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.512*</td>
<td>.586*</td>
<td>.396*</td>
<td>.504*</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.398*</td>
<td>.396*</td>
<td>.406*</td>
<td>.512*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>16411</td>
<td>15924</td>
<td>15847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of a &quot;family&quot;</td>
<td>.551*</td>
<td>.512*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.602*</td>
<td>.434*</td>
<td>.503*</td>
<td>.450*</td>
<td>.455*</td>
<td>.477*</td>
<td>.464*</td>
<td>.602*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16278</td>
<td>15924</td>
<td>16986</td>
<td>16190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand different between people</td>
<td>.538*</td>
<td>.586*</td>
<td>.602*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.447*</td>
<td>.551*</td>
<td>.416*</td>
<td>.447*</td>
<td>.418*</td>
<td>.477*</td>
<td>.572*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16073</td>
<td>15847</td>
<td>16190</td>
<td>16691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the core goals</td>
<td>.416*</td>
<td>.396*</td>
<td>.434*</td>
<td>.447*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.436*</td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td>.342*</td>
<td>.368*</td>
<td>.416*</td>
<td>.456*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16223</td>
<td>15986</td>
<td>16260</td>
<td>16148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates who motivate through recognition and rewards</td>
<td>.484*</td>
<td>.504*</td>
<td>.503*</td>
<td>.551*</td>
<td>.436*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.341*</td>
<td>.365*</td>
<td>.368*</td>
<td>.433*</td>
<td>.510*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16254</td>
<td>15926</td>
<td>16304</td>
<td>16200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers make personal efforts to improve their skills</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.450*</td>
<td>.416*</td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td>.341*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>.537*</td>
<td>.311*</td>
<td>.335*</td>
<td>.372*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16348</td>
<td>16031</td>
<td>16471</td>
<td>16347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.814(^a)</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>9.5199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Associates are motivated through recognition and rewards, Understand the company goals, Opportunities to advance and develop career, Overall job satisfaction, Part of a "family", Understand/appreciate differences between the people

**ANOVA\(^b\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1847224</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>307870.623</td>
<td>3397.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>941354.4</td>
<td>10387</td>
<td>90.628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2788578</td>
<td>10393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), Associates are motivated through recognition and rewards, Understand the company goals, Opportunities to advance and develop career, Overall job satisfaction, Part of a "family", Understand/appreciate differences between the people

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: WCISCORE
### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>112.447</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>396.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>-3.436</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities to advance</td>
<td>-1.651</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop career</td>
<td>-4.426</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of a &quot;family&quot;</td>
<td>-2.334</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appreciate differences</td>
<td>-2.709</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between the people</td>
<td>-1.252</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates are motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through recognition and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: WCIScore

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WCISCORE</th>
<th>Company as A Place to Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>WCISCORE</td>
<td>Company as A Place to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCISCORE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.639**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11615</td>
<td>11247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company as A Place to Work</td>
<td>.639**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11247</td>
<td>16659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Associate Benefit Package</th>
<th>Job Security</th>
<th>Opportunities to advance and develop career</th>
<th>Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly</th>
<th>Trust in supervisor</th>
<th>Proud to work for this company</th>
<th>Recommend this company as one of the best places to work</th>
<th>Overall job satisfaction</th>
<th>Part of a &quot;family&quot;</th>
<th>My values and company values fit</th>
<th>Quality of service provided to guests</th>
<th>Recommend company’s products and services</th>
<th>WOK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>17096</td>
<td>16710</td>
<td>16188</td>
<td>16572</td>
<td>16624</td>
<td>16713</td>
<td>16624</td>
<td>15924</td>
<td>16596</td>
<td>16184</td>
<td>16184</td>
<td>16724</td>
<td>16177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16572</td>
<td>16648</td>
<td>16024</td>
<td>16860</td>
<td>16648</td>
<td>16657</td>
<td>16648</td>
<td>16596</td>
<td>16184</td>
<td>16317</td>
<td>16317</td>
<td>16860</td>
<td>16386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16243</td>
<td>16505</td>
<td>16017</td>
<td>16467</td>
<td>16714</td>
<td>16692</td>
<td>16715</td>
<td>16320</td>
<td>16595</td>
<td>16648</td>
<td>16648</td>
<td>16860</td>
<td>16459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16655</td>
<td>16532</td>
<td>16031</td>
<td>16433</td>
<td>16656</td>
<td>16741</td>
<td>16657</td>
<td>16504</td>
<td>16156</td>
<td>16317</td>
<td>16317</td>
<td>16860</td>
<td>16459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.849a</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>2.0713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Recommend this company a one of the best places to work, Trust in supervisor, Associate Benefit Package, Opportunities to advance and develop career, Proud to work for this company, Job Security, Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>147370.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21052.947</td>
<td>4907.139</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>56871.809</td>
<td>13256</td>
<td>4.290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>204242.4</td>
<td>13263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Recommend this company a one of the best places to work, Trust in supervisor, Associate Benefit Package, Opportunities to advance and develop career, Proud to work for this company, Job Security, Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly

b. Dependent Variable: WOK
### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>33.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Benefit Package</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>18.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>18.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities to advance and develop career</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>19.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing an immediate supervisor that deals fairly</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>10.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust in supervisor</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>10.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proud to work for this company</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>35.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend this company a one of the best places to work</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>52.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dependent Variable: WOK

### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOK</th>
<th>Company as A Place to Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.691**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14960</td>
<td>14414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company as A Place to Work</th>
<th>WOK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.691**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14414</td>
<td>16659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix L
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Sales Office</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Human Resources</td>
<td>Sandra Ng</td>
<td>JW Merico</td>
<td>Pacific Place</td>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jimmy So</td>
<td>Shenyang Merico</td>
<td>Heping District</td>
<td>Shenyang Lia Ning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Liu</td>
<td>Chongqing Merico</td>
<td>Yu Zhong District</td>
<td>Chongqing PRC 400010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Agatha Kan</td>
<td>Shanghai Merico</td>
<td>Pre-opening Office</td>
<td>2270 Hong Qiao Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Sin</td>
<td>New Frontiers Raphael</td>
<td>Tsimshatsui</td>
<td>SHANGHAI 200336 CHINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diana Chik</td>
<td>Raphael Harbour View</td>
<td>Wanchai</td>
<td>HONG KONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Fung</td>
<td>China Hotel</td>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>CHINA 510015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Xi Dao Zhen</td>
<td>Grand New Frontiers Hotel</td>
<td>Xian</td>
<td>Shaanxi Province 710002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Li</td>
<td>Jing Guang New Frontiers Hotel</td>
<td>Chao Yang Qu</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivan Wang</td>
<td>Yangtze New Frontiers Hotel</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>CHINA 200335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Helen Cheng</td>
<td>NW Backyard Shenyang</td>
<td>Heping District</td>
<td>SHENYANG 110001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Debby Ren</td>
<td>NW Backyard Wuhan</td>
<td>1st Road</td>
<td>WUHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Jenniffer Zhou</td>
<td>NW Backyard Wuhan</td>
<td>1st Road</td>
<td>Jiangan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Helen Cheng</td>
<td>NW Backyard Shenyang</td>
<td>Heping District</td>
<td>SHENYANG 110001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Debby Ren</td>
<td>NW Backyard Wuhan</td>
<td>1st Road</td>
<td>WUHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Wuxi</td>
<td>NW Backyard Shunde</td>
<td>Guangdong Province 528300 PRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Miranda Zhang</td>
<td>NW Backyard Beijing</td>
<td>Chong Wen District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Li</td>
<td>Backyard Kunming</td>
<td>Beijing Postal Code 100062 PRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Jenny Yin</td>
<td>Backyard Kunming</td>
<td>Yunan 650032 PRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Jackie Porter</td>
<td>Brisbane Merico</td>
<td>CAIRNS QLD 4879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Natash Rasheed</td>
<td>Backyard by Merico G.B.R.</td>
<td>PARRAMATTA NSW 2150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Richard Wallace</td>
<td>Merico Surfers Paradise</td>
<td>SURFERS PARADISE QLD 4217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Andrew Newmark</td>
<td>Raphael Sydney Hotel</td>
<td>SYDNEY NSW 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Gurmeet Singh</td>
<td>Raphael Mumbai</td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>KP Vachali</td>
<td>Goa Merico</td>
<td>Panaji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Sophia Kiku</td>
<td>Raphael Gifu</td>
<td>Gifu City 502-0817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Hirahara Masayuki</td>
<td>Raphael Sapporo</td>
<td>Sapporo 062-0904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>KJ Lee</td>
<td>Raphael Seoul</td>
<td>Seoul 135-080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Kenny Yoon</td>
<td>JW Merico Seoul</td>
<td>Seoul 135-080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>JW Merico</td>
<td>183 Jalan Bukit Bintang</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Lynne Chee</td>
<td>NW Raphael Kuala Lumpur Hotel</td>
<td>50450 Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Colin Rozario</td>
<td>Raphael Malacca Hotel</td>
<td>75100 Malacca</td>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Rozainor Sani</td>
<td>Raphael Palm Garden Hotel</td>
<td>Putrajaya PO Box 47</td>
<td>43000 Kajang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Melinda Q Alsisto</td>
<td>Raphael Sandakan Hotel</td>
<td>90703 Sandakan</td>
<td>Sabah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Chong Hsiao Wei</td>
<td>Raphael Kota Bahrud Hotel</td>
<td>Jalan Sultan Yahya Petra</td>
<td>15150 Kota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Loh-Yeo Chuan Hua</td>
<td>Merico</td>
<td>Singapore 238865</td>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Regan Taikitsadaporn</td>
<td>JW Merico Bangkok</td>
<td>Soi 2</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Michelle Pombart</td>
<td>Merico</td>
<td>SYDNEY NSW 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>A Gaitonde</td>
<td>Raphael Goa Resort</td>
<td>Salcette</td>
<td>Goa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Raphael Naruto Resort</td>
<td>16-45 Oge Naruto-cho, Naruto-city</td>
<td>Tokushima 772-0053</td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Chikako Nago</td>
<td>Raphael Okinawa Resort</td>
<td>Onna-son</td>
<td>Kunigamigun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Kenji Kawahara</td>
<td>Raphael Tokyo Ginza Tobu</td>
<td>Chuo-ku Tokyo 104-0061</td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Shinichiro</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Sumida-ku</td>
<td>TOKYO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources Manager</td>
<td>Konno</td>
<td>Merico Kinshicho Tobu</td>
<td>JAPAN 130-0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Kazuo Kawanabe</td>
<td>Hotel New Otani Tokyo</td>
<td>Chiyoda-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Frontiers</td>
<td>Rua De Xangai</td>
<td>TOKYO 102-8578 JAPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Emperor Hotel</td>
<td>403 Huayuan Jie</td>
<td>Heilongjiang Province 150001 PRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Bei Fang Hotel</td>
<td>Merico Royal Garden Riverside Hotel</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orasa Benjapatraporn</td>
<td>Merico Royal Garden Riverside Hotel</td>
<td>THAILAND 10600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Rajan Michael</td>
<td>Ramada Hotel Palm Grove</td>
<td>Mumbai 400049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Steve Yoon</td>
<td>Pusan Merico Hotel</td>
<td>Pusan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Kan</td>
<td>Nagoya Merico Associate Hotel</td>
<td>NAGOYA 450 6002 JAPAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M
### Frequencies Statistics

If plan on leaving, why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16596</td>
<td>44520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4235</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16596</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing   | 44520   |
| Total     | 61116   |

**Key:**

10 = Lack of career advancement  
11 = Lack of job training  
12 = Don’t get along with my immediate supervisor  
13 = Don’t get along with the associates I work with  
14 = Spouse/partner relocating  
15 = Family/personal reasons  
16 = Pay is better elsewhere  
17 = Benefits are better elsewhere  
18 = Don’t like working in the hospitality industry  
19 = Other
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