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ABSTRACT

The finding of a positive relationship between a set of well-configured commitment human resources practices and performance outcomes at multiple levels of an organization is a well-documented in the strategic human resource management (HRM) literature (e.g., Combs, Lui, Hall, & Ketchen, 2006; Kehoe & Wright, 2013). However, several recent empirical studies (e.g., Liao, Toya, Lepak, & Hong, 2009) find a significant gap between the HR practices organizations report they use and the HR practices employees report they experienced. These more recent findings call into question the extent to which formal HR programs reported by organizational leaders are actually understood and implemented by lower level managers. To the extent that formal HR programs are not fully implemented as intended suggests many organizations may not be getting the full benefits from their HR program investments. The present study addresses this issue by focusing on the problem of HR practices implementation. Drawing on attribution theory, I examine how frontline managers (FLMs) and employees recognize, interpret, and react to commitment HR practices adopted by their organization. Additionally, I tested the influence of the self-transcendence values of FLMs and employees on their attributional processes. In doing so, three models (frontline manager, employee, and multi-level models) were proposed and the hypotheses based on these models were tested.
Data collected from 195 employees nested in 61 workgroups provided mixed support for the hypothesized relationships. In the frontline manager, tests of hypotheses revealed that FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs affected their commitment HR attributions and implementation of commitment HR practices. The employee model showed that employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices influenced their commitment HR attributions and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). However self-transcendence was not a significant moderator in both models. Finally, the multi-level model suggested that FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices is a significant predictor of employees’ commitment HR attributions. The findings contribute to the strategic HRM literature by demonstrating how organizations can implement commitment HR practices to attain unrealized potential benefits of commitment HR practices. The failure to demonstrate the moderating effect of self-transcendence values on attributional process of commitment HR practices presents a continued challenge for future research.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In the world of fierce competition, the strategic role of human resource management (HRM) has never been more important for organizations. In particular, this is because organizations’ strategic decisions regarding how to use their human resources contribute to improvements in organizational performance. Accordingly, organizations are competitively adopting HR programs to increase performance through the effective and efficient use of human resources.

As a reflection of this claim, the findings of strategic HRM studies suggest that a set of HR practices can be an effective tool to increase organizational performance (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Batt, 2002). This can be done by motivating employees to work harder, encouraging employees to share knowledge and work together, or developing skills and ability through HR practices. According to strategic HRM researchers, a set of “high-performance” HR practices, such as extensive training, developmental performance appraisal, competitive payment, employee involvement, and job security, can help achieve these goals (Wight & McMahan, 1992, Delery & Shaw, 2001; Huselid, 1998; Jiang, Lepak, Hu, & Baer, 2012; Snell & Dean, Jr., 1992).

However, recent findings suggest that the mechanism explaining how HR practices shape employee attitudes and behaviors needs a better explanation. Specifically, several recent studies observed a weak relationship between branch manager-reported HR practices and employee-reported HR practices (e.g., Liao, Toya, Lepak, & Hong, 2009). This finding weakens Bowen and Ostroff’s (2004) argument regarding the important role of individual perceptions of HR systems in the context of the traditional “behavioral approach” (e.g., Schuler, Jackson, & Rivero, 1989). Behavioral approach-based
explanations suggest that the effect of a set of HR practices on organizational performance happens through enacted employee behaviors. If employee perceptions of HR systems differ from the systems that organizations report using (traditionally measured from HR managers or senior leaders), then these employee behaviors cannot be unequivocally based on the HR practices that the organizations report they use.

The inconsistency between theoretical argument and empirical findings opened up a new area for further examination. In particular, Strategic HRM researchers are now trying to understand ‘why’ and ‘how’ this discrepancy between organization-reported HR practices and employee-reported HR practices happens. A long-time assumption in the strategic HRM literature is that organizationally stated HR practices are implemented by FLMs (frontline managers) as expected, being translated into employee attitudes and behaviors. However, empirical findings indicate that this assumption is not well met in reality. Thus, it is necessary to develop a better understanding of this gap.

One important step in addressing this inconsistency is to develop a better understanding of the extent to which the HR programs or practices reported by HR managers are actually implemented and experienced by employees. Specifically, I argue that examining the gap between stated HR practices and implemented HR practices is necessary. Stated HR practices are HR practices that the organization (e.g., senior executives or HR department) reports using and are designed to shape employee behaviors in ways that are necessary to attain strategically important organizational goals (Wright & Nishii, 2007). Implemented HR practices are what FLMs report using to manage employees, based on stated HR practices. Some researchers have argued for the important role of frontline managers in implementing HR practices (e.g., Perry & Kulik,
2008; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). It seems that FLMs must bear responsibility for the gap between stated and implemented HR practices. However, our understanding of the role of FLMs in implementing HR practices is limited because we do not know why FLMs implement HR practices differently and how this happens.

Moreover, it is necessary to develop an understanding of the gap between implemented HR practices and experienced HR practices. Experienced HR practices represent employees’ overall evaluative perceptions based on their experiences and observations of FLM-implemented HR practices. Thus, experienced HR practices are a more proximal antecedent (e.g., Aryee, Walumbwa, Seidu, & Otaye, 2012; Den Hartog, Boon, Verburg, & Croon, 2012) than stated or implemented HR practices in shaping employee attitudes and behaviors. Some researchers have focused on examining the role of unique interpretations of HRM messages across employees (Nishii, Lepak, & Schneider, 2008). In particular, they argued that employees’ experiences of HR practices can vary significantly in a single organization. I expect that the HR practices experienced by employees could vary significantly even within the same work group. However, as far as I know, studies explaining why employees develop different perceptions have not yet appeared in the literature.

These different types of HR system concepts jointly provide multiple sources of the gap between stated, implemented, and experienced HR practices. Thus, making a clear distinction among stated, implemented, and experienced HR practices is important in terms of understanding the implementation of HR practices. As some researchers have suggested, not all planned HR practices are actually implemented (Truss & Gratton, 1994; Wright & Snell, 1998, Nishii et al., 2008). Additionally, HR practices do not affect
employee attitudes and behaviors if employees do not experience those HR practices. Thus, it is necessary to identify the sources of variation in HR practice experiences across employees and to minimize these variations to increase the intended effect of stated HR practices on employees.

Finding an answer to this problem is very important in terms of advancing strategic HRM research because this is closely related to clarifying the previous findings of strategic HRM research. To understand “why” and “how” the gap between stated and experienced HR practices emerges, I attempt to find answers by focusing on at least three initial questions. First, it is necessary to understand how FLMs recognize, interpret, and implement HR practices. Second, finding potential moderators that influence FLMs’ implementation of HR practices is required. Third, examining the actions of employees to FLM-implemented HR practices should follow. In doing so, I examine the effect of employees’ commitment HR attributions on employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) that have been regarded as an important behavioral outcomes in previous strategic HRM studies (e.g., Gong, Chang, & Chueng, 2010; Kehoe & Wright, 2013; Sun, Aryee, & Law, 2007)

1.1 Dissertation Preview

To answer the three research questions, in Chapter 2, I develop my arguments based on multiple literature bodies, such as strategic HRM (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Nishii et al, 2008; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007), attribution theory (Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1971, 1973; Weiner, 1972, 1986), and individual values (Schwartz, 1992; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Specifically, I begin with a review of the strategic HRM literature and
explain the importance of HR practice implementation in the context of strategic HRM research. After, I explain the importance of FLMs in implementing HR practices. Next, I describe the process of the FLMs’ perception, interpretation, and implementation of commitment HR practices based on attribution theory. Additionally, I add individual values (self-transcendence) to the implementation of commitment HR practices as a moderator to develop “a model of FLM’s implementation of commitment HR practices.” Finally, I emphasize the necessity and importance of incorporating employee perspective in understanding the gap between commitment HR practices that an organization reports using and the commitment HR practices reported by employees.

In Chapter 3, I develop hypotheses based on the three conceptual models. The three models include a FLM model, an employee model, and a multi-level model. The FLM model tests a series of hypotheses developed based on theoretical review. The employee model replicates the FLM model at the employee level with OCB as an outcome variable instead of the implementation of commitment HR practices. The multi-level model tests the effect of the FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices on OCB through employees’ interpretation of implemented commitment HR practices.

In Chapter 4, I describe the research methodology designed to test the three hypothesized models. A survey design was employed to collect the data from employees, frontline managers, and HR representatives of multiple organizations. This chapter describes the research setting, data collection procedures, sample characteristics and measures in detail.

In Chapter 5, I present the results of a series of statistical analysis. Specifically, descriptive analysis and the results pertaining to hypotheses of the three models are
reported. With regard to the FLM and employee model, I began with confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis of the measure of commitment HR attributions.

In Chapter 6, the contributions, implications of the findings from the three models, directions for future studies, and managerial implications were described. In addition, limitations and conclusions for the dissertation were provided.
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL REVIEW

Strategic HRM research is distinctive from traditional studies of human resource management in two ways. First, strategic HRM is focused on examining the relationship between HR practices and important unit-level outcomes, such as unit-level HR performance, operating performance, and financial performance (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Delery & Doty, 1996; Guthrie, 2001; Combs et al., 2006). Second, strategic HRM examines the aggregated effects of multiple HR practices rather than individual HR practices. The logic supporting this relationship is that individual HR practices do not influence employee attitudes and behaviors in isolation but a set of multiple HR practices works as a system, reinforcing their respective positive effects (Kochan, Cutcher-Gershenfeld, & MacDuffie, 1991; Arthur, 1992). Following this rationale, researchers adopted a system perspective (Wright & Boswell, 2002) to examine the effect of a dynamic bundle of intentionally designed HR practices on unit-level performance (Lado & Wilson, 1994).

2.1 The Empirical Findings of Strategic HRM

The early empirical studies on strategic HRM found a positive association between a set of HR practices and unit level performance (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; MacDuffie, 1995; Delery & Doty, 1996; Tsui, Pearce, Porter, & Tripoli, 1997). This finding had significant implications for management scholars in that it provided evidence for the theoretical argument that posited positive effects of HR practices on organizational performance. Although the early perspectives of strategic human resource management suggested a positive relationship between HR systems and unit-level
performance (Dyer & Holder, 1988; Fisher, 1989; Wight & McMahan, 1992), this argument did not receive significant attention from scholars due to the lack of empirical evidence. Consequently, the empirical findings supporting the relationship between a set of HR practices and organizational outcomes paved the way for further studies in the area of strategic HRM.

Along with this finding, other findings drew the attention of researchers. For example, Arthur (1992, 1994) argued that organizations pursuing different business strategies adopt different sets of HR practices (commitment vs. control-based HR practices). Arthur’s findings suggest that the vertical fit between business strategy and HR practice affects organizational performance. Other studies also explored “fit” in different perspectives. MacDuffie (1995) showed that the horizontal fit between individual HR practices increases performance. Delery and Doty (1996) argued that multiple positive paths supporting the link between HR practices and organizational performance exist, proposing three main distinctive forms of HR practice composition (universal, contingent, and configurational approaches). Additionally, Tsui et al. (1997) found that organizations with an unbalanced mode of employment (high investment and economic exchange) showed the highest performance over other organizations using alternative employment modes. Although these studies suggested multiple approaches to employment, many following studies focused mainly on studying the universal (best practices) approach.

Several different forms of the best practices approach have been proposed to date. However, a set of HR practices labeled “commitment HR systems” is especially relevant to the current study. The underlying messages captured by commitment HR systems
suggest that an organization using commitment HR practices regards its employees as valuable assets of the organization, makes investments in employees (through offering extensive training and development and providing high levels of job security), values employees’ input, and cares about employees’ well-being. By doing so, such organizations establish social exchange relationships (Blau, 1964) with employees. When social exchange relationships are established, the parties involved in this relationship develop exchange expectations based on ‘mutuality.’ Under high levels of investment and perceived organizational support, employees develop a feeling of ‘debt’ and perceive an obligation to pay back to the organization (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Consequently, employees are more committed to producing high-quality products and providing better service. In particular, it is important to note that all of the HR practices used by the organization work as a system to convey a message that is consistent with the core idea of commitment HR systems. Table 1 highlights the underlying philosophies, most-relevant theory, example HR practices, and individual values related to commitment based-HR systems. I am particularly interested in examining the relatedness of self-transcendence values to commitment HR systems. Arguments about the relationship between these two concepts have not appeared in past studies. In this dissertation, I argue for the relatedness between the two concepts based on a review of theory.
Table 1

**Commitment-based HR System**

| Underlying Philosophy | -Employee well-being: HR philosophy that places a high value on the welfare and treatment of the establishment’s human resources through making investments to employees (Kochan, Katz, & McKersie, 1986; Arthur, 1992, 1994).
| | -High quality product or service: Business strategy that places a strong emphasis on producing a product or service that is regarded to be superior in quality and valuable to customers (Porter, 1996; Schuler & Jackson, 1987; Miles & Snow, 1978)
| Theory | -Social exchange theory: Parties involved in social exchange relationship develop exchange expectations based on ‘mutuality’ (Blau, 1964). Under high investment from an organization and perceived organizational support, employees develop a feeling of ‘debt’ and develop an obligation to pay back to the organization (Bamberger & Meshoulam, 2000).
| Practices (example) | -Long-term incentive programs
| | -Extensive training programs
| | -Development-oriented performance appraisal programs
| | -Career management programs (internal labor market)
| | -Employee involvement programs
| | -Job security
| | -Flexible work arrangement programs
| | -Competitive salary
| (Collins & Smith, 2006; Lepak, Liao, Chung, & Harden, 2006; Gong, Law, Chang, & Xin, 2009)
| Related Values | -Self-transcendence: Individual values that indicate the extent to which transcending self-interests motivates people to benefit others, being less sensitive to calculation of personal costs and benefits (Schwartz, 1992).
As an increasing number of empirical findings of Strategic HRM research suggest, additional evidence on the positive relationship between commitment HR systems and organizational outcome is appearing. Researchers have specifically found that commitment HR practices are positively associated with various types of organizational performance, such as profit and productivity through employees’ organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover (e.g., Arthur, 1992, 1994; Batt, 2002; Combs, Liu, Hall, & Ketchen, 2006; Guthrie, 2001; Huselid, 1995). For example, Combs et al. (2006), in their meta-analytical study, found a positive relationship of HPWP (or related types of HR systems, such as commitment HR systems and high involvement employment systems) with organizational outcomes in profitability, productivity, and turnover (r = .19, SDr = .12). All of these findings provide strong support for the effectiveness and usefulness of a set of well-configured HR practices in increasing organizational performance.

2.2 The Potential Issues Relevant to the HR Practices-Performance Linkage

The findings from previous studies are impressive in that researchers identified HR systems as an important antecedent to organizational performance. However, the way in which HR practices (or programs) relate to performance outcomes remains an unresolved issue. This problem is becoming more obvious with the progress of theories and empirical findings used to support the HR practices-performance mechanism.

Studies focused on exploring the best practices approach (e.g., high performance work system, commitment HR practices, or high involvement work system) have provided multiple explanations for the HR practice-performance mechanism. Generally,
these explanations can be summarized in three streams, identified as human capital, motivation and commitment, as well as relational perspectives. The human capital approach focuses on employees’ accumulation of knowledge, skills, ability and other characteristics that become a source of unit-level human capital to organizations (Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011). The relational perspective suggests that HR practices can be used to promote interpersonal interactions, which lead to increased knowledge exchange, organizational citizenship behaviors, and social capital (e.g., Leana & Van Buren, 1999; Mossholder, Richardson, & Settoon, 2011; Takeuch et al., 2007). Finally, the commitment and motivation stream proposes that organizations can use HR practices to increase employee motivation (Arthur, 1994; Guthrie, 2001; Lepak et al., 2006; Lepak, Taylor, Tekleab, Marrone, & Cohen, 2007).

The mechanism of how commitment HR practices affect organizational performance is mainly based on the commitment and motivation explanation. A traditional assumption of strategic HRM suggests that HR practices influence organizational performance through enacted employee behaviors (e.g., Schuler, Jackson, & Rivero, 1989). Specifically, this perspective emphasizes that a set of HR practices can be used to motivate employees to engage in positive employee behaviors (e.g., in-role or contextual performance behaviors) that would affect strategically important organizational outcomes.

However, this behavioral explanation still lacks theoretical rigor, given that the role of individual perception is missing. For this reason, the study by Bowen & Ostroff (2004) has serious implication in terms of advancing our understanding of the HR practices-performance relationship. Specifically, these authors suggested the significant
role of individual perceptions in shaping employee behaviors, proposing individual perceptions as a critical source of behaviors. Although the important role of perceptions in shaping behaviors is not new in many related areas, such as industrial/organizational psychology or organizational behavior, the argument presented by Bowen & Ostroff certainly provides interesting perspectives for strategic HRM research. Thus, I believe that the traditional behavioral explanations are only useful when HR practices are implemented and interpreted accordingly. If the employee perceptions of HR practices are different from the HR practices reported by the organization, the linkage between HR practices and employee behavior is untenable.

In contrast to the pre-held assumption, recent empirical studies indicate a surprising finding. Several researchers found a very weak correlation between the HR practices reported by FLMs/branch managers and employee reported HR practices. Specifically, Liao et al. (2009) found that branch manager-reported HR practices are not significantly correlated with employee-reported HR practices. In a recent study, Aryee et al. (2012) also found a very weak correlation of .19 (P<.01) between branch manager-rated and employee-rated HR practices. Den Hartog et al. (2012) also found a weak correlation (r=.13, P<.01) between FLM-rated HRM and employee-rated HRM. These recent studies suggest that the traditional assumption held in strategic HRM research differs from reality. These findings indicate a highly important issue because they could imply that the past explanations for the HR practices-performance linkage may not be accurate.

One important step in addressing this issue is developing a better understanding of the extent to which the HR programs and policies that are reported by FLMs are actually
implemented and experienced by employees. The implementation of HR practices is an important research question because employees shape their attitudes and behaviors based on their experiences and observations of the implemented HR practices. In several recent studies, researchers emphasized the role of FLM or supervisors in implementing HR practices (e.g., Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007; Den Hartog et al., 2012). The role of FLMs in implementing HR practices becomes more important given that FLMs are likely to show variance in their recognition, interpretation, and implementation of organizationally stated HR programs. In the following, I explain why the gap between stated and employee-experienced HR practices arises, beginning by emphasizing the important roles of FLMs in the implementation of HR practices.

2.3 The Increasing Roles of Frontline Managers in Implementing HR Practices

To explain what motivates FLMs to implement stated HR practices as expected, I propose that the previous literature on attributions and individual values can provide valuable insights because this literature suggests that individuals display different levels of motivation in shaping their behaviors and that this motivation is contingent on their attributions and values. To develop my argument, I begin by addressing why FLMs matter in terms of implementing HR practices.

Several studies on strategic HRM have noted that today’s FLMs assume more HR responsibilities than in the past. This reflects organizations’ recognition of the growing importance of FLMs in managing employees. Thus, not only HR staff members but also FLMs are responsible for HR-related activities. For example, Den Hartog et al. (2012) found that the quality of FLMs’ communication with employees affects the relationship
between FLM-rated and employee-rated HRM practices. Purcell and Hutchinson (2007) argued that HR-related events delivered by FLMs frequently fall in the realm of leadership behaviors. Specifically, they mentioned that the extent to which employees recognize leaders as providers of HR practices significantly influences employee behaviors. Although some HR practices might directly affect employees (e.g., benefits), most HR practices, such as training, performance appraisal, and career management, are enacted by FLMs (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007).

More importantly, FLMs not only assume heavier roles but also possess higher levels of “discretion” in the implementation of HR practices today. This is an especially important point because it becomes a source of variability in the implementation of HR practices across FLMs. For example, Kelly and Kalev (2006) surveyed the adoption and administration of flexible work arrangement programs in US organizations. The study revealed that, in most organizations, employees have a right to “ask” if they can use flexible work arrangement programs but they are not “automatically” given the right to use those programs. Although this study was limited to surveying only one of many HR functional areas, it is possible that this can occur in many other areas of HR practices in a similar fashion.

Additionally, it is important to note that the implementation of HR practices is significantly influenced by FLM motivation. A study performed by McGovern et al. (1997) provides a good example for this viewpoint. In the study, the authors asked managers to rank various factors based on the extent to which each factor motivates their involvement in HR-related activities. The finding showed that ‘personal motivation’ was the most influential factor over others, such as targets, company values, and career
advancement chances, in FLMs’ motivations for HR activities. Thus, this finding partly explains why the implementation of HR practices varies significantly across FLMs. All of these findings indicate that FLMs occupy a central position in shaping HR practices.

2.4 Attribution Theory and HR Practices Implementation

Given that the implementation of HR practices is one of the primary roles of FLMs (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007; Den Hartog et al., 2012), effective communication between an organization and FLMs is critical for the successful implementation of HR practices. The significant role of effective communication in shaping individual behaviors is well documented in the literature of attribution theory.

2.4.1 Attribution theory

Attribution theory originated from the work of Fritz Heider (1958). His definition of attributions can be described as causal ascribing of positive or negative outcomes. According to his notion, people engage in cognitive process in search of the cause and effect of an event to be more efficacious in their interactions with the environment. As a result, the attributions that they develop influence their responses to an event. His simple analogy of people as naïve psychologists succinctly describes the main idea of attribution theory.

However, it has been recognized that there is no single theory of attribution but a family of attribution theories (Kelley & Michela, 1980). The current study draws on the perceptions of causality stream of which Kelley (1971, 1973) and Weiner (1972, 1986) made significant progress based on the initial work of Heider (1958). Kelley focused on
identifying characteristics of information that people use to make attributions, whereas Weiner worked on how consequences of attributions affect the emotions and behaviors of individuals (Martinko, Harvey, & Douglas, 2007). Their work has been used extensively in the area of organizational study. In particular, leadership scholars have frequently applied attribution theory to explain leader’s attribution for success or the failure of subordinate performance and the quality of leader-member relationships (e.g., Green & Mitchell, 1979; Martinko & Gardner, 1987; Green & Liden, 1980; Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). However, Martinko, Harvey, & Dasborough (2011) suggested that attribution theory is underused in organizational studies, although the theory can be applied to explain various phenomena that happen in the organizational context. Currently, attribution theory is being applied in areas such as attribution styles (Martinko, Sikora, & Harvey, 2012), transformational leadership (Sun & Anderson, 2012), and abusive supervision (Martinko, Harvey, Sikora, & Douglas, 2011).

2.4.2 The relevance of attribution theory to strategic HRM study

As I mentioned above, strategic HRM researchers posit that HR practices can be used to shape employee behaviors. Given that individual attributions are a significant source of their behaviors, it can be assumed that HR practices can shape employee behaviors through the development of strong attributions. In a recent study, Nishii et al. (2008) applied attribution theory to a strategic HRM study. The findings of the study suggest that employees’ attributions of the HR practices that they experience or perceive significantly influence their attitudes and behaviors. In their study, the authors proposed a typology of HR attributions based on business strategies (e.g., Arthur, 1992, 1994; Porter,
1980; Schuler & Jackson, 1987) and employment philosophies (e.g., Lepak, Taylor, Tekleab, & Marrone, 2002; Osterman, 1994). Business strategies-based distinction of HR systems suggests that some organizations focus on improving their product quality, whereas other organizations focus on minimizing costs (Miles & Snow, 1978; Schuler & Jackson, 1987). The distinction of HR systems based on employment philosophies suggests that some organizations prefer to motivate employees to work harder by closely supervising employees, whereas other organizations promote employees’ willingness to work harder by allowing more discretion and developing trust with employees (Osterman, 1994). Following this logic, Nishii et al. (2008) proposed five types of HR attributions, which include four internal attributions, identified as 1) service quality, 2) cost reduction, 3) employee well-being, and 4) exploiting employees, and one external attribution, 5) union compliance. In the case of external attribution, management is regarded as a passive recipient of external forces, such as union contracts and employment regulations. However, internal HR attributions were found to vary as a function of individuals’ interpretations of HR practices. Their findings suggest that employees develop positive attributions (e.g., quality or employee well-being) when HR practices are regarded to benefit employees, whereas they denote negative attributions (e.g., cost reduction or exploiting) when they believe that their organizations intend to take the most out of employees. In addition to the findings of this study, further studies on HR attributions are necessary because unrealized potential contributions of attribution theory seem to exist.
2.4.3 The application of attribution theory to the implementation of HR Practices

As mentioned above, attribution researchers have examined not only how attributions influence behaviors but also what the antecedents of individual attributions are. Given that this stream of research is quite well established and has yielded many useful findings (e.g., Kelley, 1971, 1973; Ashkanasy, 1989, 1995, 2002; Martinko, Harvey, & Douglas, 2007; Gupta, 2012; Martinko, Sikora, & Paul Harvey, 2012), the application of attribution theory to strategic HRM research seems promising. Drawing on these previous findings, I attempt to propose a model that describes the process of how FLMs implement HR practices.

In this dissertation, I propose that an attributional process that appeared in previous leadership studies (e.g., Green & Mitchell, 1979; Martinko & Gardner, 1987) can be used to describe the process of the implementation of HR practices by FLMs. In particular, Green and Mitchell (1979) presented a model of the leader’s attributional process. This model explains the process of how individuals receive, interpret, and react to environmental stimuli. A rough description of the process suggests the linkage of subordinate behavior → leader attribution → leader behavior. In this model, subordinate behavior is an informational cue, and leaders make attributions of “why” based on this informational cue. Finally, leaders’ attributions shape leaders’ behaviors. I believe that this psychological process can be applied to understand the implementation of HR practices. Although Nishii et al. (2008) found a significant relationship between commitment (quality and employee enhancement) HR attribution and employee behaviors, it is necessary to develop a deeper understanding for this relationship. In doing so, understanding the process of how FLMs perceive and interpret the information related
to HR practices and shape their behaviors in implementing HR practices would be a necessary next step.

To understand the implementation of HR practices, it is important to know that exposure to information is different from individuals’ psychological process of attaching meanings to that information. Thus, awareness of commitment HR programs must be distinguished from commitment HR attributions. This logic is consistent with the literature on message-based persuasion (Chaiken, Wood, & Eagley, 1996; McGuire, 1972). In McGuire’s two-stage model, reception means encoding the message (exposition to the message, attention to its content and comprehension of the content) and yielding means accepting the message (agreeing and storing the content in memory). I consider awareness of commitment HR programs as reception of the information, whereas I take commitment HR attributions as yielding. This argument is also consistent with Green and Mitchell’s (1979) early work of the attributional process of leaders as described above. In subsequent studies testing Green and Mitchell’s model, researchers measured information cues and attributions separately (e.g., Mitchell & Wood, 1979; Ashkanasy, 1995; Ashkanasy, 1997). In particular, Ashkanasy (1997) argued that leaders’ attributions have prediction power over and above the variance explained by informational cues.

However, the application of attribution theory is not limited to understanding the process of the implementation of HR practices. Attribution theory also can be used to explain why variance in the implementation of HR practices by FLMs exists across work groups. Variance in the HR attributions of individuals is a function of the strength of an HR climate (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). Drawing on theories from attribution (Heider, 1958) and the covariation model (Kelley, 1967), Bowen and Ostroff (2004) explained
three conditions (distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus) that are necessary to
develop a strong HR climate. Distinctiveness describes the extent to which a situation
stands out in an environment. Some situations or information are more salient than others
to perceivers under some conditions. Thus, employees perceive some HR practices better
than other HR practices. For example, performance appraisal practices are highly
observable to employees if employees can understand how FLMs evaluate and what
components of their jobs are regarded as important in performance appraisal. However,
distinctiveness alone is insufficient to maintain the uniform understanding of HRM
messages across employees. Although HRM messages with a high degree of
distinctiveness would have higher chances of encoding and interpretation by employees,
it is necessary to maintain high levels of consistency. Consistency suggests that the
effects of an event should be present across time, situation, and people, that is, whenever
the entity presents, regardless of the form of the interactions (Kelley, 1967). If employees
observe consistent cause-effect relationships, they develop a clear idea of what type of
behaviors lead to rewards or promotion within the organization. Finally, consensus
describes the degree of agreement with respect to the cause-effect relationship among the
perceivers of messages. For example, agreement between message senders, such as senior
executives, HR managers, and FLMs, leads to higher levels of agreement between
employees (e.g., Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Additionally, higher perceptions of the fairness
of HR systems lead to higher agreement across employees (e.g., Bowen, Gilliland, &
Folger, 1999; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Consequently, higher levels of agreement
among perceivers lead to stronger attributions.
Although these authors proposed the ‘strength of HR systems’ to explain the variance of HR perceptions across “employees”, I believe that the same logic can be used to explain the variance across “FLMs” as well. A strong HR climate indicates that the awareness of HR practices is consistent across FLMs. Thus, it is likely that FLMs across work groups would implement HR practices in a relatively similar manner. However, I believe that many organizations frequently develop weak HR climates, creating variance in the awareness of HR programs across FLMs. In this case, FLMs’ interpretation of HR practices is heavily influenced by individual differences, such as values, cognitive style, educational backgrounds, personality, etcetera (Nishii et al., 2008). Consequently, this would result in the development of significantly different levels of attributions for a specific type of HR practices (e.g., commitment HR attributions). Although it is important to recognize that organizations vary in terms of the strength of the HR climate, examining inter-organizational variance is out of the boundary of this dissertation. In the current study, I explore how individual differences can explain intra-organizational variance in the FLMs’ awareness of HR practices when the strength of HR climate is weak.

Finally, studies on attribution theory also found that the attribution process (as described above) is contingent on many possible moderators (e.g., Green and Mitchell, 1979; Martinko et al., 2007; Bowler, Woehr, Bowler, Wuensch, & McIntyre, 2011). Specifically, researchers have suggested both individual differences as well as situational differences as potential moderators. It is widely accepted that individuals attach different meanings to things, even to the same environmental stimuli (Fiske & Taylor, 1992; Ichheiser, 1949). Additionally, situations such as organizational climate (e.g., Delbecq &
Milles, 1985; Schneider et al., 1990; Zohar, 2000) and leadership (Lewin, Lippit, & Whilte, 1939) are known to influence individual attributions. I expect that this would be the same for HR attributions. In the following section, I identify a moderator on the process of the implementation of HR practices. In doing so, I focus on the potential effects of individual values on the implementation of HR practices.

### 2.5 Individual Values and the Implementation of Commitment HR Practices

Although many potential moderators of the implementation of HR practices likely exist, I focus on individual values. Generally, my decision to examine the effect of individual values is based on 1) the fact that values are regarded as a strong motivator in the previous studies (e.g., Schwartz, 1992; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) and 2) the idea that some specific values are closely related to those of commitment HR practices. Below, I present specific reasons for this decision and describe how the selected values work to moderate the FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices.

#### 2.5.1 Individual values in an organization

Values are among a few social science concepts to which researchers in multiple social science disciplines (e.g., sociology, psychology, and anthropology) have paid significant attention (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Values can be defined as the modes of behavior (e.g., honesty, helpfulness) and end-states of existence (e.g., a comfortable life, wisdom) that a person pursues (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). As Schwartz (1992) suggested, values are different from other related constructs, such as norms, attitudes and
opinions, which usually refer to specific actions, objects, or situations, in their generality or abstractness. Another notable distinction of values from other concepts is “oughtness” (Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973; Williams, 1968, 1979), which requires individuals to adopt socially dominant values over others in shaping their behaviors. Once developed, values influence individual’s perceptual and cognitive processes such that some external stimuli, which are consistent with the person’s values, are salient and easily recognizable to perceivers (Postman, Bruner & McGinnies, 1948; Williams, 1979; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). In sum, these aspects of individual values suggest that values seem to significantly influence the behavior of individuals.

The roles of individual values are critical in the context of organizations for two reasons. First, values, as mentioned above, are relatively stable over time (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Although values are subject to change, they are not likely to change in a short amount of time. People acquire their values under discomfort or deprivation (Jones & Gerard, 1967). In the process of value acquisition, people develop emotional attachment to the experiences they have undergone to acquire their own values. This indicates that changing value priorities or acquiring new values is not easy because this would accompany discomfort or deprivation. For this reason, people’s experiences of value acquisition become a justification for maintaining their current values (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Given that members of organizations start their careers in organizations with an established set of values, the stability of values could be a barrier for organizations with respect to shaping the attitudes and behaviors of their employees for a strategic purpose (Brown & Trevino, 2009). Second, values can operate consciously or unconsciously, affecting the perceptions and behaviors of individuals (Verplanken &
Holland, 2002). People in organizations make strategic decisions frequently and operational decisions on a daily basis. Supposing that all decisions are subject to the unconscious influence of individual values, the net effect of values on organizational effectiveness or survival would be enormous.

2.5.2 The similarity and difference between individual attributions and values

From my review of the literature on values and attribution theory, I found some similarities and differences between the two theories. Thus, it is important to describe the similarities and differences between the two concepts in order to establish that they are separate constructs with unique effects on the implementation of commitment HR practices by FLMS.

Past studies suggest that values are a motivational construct (Schwartz, 1992; Feather, 1995). People are more likely to carry out an action when they place higher value on the attainment of certain goals. Under conflict between values, a person will choose to follow a value that takes a higher priority over others. This happens because people adopt a certain set of values based on their motivation to avoid expected social- or self-sanctions (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). This is somewhat similar to the mechanism of attribution theory in that people try to make sense of situations to be more confident in their social interactions, and inappropriate social interactions would result in social sanctions. Additionally, the construct of attributional style, which refers to individuals’ tendencies to make similar attributions for different events over time (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Russell, 1991), in attribution theory is similar to values
because both have stable influences on behaviors over time. Thus, both values and attributions are useful constructs in understanding human behavior in organizations.

However, they also have some differences. Attribution is a cognitive process of making sense of situations to find answers for unexpected or disappointing results of certain events or environmental stimuli. Attribution strength is based on the quality of communication (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Nishii et al., 2008), and a prolonged period of time is not necessary to develop strong attributions. However, values are more strongly tied to emotions rather than cold ideas or logic (Schwartz, 1994). Additionally, strong values are enacted over a long period of time and transcend specific actions and situations (Schwartz, 1992), whereas attributions are subject to changes based on situations, objects, and the characteristics of the perceiver (Brunswik, 1956). This difference suggests that considering both values and causal attributions would provide stronger explanations in understanding human behaviors as opposed to considering only one of either.

2.5.3 The relevance of FLMs’ values on the implementation of HR practices

Several previous studies in strategic HRM indicate that individual values are a relevant topic in studying strategic HRM. Thus, using the insights gained from value research seems to be especially useful to achieve progress in strategic HRM research. The early conceptual studies of strategic HRM suggested that the values of a top management team shape the management philosophies of the organization (Dyer & Holder, 1988; Kochan et al., 1986; Schuler, 1992; Walton, 1985). This perspective is consistent with the argument made in the upper echelon perspectives (Hambrick & Mason, 1984) or strategic leadership literatures (Finkelstein, Hambrick, & Cannella, 1996). The literature on
strategic leadership describes organization as a reflection of the top management team. Specifically, many studies showed that a top management team’s cognitive structures, values, and compositions affect organizational performance (e.g., Murray, 1989; Halebian & Finkelstein, 1993; Barrick et al., 2007). A recent empirical study by Lepak et al. (2007) found evidence for this assertion in the context of a strategic HRM study. Specifically, their findings indicated that employee-centered HR philosophies of top leaders are positively related to the degree to which organizations use high involvement human resource systems.

However, not only the values of senior managers but also the values of FLMs seem to be important in examining the influence of HR practices on organizational outcomes. As mentioned above, the values of a top management team influence the adoption of HR practices (Lepak et al., 2007), whereas FLMs are responsible for the implementation of adopted HR practices (e.g., McGovern et al., 1997; Kelly & Kalev, 2006; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). Based on these conceptual arguments and empirical findings, I propose that the values of FLMs should affect their implementation of HR practices (the specific mechanisms will be presented in the hypothesis section). Thus, the HR philosophies that organizations adopt would significantly affect organizational success when FLMs are consistently committed to implementing the espoused HR philosophies. However, the HR philosophies of top managers are not likely to lead to positive behaviors of employee (e.g., OCB) as organizations expect when FLMs do not implement the espoused HR philosophies. This happens because employees are not likely to be exposed to, perceive, and adopt the philosophies on which senior managers place a strong emphasis if FLMs do not act as conduits of organizationally espoused
philosophies. Thus, the role of FLMs’ values in understanding the gap between stated and implemented HR practices seems significant.

2.5.4 Self-transcendence and commitment HR practices

Next, I explain what values would be especially relevant in implementing HPWS practices. Based on the characteristics of commitment HR practices (Table 1), I argue that an organization can show that it places high priority on employees’ well-being by using commitment HR practices. Thus, employees would develop strong beliefs that their organization would consider the potential effects on employees when the organization makes work-related decisions. Consequently, employees develop strong beliefs that their organization is committed to promoting employees’ well-being.

I believe that this approach to managing people is closely related to several individual values that appeared in the past. Specifically, values such as “other-oriented” (Korsgaard, Meglino, & Lester, 1996; Korsgaard et al., 1997; Simon, 1990), “concern for others” (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987; McNeely & Meglino, 1994), “collectivism” (Hambrick & Brandon, 1988; Wegner III, 1995), and “self-transcendence” (Schwartz, 1992, 2012) seem to convey consistent messages, as commitment HR practices do. The main message across all of these variously labeled values suggests that people with high levels of these values care about the people who would be influenced by his/her decisions or behaviors but are not committed to personal cost/benefit-oriented calculations. Thus, this message is consistent with the philosophy of commitment HR practices that promote the well-being of employees.
Although several similar values appeared in the past, I focus on self-transcendence, as proposed by Schwartz (1992), for several reasons that I present below. First, Schwartz’s measure can be generalized across organizations and cultures. As far as I can tell, Schwartz’s work is one of the most comprehensive works so far because he identified 10 universal values and a stable value structure by using data collected from 20 different countries. Second, Schwartz’s measure has been validated in many previous value studies. The consistent use of Schwartz’s measure (e.g., Sosik, 2005; Brown & Trevino, 2009) evidences the usefulness of this measure in predicting multiple variables across studies. Third, Schwartz’s two value measurement studies, which were performed for different samples with a 30-year time gap, are consistent. This is strong evidence for the validity and reliability of the measure. Thus, the current study will draw on self-transcendence, as proposed by Schwartz.

Schwartz’s (1992) measure consists of four higher order dimensions, which include self-transcendence, self-enhancement, conservation, and openness to change. Among these, self-transcendence and self-enhancement seem to be especially relevant to the implementation of commitment HR practices when considered with the management philosophy underlying the use of these HR practices. Self-enhancement indicates the extent to which a value motivates people to pursue their personal interests at the expense of others. In contrast to self-enhancement, self-transcendence, as explained before, indicates the extent to which transcending self-interests motivate people to benefit others, being less sensitive to the calculation of personal costs or benefits (Schwartz, 1992; Korsgaard et al., 1997). Schwartz (1992) suggested that values located at the opposite side of the value circle, such as self-transcendence and self-enhancement, indicate
conflicts between them. Accordingly, people cannot pursue both simultaneously. Thus, FLMs with a high degree of self-transcendence are more likely to engage in activities that benefit employees than FLMs with a high degree of self-enhancement. Likewise, employees with a high degree of self-transcendence are more likely to engage in helping behaviors such as OCB.

2.5.5 Unequal weighing and value-congruence as a moderating mechanism

In applying individual values (self-transcendence) as a moderator of FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices, I plan to explain two moderating mechanisms, “unequal weighing” and “value-congruence.” Although these two logics fall within the realm of value research, they have been developed in separate streams of value literature. First, the “unequal weighing” logic suggests that not all information is equally salient to perceivers, causing the perceivers to focus more on some information over other information. This mechanism can be found in the literature on stress (e.g., Lazarus, 1996; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Schwartz, Sagiv, and Boehnke, 2000), which describes how individuals cope with stress and strains to maintain their well-being. For example, Schwartz et al. (2000) examined the relationship between values and worry. Specifically, they emphasized the role of people’s interpretations of a situation, rather than the objective circumstances, in processing information. In doing so, individuals use an unequal weighing process to develop their interpretation of raw information (Lazarus, 1996; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

With regard to the specific mechanism of how individuals process information that causes stress, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) proposed a two-stage process. In the first
stage, people engage in primary evaluation, which is a cognitive appraisal of whether a particular encounter is relevant to personal well-being. The secondary evaluation, which is called coping, is the process of personal evaluation of whether the person can do anything to overcome the given harms or improve his/her well-being. In this two-stage information processing, primary evaluation provides the logic for unequal weighing. Interpretation of the given informational cues is a function of cognitive appraisal and is subject to individual difference. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) suggested that values, commitment, beliefs, and goals are the most important personal factors that influence cognitive appraisal. Thus, individuals would focus on information that is consistent with their own values instead of other information because the value-consistent information is more salient to them. Consequently individuals will use this value-consistent information to develop their understandings.

Value-congruence is a second moderating mechanism that explains the effect of values on the implementation of commitment HR practices by FLMs. The logic of value-congruence has been developed in the literature on person-environment (PE) fit (e.g., Chatman, 1989; Kristof, 1996; Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). The basic assumption of the fit literature suggests that PE fit leads to positive outcomes (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). Empirical findings, in general, have supported this claim for the positive relationship between PE fit and individual outcomes (e.g., Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). In the literature on PE fit, the focus has evolved from emphasis on the fit between the characteristics of individuals and jobs to the fit between individual characteristics and various other types of environments, such as supervisor, job group, and organization (Ostroff & Schulte,
Although there are several different modes of PE fit, person-organization (PO) fit is appropriate to explain the interactive nature between the organizational philosophies of HR programs (practices) and the values of FLMs (employees). Past studies suggested that value-congruence between individuals and organizations leads to positive work attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989; Cable & Judge, 1996; Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1996).

I believe that it is important to distinguish two different sub-types of fit to explain the interactive nature between commitment HR programs and individual values. Fit can be thought of in terms of supplementary fit as well as complementary fit (Kristof, 1996). “Supplementary fit” (e.g., value-congruence) happens when an individual “supplements, embellishes, or possess characteristics which are similar to other individuals” in an environment (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p.269). However, “complementary fit” (e.g., need fulfillment) occurs when a “weakness or need of the environment is offset by the strength of the individual and vice versa” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p.271). Although an empirical study showed that the two concepts independently affect individual’s satisfaction, intentions to stay, and identification with the organization (Cable & Edwards, 2004), they are closely related to each other. Specifically, some past studies suggested need fulfillment and reinforcement as explanations for supplementary fit (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Feather, 1991; Koestner & McClelland, 1992). These explanations suggest that supplementary fit sometimes influences individual outcomes as complementary fit does by fulfilling individual’s needs for consensuality. In the hypothesis development section, I specify how the self-transcendence of FLMs
influence their implementation of commitment HR practices by following the logic of value congruence.

2.6 The Different Responses of Employees for Implemented HR Practices

In addition to the gap between awareness and the implementation of FLMs, a gap also exists between the HR practices implemented by FLMs and the HR practices experienced by employees.

Past studies on strategic HRM were mainly focused on the perspectives of employers, rather than employees, in examining the effect of HR systems on various outcomes (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Delery & Doty, 1996; Guthrie, 2001). However, this approach seems to have some limitations in advancing the Strategic HRM literature. As I mentioned before, the HR practices reported by organizations/HR departments/FLMs can be significantly different from the HR practices reported by employees. Consequently, the previous findings on the relationships between HR measures and outcomes can be biased when researchers focus on the perspectives of employers. For this reason, the perspectives of employees should be considered as well.

Specifically, focusing only on employers’ perspectives of HR practices masks the variance across employees (Lepak & Boswell, 2012; Nishii & Wright, 2008). The effect of disregarding this variance is not miniscule because this means that the effect of HR practices on individual attitudes and behaviors is not equal even under the same HR practices. This is in contrast to the pre-held assumption of strategic HRM research that is mainly focused on the unit-level. Thus, it is necessary to develop a better understanding of “why” and “how” inter-employee variance emerges. Unfortunately, strategic HRM
researchers do not have sufficient explanations for these questions yet. However, I argue that the current dissertation provides one of the possible answers toward understanding the variance across employees.

Thus, focusing on employees’ perspectives of HR practices offers an opportunity to identify another source of the gap between stated and implemented HR practices in addition to the gap created by FLMs. This suggests that researchers cannot simply assume that the HR practices reported by organizational leaders are the same as those actually experienced by employees. Consequently, the gap created by FLMs and employees would cause different employee attitudes and behaviors.

Based on these rationales, I propose that the ways in which employees recognize, interpret, and respond to implemented HR practices can be understood as the same processes as FLMs implement HR practices and the same theories and logics apply to explanations of employees’ different responses for implemented commitment HR practices. Thus, I avoid repeating the theory review on explaining employees’ working behaviors.
CHAPTER 3: HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

This dissertation includes three conceptual models, developed to test hypotheses that are based on the theoretical review described in the previous section. The models are presented below.

**Figure 1**

**The Frontline Manager Model**

Note: Mgr=frontline manager.

**Figure 2**

**The Employee model**

Note: EE=employee, OCB=organizational citizenship behavior.
The manager model (Figure 1) describes the process of the implementation of commitment HR practices by FLMs. This model is based on the studies by Kelley (1971, 1973) and Weiner (1972, 1986). As suggested in previous studies (e.g., Green & Mitchell, 1979; Martinko et al., 2007), observers’ perceptions of information cues affect observer’s responses through causal attributions (informational cue $\rightarrow$ causal attribution $\rightarrow$ responses). The current model replicates this attribution process in the context of commitment HR practice implementation. It is important to emphasize that I consider HR implementation to be multiple processes that include the implementation of HR practices by FLMs and employees’ responses to those implemented practices. In addition to the manager model, the employee model (Figure 2) presents how employees’ awareness of implemented commitment HR practices influences OCB through their commitment HR attributions. Moreover, dynamic interactions between a FLM and subordinates would affect the resultant behaviors of employees. Thus, in the multi-level
model, I examine the effect of observations or experiences of FLM-implemented commitment HR practices on OCB through employees’ commitment HR attributions.

3.1 FLMs’ Commitment HR Awareness, Self-Transcendence, and Attributions

Awareness of commitment HR programs is the extent to which FLMs perceive or recognize the levels of organizational emphasis in adopting and utilizing commitment HR programs. In other words, this concept is simply the awareness of HRM-related information and does not involve the evaluation of information. Thus, awareness of commitment HR programs is similar to the organizational stimuli or informational cues that cause HR attributions.

With respect to the link between FLMs’ commitment HR awareness and attributions in the conceptual model depicted in Figure 1, I propose that FLMs’ awareness and attributions of commitment HR practices are positively related. I recognize that there could be differences in FLMs’ awareness of the level of HR programs. The core idea of commitment HR programs is valuing employees’ input and taking care of their well-being (Table 1). If organizations are successful in communicating their commitment to employees’ well-being, FLMs with high awareness of commitment HR practices would develop strong commitment HR attributions. Specifically, this would happen when FLMs recognize higher levels (intensity) of organizationally stated HR messages intended to promote employee well-being. As Bowen and Ostroff (2004) argued, organizations can communicate their HR policy and philosophies successfully if FLMs perceive HRM-related information consistently across multiple HR practices and time. Thus, I propose that higher levels of FLMs’ awareness of
commitment HR programs would strengthen the FLMs’ attributions that their organizations adopted the given set of HR programs to advance employees’ well-being.

_H1:_ FLMs’ awareness of the commitment HR programs offered by the organization is positively associated with their commitment HR attributions.

Although the attribution literature suggests that the awareness (informational cues) of individuals independently affects attributions (e.g., Green & Mitchell, 1979), many researchers found moderators of this relationship (e.g., Wells & Harvey, 1977; Jones & Nisbett, 1972; Martinko et al., 2007). In the current study, I propose that the association between FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs and commitment HR attributions is contingent on the level of self-transcendence values of FLMs.

To examine this moderating effect, it is necessary to understand how values affect individual’s interpretations of information. As a mechanism for this moderating effect, I suggest “unequal” information processing of individual values. As mentioned in the conceptual development section, individuals use their values, commitment, beliefs, and goals in their cognitive appraisal (Lazarus, 1996). By doing this, people make their cognitive appraisal an emotionally driven construction of meanings, rather than an objective recognition or evaluation of the given facts. This happens for two main reasons, which I describe below. First, people engage in selective interpretation in processing environmental stimuli. This happens because people have better access to concepts tied to their important values (Postman et al., 1948; Williams, 1979; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). When environmental stimuli provide situations that are consistent with personal values, the situations are more interpretable to perceivers. Because people try to reduce their cognitive labor (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987; Lord & Maher, 1990; Lord & Smith, 1983),
people attach less meaning to less interpretable stimuli, and interpretations of the situations become more personalized. Thus, individuals favor information that is consistent with their values over other information.

Second, individuals tend to evaluate information in a biased manner when they examine empirical evidence of what they have strong opinions toward (Lord, Ross, & Lepper, 1979). This suggests that individuals are more likely to accept “confirming” evidence whereas less likely to accept “disconfirming” evidence without thorough examination. This happens because the confirming evidence promotes the individuals’ pre-held positions. It is well known that people do not change their beliefs and theories easily. Strongly entrenched beliefs can survive in the face of the accumulation of non-supportive evidences (Lord et al., 1979). For this reason, individuals tend to define situations in light of their own important values and give heavier weight to value-relevant events based on their value priority. Thus, the same situation can be interpreted differently across individuals (Schwartz et al., 2000).

Following the uneven interpretation logic, I expect that FLMs with a high degree of self-transcendence would weigh messages that are related to commitment HR practices more heavily than other information that is not relevant to commitment HR practices. Additionally, FLMs with a high degree of self-transcendence would develop strong emotional attachment to information that is related to commitment HR practices. For example, FLMs with a high degree of self-transcendence would be more likely to consider that a program such as training might be used because it promotes employee well-being. However, FLMs with a low degree of self-transcendence are less likely to justify that adopted commitment HR programs are needed to promote employees’ well-
being. This is because FLMs with a low degree of self-transcendence weigh information that is not related to commitment HR programs less heavily than FLMs with a high degree of self-transcendence. Therefore, FLMs with a low degree of self-transcendence are not likely to develop strong commitment HR attributions than FLMs with a high degree of self-transcendence.

\[ H2: \text{FLMs’ self-transcendence moderates the association between FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs and commitment HR attributions. Specifically, the association is more positive when the degree of self-transcendence is high than when it is low.} \]

3.2 FLMs’ Commitment HR Attributions, Self-Transcendence, and Implementation

FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices means FLMs’ activities or behaviors performed to administer or deliver a set of HR practices. This concept indicates actual behaviors rather than perceptions and is partly based on supervisors’ awareness and understanding of HRM-related information. In other words, this HR implementation behavior results from FLMs’ motivation to implement HR practices based on HR attributions. Thus the FLMs’ implementation is clearly different from the FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs.

I propose that the implementation of commitment HR practices by FLMs is influenced by FLMs’ commitment HR attributions. Attribution theory (Heider, 1958; Kelley, 1971, 1973; Weiner, 1972, 1986) suggests that people try to make sense of an event or situation to be confident in their social interactions. This explanation carries the assumption that attributions are a psychological process used to respond to environmental stimuli. When people develop inaccurate attributions, this is more likely to cause inappropriate behaviors, and actors can be subject to social sanctions or criticism. Thus,
actors prefer to make an action under strong attribution, whereas actors would hesitate to carry out an action when they are not confident in their attributions.

Many empirical findings support the argument that individuals’ attributions shape their behaviors (e.g., Green & Mitchell, 1970; Green & Liden, 1980; Knowlton & Mitchell, 1980). These empirical findings are very meaningful in that this confirms the pre-held assumptions that attributions independently affect behaviors. In particular, researchers found that attributions for the causes of subordinates’ performance have central effects on leaders’ behaviors, such as rewards and punishments, closeness of supervision, and expectations of members’ future performance. For example, Weiner & Kukla (1970) showed that, regardless of ability, subordinates received positive evaluations when success was regarded as a result of effort. However, subordinates received negative evaluations when failure was due to a lack of effort.

Based on these findings, I expect that FLMs will show higher levels of implementation activities for commitment HR practices when they maintain strong commitment HR attributions. In other words, this means that FLMs think their organizations believe in the effectiveness of commitment HR programs in promoting employee well-being. Consequently, the FLMs would be more committed to implementing commitment HR programs. As mentioned above, FLMs engage in HR attributional processes to identify the appropriate behaviors that are necessary for the implementation of the stated HR programs. When FLMs lack certainty with respect to the purpose of adopted HR programs, they will not be confident with the implementation of HR practices. Thus, FLMs lacking strong commitment HR attributions will display low
levels of implementation activities or implement other types of HR practices (e.g., control-based HR practices).

\[
H3: \text{FLMs’ commitment HR attributions are positively associated with the implementation of commitment HR practices.}
\]

I also propose that the values of FLMs influence the relationship between commitment HR attributions and the implementation of HR practices. To explain how values affect the behavior of individuals, I suggest value-congruence between philosophies of commitment HR programs and the self-transcendence of FLMs as a mechanism that reinforces the implementation of commitment HR practices.

However, it is important to note that I do not argue for actual value-congruence here. Instead, I posit that the congruence between FLMs’ attributions of the philosophy of the HR practices used by the organization and FLMs’ values would influence the implementation of commitment HR practices. HR attributions are employees’ (in the current hypothesis, FLMs’) beliefs or interpretation of the underlying philosophy of the HR practices used by the organization (Nishii et al., 2008). The significant role of “perceived” fit in shaping employee attitudes and behaviors has frequently appeared in the past (e.g., Wexley, Alexander, Greenawalt, & Couch, 1980; Golmeh, 1974; Greene, 1972; Labovitz, 1972). Thus, FLMs would develop high levels of value-congruence when FLMs’ HR attributions are consistent with their values.

Value-congruence is a widely studied form of supplementary fit (Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1989; Judge & Bretz, 1991). As mentioned in the theoretical review, some researchers have argued that the effect of supplementary fit on the attitudes and behaviors of individuals is indirect. Specifically, they posit that supplementary fit affects
the behaviors of individuals through psychological need fulfillment (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Feather, 1991; Koestner & McClelland, 1992). Individuals’ important values influence what in their work they would like to find fulfilling (Hogan, 1991). Likewise, important organizational values would affect what an organization provides to its employees (Schein, 1985). Thus, value-congruence between an organization and its employees would be an instrument to fulfill the needs of individuals because the organization is more likely to provide what its employees need. For example, value-congruence can fulfill people’s basic needs for others’ consensual validation of their perspectives. This idea has appeared in a variety of literature areas, such as theories of need fulfillment (e.g., Locke, 1976), Festingers’ theory of social comparison (1954), Heider’s balanced state theory (Heider, 1958), and Byrne’s similarity-attraction paradigm (1971).

However, other researchers proposed a different explanation regarding how value-congruence influences employees. According to the value-congruence literature, value-congruence directly affects employee attitudes and behaviors because it enhances employees’ identification with their organization (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Riketta, 2002). In particular, Cable and Edwards (2004) argued that this perspective is more fundamental than the psychological need fulfillment perspective because social identity perspectives (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) provide answers to questions that are more important to individuals. Specifically, the social identity perspective can help in understanding an individual’s self-definition, which describes “a concrete, public expression of a person’s values” (p. 824). A meta-analysis of organizational commitment
found that individuals’ attitudinal identification with their organizations significantly influence job-performance and contextual performance (Riketta, 2002).

A more recent study proposes an integrative perspective on the two different explanations described above. Greguras and Diefendorff (2009) argued that value-congruence has both direct and indirect effects on employee attitudes and performance. Specifically, their findings suggest that supplementary fit (PO fit) has a direct impact on affective organizational commitment and job performance. Moreover, they found a significant indirect effect of PO fit on affective organizational commitment and job performance through three types of need satisfaction (autonomy need, relatedness need, and competence need). Ultimately, these previous studies suggest that the perceived value-congruence between an organization and its employees has both direct and indirect effects on the attitudes and job behaviors of individuals.

Following these arguments, I expect that the relationship between commitment HR attributions and the implementation of commitment HR practices by FLMs will be influenced by the self-transcendence of FLMs. Consistent with the philosophy of commitment HR programs (Table 1), self-transcendence indicates that people with a high degree of self-transcendence are less calculation-oriented and instead tend to promote collective interests. Organizations believe that using commitment HR practices will shape the positive behaviors of employees that are necessary in pursuing organizational goals. This would happen because the idea of self-transcendence (Schwartz, 1992) is congruent with the philosophies of commitment HR programs. When both commitment HR attributions and self-transcendence are high, FLMs are likely to perceive higher levels of identification with the organization and enhanced need fulfillment. As mentioned before,
the implementation of HR practices is one of the core jobs of FLMs (Perry & Kulik, 2008; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007; Den Hartog et al., 2012). Thus, FLMs with a high degree of commitment HR attributions are more likely to implement commitment HR practices under high levels of self-transcendence.

**H4**: FLMs’ self-transcendence moderates the association between FLMs’ commitment HR attributions and commitment HR practice implementation. Specifically, the association is more positive when self-transcendence is high than when it is low.

### 3.3 FLMs’ Commitment HR awareness and Implementation

In addition to the FLMs’ attribution process proposed above, I also expect that there will be a direct positive association between FLMs’ commitment HR awareness and implementation activities. People often delve into “why” questions when they want to make sense of organizational stimuli. However, previous studies found that people do not always process information in this manner but frequently process information subconsciously or automatically. Although Green & Mitchell (1979) suggested a rational attribution process to explain their model, they also noted that there are other cases that work as a “short-circuit” in the attributional process. Specifically, they mentioned that (1) when an organizational context (e.g., policy) limits the FLMs’ possible responses, the FLMs will give up causal analysis, and (2) when an organization’s policies are not clear or multiple causations are possible, FLMs will develop their own automatic responses.

Another explanation for the direct association between awareness and actions was suggested by Lord and his associates (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987; Lord & Maher, 1990; Lord & Smith, 1983; Phillips & Lord, 1986). In a series of studies, Lord and his associates argued that people do not engage in an attributional process for every event
that they experience. Rather, causal attributions are more likely to occur in a selective manner because not all events are equally salient with respect to the perception of the perceivers. In other words, some events do not trigger causal attributions because the events provide no new information. Thus, paying attention to the events is a waste of time and cognitive effort. However, some other events might be perceived more saliently because the events convey information that is inconsistent with the expectations of event-perceivers. In this case, it is worth engaging in an attributional process to make sense of the situation. The main reason that people are selective in causal attribution is to reduce their cognitive labor (Lord & Smith, 1983; Wong & Weiner, 1981). Thus, people tend to use routine scripts or heuristics as a means to process information automatically (e.g., Schank & Abelson, 1977).

Based on the logic of automatic information processing, I expect that the implementation of commitment HR practices by FLMs would increase with their increasing awareness of commitment HR programs. For FLMs, using HR practices to manage their subordinates is a primary role. Thus, FLMs might have fairly good knowledge and understanding of the purpose of HR programs. Additionally, they would recognize that some HR programs are not well defined and lack clear purpose. Consequently, I do not believe that FLMs engage in HR attributions all the time. It is likely that FLMs develop routine patterns in terms of delivering and administrating some HR practices. Thus, FLMs would automatically apply certain organizational HR policies or programs without having causal analysis for “why.”

*H5: FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs is positively associated with their implementation of commitment HR practices.*
Moreover, I propose to test the overall model illustrated in Figure 1. The logic for this model is based on the explanations suggested above (H1 to H4). My conceptual model is frequently called “moderated-mediation” (Muller, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2005) or “first and second stage moderation” (Edwards & Lambert, 2007). This model is a special case of mediation in which the established mediation is contingent on the levels of a moderator. In other words, this model simultaneously addresses the questions of ‘how’ and ‘when’ an independent variable influences a dependent variable. In the FLM model, FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs affects the FLMs’ implementation through commitment HR attributions. However, the strength of this indirect effect would change depending on the levels of self-transcendence values. Specifically, the first linkage between the awareness of commitment HR programs and commitment HR attributions is contingent on the levels of FLMs’ self-transcendence. Moreover, the second linkage between commitment HR attributions and the implementation of HR practices also is contingent on the levels of FLMs’ self-transcendence. Consequently, the strength of both linkages would change as a function of self-transcendence.

H6: The mediated relationship between FLMs’ awareness and implementation of commitment HR programs through commitment HR attributions will be moderated by FLMs’ self-transcendence. Specifically, the relationship between awareness and attributions as well as attributions and implementation will be moderated by self-transcendence such that this mediated effect will be more positive when self-transcendence is high than when it is low.
3.4 Employees’ Commitment HR Awareness, Attributions, Self-Transcendence, and OCB

In terms of the cognitive process of how employees perceive and interpret their FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices, the process is same as that in the FLM model. Thus, the theoretical foundations for the employee model hypotheses are consistent with the FLM model hypotheses. The only difference is the dependent variable. The FLM model examines the effects of HR attributions and the self-transcendence of FLMs on the implementation of commitment HR practices, whereas the employee model examines the effects of HR attributions and the self-transcendence of employees on OCB. In pursuit of parsimony, the theories are not repeated for the following hypotheses.

Following the logic suggested for hypothesis 1, I presume that there would be a positive association between employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices and commitment HR attributions. When employees observe or experience higher levels (intensity of messages) of FLMs’ implementation behaviors, employees develop strong beliefs that their organization invests in its employees and is concerned about its employees’ well-being. Consequently, employees are expected to develop strong commitment HR attributions under this condition.

*H7: Employees’ awareness of the commitment HR practices offered by an organization is positively associated with their commitment HR attributions.*

I also expect that the association between employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices and commitment HR attributions is contingent on the level of employees’ self-transcendence. This would happen based on the logic of unequal interpretation
suggested in H2. Employees with a high degree of self-transcendence are supposed to focus more on commitment HR practices than other information. Thus, these employees are more likely to develop strong commitment HR attributions. Moreover, these employees would attach positive meanings to commitment HR programs because the central idea of these HR programs is consistent with self-transcendence. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis.

**H8:** Employees’ self-transcendence moderates the association between employees’ awareness of commitment HR programs and commitment HR attributions. Specifically, the association is more positive when self-transcendence is high than when it is low.

Next, I suggest that employees’ commitment HR attributions influence employees’ organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Organ (1997) described OCB as discretionary behaviors that contribute “to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (p. 91). Previous literature on strategic HRM suggests that commitment HR programs lead to higher levels of OCB (e.g., Gong et al., 2010; Kehoe & Wright, 2013; Sun et al., 2007). One explanation for positive relationship is based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). In contrast to short-term exchange based on calculation, people in long-term social relationships develop obligations based on reciprocity (Bamberger & Meshoulam, 2000; Delery & Doty, 1996; Horn et al., 2009; Tsui et al., 1997). Thus, employees who perceive a high degree of organizational investment in employees from their employer and a high degree of concern for employees’ well-being are more likely to develop positive attitudes and behaviors based on mutual expectations. Employees under commitment HR practices have a higher degree of discretion (Sun et al., 2007) and well-developed knowledge and
skill sets. Thus, they use their skills, knowledge, and discretion to reciprocate organizational support through increased levels of OCB. Based on the mechanism of social exchange, I propose that employees’ commitment HR attributions affect OCB of employees.

*H9: Employees’ commitment HR attributions are positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.*

However, I propose that the linkage between employees’ commitment HR attributions and employees’ OCB is contingent on the level of self-transcendence of employees. As described in the FLM model, I suggest that value-congruence between the philosophies of commitment HR practices and the self-transcendence of employees would affect the behaviors of employees.

Although OCB is regarded as contextual performance rather than in-role performance, many researchers consider that OCB has common antecedents, which is also the case for in-role performance. Traditionally, ability and motivation are considered primary antecedents of job performance (Hunter, 1983; Lawler III, 1973; Motowildo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997), whereas satisfaction and organizational commitment are considered to be antecedents of contextual performance (Organ, 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bacharach, 2000). However, Organ and Ryan (1995) argued that ability and motivation can be antecedents of contextual performance because people should have appropriate ability and motivation to engage in certain contextual-performance behaviors. Without ability and willingness, employees’ satisfaction with their work and organization would not be a strong driver for their engagement in extra-role behaviors. Moreover, this common antecedent argument is becoming more
convincing in that contextual performance is considered to be part of in-role performance today. In other words, engaging in extra-role behaviors is not a choice given to employees but almost always is required by organizations. Additionally, an increasing number of organizations are recognizing the significant role of OCB. For example, Podsakoff et al. (2000) argued that OCB significantly impacts organizational level performance.

As specific mechanisms for the effect of value-congruence on OCB, I believe that the same explanations suggested for the FLM model will apply here. Specifically, I expect that higher congruence between employee’s values and their inferred HR philosophy (HR attributions) of the organization 1) enhances employees’ identification with the organization and 2) fulfills the needs of the individuals through complementary fit. Previous studies suggested that the fulfillment of needs leads to higher performance, satisfaction, and contextual performance (Morrison, 1994; Organ, 1990; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podskoff et al., 2000).

As described before, the philosophies of commitment HR practices are consistent with the idea of self-transcendence. When employees exhibit a high degree of self-transcendence, increased commitment HR attributions would cause stronger fit perceptions on the part of employees, reinforcing the effect of value-congruence. Additionally, repeatedly fulfilling the needs of employees would strengthen the effect of supplementary fit (need fulfillment). In particular, special attention should be given to the fact that, in both commitment HR practices and self-transcendence, helping others is one of the most highly regarded forms of working behaviors. Thus, employees would display
higher levels of OCB when both the self-transcendence and commitment HR attributions of employees are high.

\[ H10: \text{Employees’ self-transcendence moderates the association between employees’ commitment HR attributions and organizational citizenship behavior. Specifically, the association is more positive when self-transcendence is high than when it is low.} \]

Consistent with the logic provided for the direct association between FLMs’ awareness and implementation of commitment HR practices, employees’ awareness will be directly related to their organizational citizenship behaviors. As suggested before, an automatic or subconscious processing mechanism includes repeated attributions for the same HR practices. For example, it is likely that employees would not engage in an attributional process if they repeatedly experience the same attributions such that the organizational intention of regularly offered trainings is to improve employees’ skills and knowledge and to promote employees’ well-being. Thus, commitment HR attributions, which are based on the repeated social exchanges between employees and organizations, would increase employees’ OCB.

\[ H11: \text{Employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.} \]

Based on the logic suggested for H7 to H10, I will test the overall model shown in Figure 2. As is the case with H6, this model will be tested by using moderated-mediation (Muller et al., 2005). The employee model suggests that employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices influences OCB through commitment HR attributions. Specifically, the first linkage between the awareness of commitment HR practices and
commitment HR attributions is contingent on the levels of employee self-transcendence. Additionally, the second linkage between commitment HR attributions and OCB would change based on the levels of employee self-transcendence. Consequently, the strength of both linkages would vary at different levels of employee self-transcendence.

\[ H12: \text{The mediated relationship between employees’ awareness and OCB through commitment HR attributions will be moderated by employee self-transcendence. Specifically, the relationship between awareness and attributions as well as attributions and organizational citizenship behavior will be moderated by self-transcendence such that this mediated effect will be more positive when self-transcendence is high than when it is low.} \]

3.5 FLM’s Commitment HR Implementation, Employees’ Commitment HR Attribution, and OCB

Employees receive HRM-related information from multiple sources, such as senior managers, the HR department, and frontline managers (supervisors). For example, senior managers are regarded as articulators of HR philosophies or policies (Arthur & Boyles, 2007; Lepak et al., 2007). HR departments are frequently used as sources of HR programs in past studies on strategic HRM (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Datta, Guthrie, & Wright, 2005; Delery & Doty, 1996; Huselid, 1995) because their primary role is to design HR programs. Finally, FLMs (supervisors) are responsible for implementing and delivering HR practices (Den Hartog et al., 2012). Although these sources provide employees with useful information regarding HR systems, not all sources of HRM-related information seem equally important in terms of explaining employee attitudes and behaviors. I consider senior managers and HR departments to be antecedents of FLMs’ activities of HR practice implementation. Thus, supervisors’ HR implementation is based on the HR programs and policies that they receive from senior managers and the HR department.
However, the recent strategic HRM literature suggests that the HR information measured from organizational representatives may be less useful in predicting employee attitudes (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Nishii et al., 2008). When stated HR programs are not implemented by FLMs, employees will not be exposed to those HR practices, resulting in the lack of impact on employees’ behaviors. As Purcell and Hutchinson (2007) suggested, FLMs assume significant roles in implementing HR practices today. Given that employees develop their own interpretations of HR practices based on their experiences with and observations of HR practices, supervisors’ implementation of commitment HR practices would be a significant predictor of employees’ HR attributions. Specifically, it is likely that employees would develop higher levels of commitment HR attributions when FLMs’ implementation levels (intensity of messages) are high in terms of the number of commitment HR practices and the frequency of implementation behaviors.

**H13: A FLM’s implementation of commitment HR practices is positively associated with employees’ commitment HR attributions.**

As is the case with H5 and H11, I expect an additional subconscious (or automatic) information processing mechanism for the current hypothesis. As explained previously, people do not always engage in attributional process of ‘why’ (Green & Mitchell, 1979). People frequently respond to given environmental (organizational) stimuli automatically by using “routine scripts” or “heuristics.” In the current hypothesis, I propose a direct association between a FLM’s implementation of commitment HR practices and OCB. With repetition of the same attributions tied to various HR practices
designed to develop social exchange relationships with employees, employees will automatically display OCB without engaging in commitment HR attributions.

\[H14: \text{A FLM's implementation of commitment HR practices is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.}\]

Finally, I propose a mediation hypothesis to test the overall model illustrated in Figure 3. The logic is consistent with H13 and H14. The multi-level model suggests a direct association between FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices and OCB. However, the strength of this link will be reduced through the commitment HR attributions of employees.

\[H15: \text{The association between a FLM's implementation of commitment HR practices and organizational citizenship behavior will be partially mediated by employees' commitment HR attributions.}\]
CHAPTER 4: METHODS

The methods section consists of two parts. In the first section, I explain the study design and data collection procedures. The use of multiple organizations with multiple waves of data requires well-defined data collection procedures to avoid incompatibility between data and the hypotheses. In the second section, I describe what measures were used for this study and how those measures were developed or used in the past.

4.1 Research Setting and Sample Characteristics

To test the hypothesized models in a more efficient manner, I decided to collect data from multiple organizations in South Korea. Although using a single organization is useful in that it provides a natural control mechanism, it also has a potential downside. Because the selected organization could show limited variance in the implementation of commitment HR practices across FLMs, it would be difficult to find support for the hypothesized models using a single organization. As Bowen & Ostroff (2004) suggested, it is possible that organizations with a strong HR climate would not show significant variance across FLMs or employees.

To identify participating organizations, I identified potential sample organizations based on industry, size, and accessibility. In doing so, I tried to make the sample more generalizable by including diverse organizations in terms of size and industry. To recruit these organizations, I made an initial contact to explain the project and its requirements. The contact person at each organization was an individual who was familiar with the researcher previously. Specifically, I introduced the goals of the study, data requirements, and survey administration procedures such as timing, distribution, collection, and
returning. With the consent of participating organizations, survey items were reviewed by HR representatives and a person who would be the main contact at each organization to make sure that the survey’s administration would not have any negative influences on their employees.

A total of 44 organizations were invited to participate in the study, with 34 organizations consenting to participate. Sample organizations represented a diverse mixture of industries such as manufacturing, trading, insurance service, high-technology, and non-profit organizations. The sample included work groups representing multiple types of work such as administration, R&D, sales, training, marketing, manufacturing process management, customer services, and line workers of respective business areas.

To make the survey administration more efficient and smoother, an individual with a professional career in multiple industries and research experience in a business master’s program was hired as a data collection coordinator. The coordinator sent a packet including surveys, recruiting letters, and return envelopes after making an initial contact to explain the detailed survey administration procedures. Following the delivery of the survey materials, the coordinator contacted each organization again to further discuss and clarify the distribution and collection process. To protect individual identity and increase the validity of the survey responses, I minimized collecting information that could be associated with any individual’s identity. Specifically, the participants were asked to include the last two digits of their cell or home phone number to link the two surveys from the same individual (Time 1 and 2 surveys). The coordinator contacted each organization again at the end of the third week to check the progress and remind them of the administration of the second survey (3-4 weeks after the first survey). The cost for
returning surveys was paid by the researcher. In general, the coordinator contacted each organization around 3-5 times to manage the data collection process and to resolve potential problems.

In total, five surveys were developed for FLMs (Times 1 and 2), subordinates (Times 1 and 2), and HR representatives (Time 1 only). The FLM surveys included measures such as awareness and implementation of commitment programs, HR attributions, individual values, OCB of each of their subordinates, and demographic information. The subordinate surveys included items such as awareness and experiences of commitment HR practices, HR attributions, individual values, and demographic information. Finally, the HR survey included items measuring information related to each establishment such as size, age, and other relevant factors. The use of multi-source and multi-wave data was based on the decision to avoid possible common method bias. As suggested in the previous literature on strategic HRM (e.g., Wright, Gardner, Moynihan, & Allen, 2005; Guthrie, 2001), this seems to be necessary to make a stronger claim for the findings of this study, although some studies argue that the bias from the use of the same source of data is miniscule (Spector, 2006). The information regarding sources and timings of each variable can be found in Table 2.

Because all measures were originally developed in English, I translated the questionnaires in Korean and then back-translated in English to check the accuracy of the translation (Brislin, 1980). One management professor and two business Ph.D. students affiliated with a large U.S. university and three HR managers, each of them with more than ten years of experience in HR in Korean-based global companies, were involved in
the translation process. In the process, feedback from the Korean HR managers was incorporated into the surveys to enhance the quality of data collected.

Out of the 34 organizations that agreed to participate, 21 organizations provided usable sets of surveys for some or all of the measures in the study. Specifically, 12 organizations failed to return surveys and one organization had a senior executive instead of FLMs, which makes the surveys from this organization inappropriate for the current study. In total, the final sample included 195 employees and 61 FLMs nested in 61 work groups nested in 21 organizations. This sample includes three work groups from the same organization that failed to provide Time 2 surveys. These groups were retained in the sample and automatically dropped in analyses that need variables measured in both Time 1 and 2 surveys.

The average group size was relatively small with 3.2 individuals (the range is from 2 to 5). To encourage participation, maintaining a low participation requirement was needed. Demographic information showed that, of the FLM respondents, 88.5% were male and the average tenure was 9.51 years. The level of education was 8.2%, 70.5%, 19.7%, and 1.6% for 2-year college degree, bachelor’s, master’s, and doctorate, respectively. Finally, all FLMs were employed as permanent workers. With regard to employee participants, 67.7% were male and the average tenure was 5 years. The level of education was 6.3%, 24.4%, 57.1%, and 11.2% for high school, 2-year college degree, bachelor’s, and master’s, respectively, and 1% was unanswered. The percentage of permanent workers was 90.7%.
4.2 Measures

In the following section, I introduce the measures used in the current study, including awareness, attributions, and the implementation of commitment HR programs, self-transcendence, and OCB. In some cases, I collected data from both FLMs and employees. In other cases, only one source (either FLMs or employees) was used for data collection. For each measure, I provided descriptions, sources, and sample items. For measures adapted from previous strategic HRM studies, I provided in-depth details about the procedures and reasons for choosing those measures and making changes.

4.2.1 FLMs’ (Employees’) awareness of commitment HR programs (practices)

This variable measures the extent to which FLMs recognize or perceive the levels of organizational emphasis in adopting and utilizing commitment HR programs (practices). I distinguish HR programs from HR practices such that HR programs are organizationally espoused guidelines for the implementation of HR practices that the employees experience and observe. Thus, FLMs follow the HR programs as stated by senior managers and the HR department for the implementation of HR practices in their own work groups. As far as I can tell, the “awareness of commitment HR programs” is a new measure. However, this measure is a simple variant of previously used HR system index variables, such as HPWS programs, commitment HR programs, and high-involvement HR practices. The main difference is that the previous measures are based on the responses of senior (or general) managers or HR departments, whereas the current measure is based on the responses of FLMs and is subject to individual difference in their
awareness of commitment HR programs with the potential for organizational variance across FLMs.

The measure of awareness of commitment HR programs was developed based on the review of previous strategic HRM studies. However, not all HR programs identified in past studies should be included in the current study because 1) not all HR programs necessarily constitute “commitment HR programs” and 2) FLMs’ discretion in implementation is limited in some HR practices.

In choosing the HR programs to include in the commitment HR systems measure, I considered a number of recent studies that used several variants of HR programs for the description of HR system constructs. For example, Batt and Colvin (2011) identified three HR sub-systems, which include high-involvement, long-term investments and inducements, and short-term performance enhancing HR practices. Among these, high-involvement and long-term investments are particularly relevant to commitment HR systems. Most of the HR functional areas in the current study were chosen based on a study by Gong et al. (2009). They identified eight HR functional areas after reviewing 48 strategic HRM articles; these areas are 1) employment security, 2) reduction of status distinction, 3) selective hiring, 4) employee participation, 5) comparatively high pay contingent on performance, 6) extensive training, 7) career planning and advancement, and 8) performance appraisal. These functional areas are consistent with the 10 functional areas identified in the previous review study by Lepak, Liao, Chung, and Harden (2006), except for one area: reduction of status distinction. Reduction of status distinction was dropped because this practice is not directly related to commitment HR programs. In addition to these areas, I dropped selective hiring and pay-for-performance because
FLMs’ influence on these practices is limited such that many organizations frequently use standardized selection systems (e.g., Den Hartog, 2012) and compensation programs strictly controlled by organization policy. However, I added two items that measure employee discretion and information sharing (one item for each) based on the HR system architecture suggested by Lepak et al. (2006) to measure employee involvement as well as employee participation. In total, 11 items from five HR functional areas were used to capture FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs. These items are also consistent with the inducement and investment HR practices proposed by Shaw et al. (2009).

The scales ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a great extent) for all items. These items also include “not at all” because it is possible that organizations do not adopt certain HR practices. To make a distinction from FLMs’ implementation of HR practices, the following instructions were included: “Please indicate the extent to which your organization has formal HR programs in the following areas, although these HR programs may not always be implemented.” Sample items include “Our organization provides job security to employees,” “Our organization shares information about how the organization is performing,” and “Our organization provides a lot of training to employees.” This variable was measured at Time 1 and the Cronbach alpha for this measure was .87 for both FLMs and employees.

4.2.2 FLMs’ implementation (employees’ experience) of commitment HR practices

FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices describes the extent to which FLMs proactively implemented a set of HR practices. This measure is consistent with the “actual HR practices” that appeared in previous strategic HRM studies (e.g., Huselid &
Becker, 2000; Wright & Boswell, 2002; Nishii & Wright, 2007). For this measure, I followed the same procedures and drew from the same strategic HRM studies that I used to develop FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR practices. In terms of measurement, I focused on differentiating this measure from the awareness measure by using words such as “actively,” “committed,” and “devoted” in survey items. In contrast to awareness, which focuses on measuring the intensity of perceived messages, implementation focuses on FLMs’ implementation or delivery of certain HR practices.

In total, 11 items were used. The scales ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a great extent) for all items to measure this variable. These items also include “not at all” because it is possible that FLMs decide not to implement some HR practices because FLMs can see that their organizations seem unconcerned about FLMs’ implementation of those practices.

To distinguish this construct from “FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs,” I included a short explanation describing this measure as I did for “awareness of commitment HR practices”. Sample items include “I actively communicate with my subordinates that employees in our organization can expect to stay for as long as they wish,” “I encourage my subordinates to be involved in problem-solving activities,” and “I am committed to offering my subordinates chances to develop a successful career within our organization.” This measure was measured from FLMs as well as their subordinates to avoid common method bias. FLM ratings were used as a predictor of the employee model whereas employee ratings were used as an outcome variable of the FLM model. In terms of employee experience of commitment HR practices (employee-rated), I replaced the subject “I” with “my supervisor” and the reference “my subordinates” with “people in
our work group.” Employee ratings were collected at Time 2 and FLM ratings were collected at Time 1. The Cronbach alphas for this measure were .86 and .93 for FLMs and employees, respectively.

Given that employees’ experience of commitment HR practices is an outcome variable of the FLM model, it was necessary to calculate aggregation statistics to check if this measure shows appropriate group-level properties. Specifically, Rwg, ICC (1), and ICC (2) were calculated to justify aggregation of this measure up to the group level. Rwg is a measure indicating the level of agreement within a group (unit). The mean Rwg score was sufficiently high at .78 (James, 1982). ICC (1) indicates the extent to which variance of a focal variable can be explained by group membership and ICC (2) indicates reliability of ICC (1). ICC (1) and (2) were sufficiently high at .45 and .73, respectively.

4.2.3 FLMs’ (Employees’) attributions of commitment HR programs (practices)

HR attributions measure employees’ causal attributions of “why” their organizations adopt a certain set of HR practices (Koys, 1988, 1991; Nishii et al., 2008). Thus, this measure captures employees’ interpretations of received information that is related to HR programs/practices. Nishii et al. (2008) originally proposed five different types of HR attributions based on the previous strategy and employment literature. To measure commitment HR attributions, I used two internal attribution items (quality and employee well-being) for each of the five HR functional areas identified for awareness and the implementation of commitment HR programs. As mentioned before, these two types are very closely related to each other conceptually, and measuring both types of
attributions is necessary to capture commitment HR attributions. I also included measures for other types of HR attributions to check the dimensionality of the measure.

Although this measure is designed to measure employees’ attributions of HR practices, I expect that this measure can be used for FLMs as well. Thus, the same measure will be used for both FLMs and employees to measure the degree to which they believe that their organization adopted its current HR practices to promote the well-being of employees and to enhance their commitment to the organization. The scales range from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a great extent). The sample items include “Our organization provides employees with the employee involvement programs that it does, so that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being,” “Our organization provides employees with the training that it does, so that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being.” The Cronbach alphas for this measure measured from FLMs were .80 and .84 for quality and employee well-being HR attributions, respectively. The correlation between the two types of HR attributions was .80 (p<.01), and these two variables were averaged to create commitment HR attributions. The Cronbach alphas for this measure measured from employees were .85 and .82 for quality and employee well-being HR attributions, respectively. Again, these two types of HR attributions were averaged to create employees’ commitment HR attributions (r=.80, p<.01). These variables were measured at Time 2.

4.2.4 FLMs’ (Employees’) self-transcendence

Schwartz’s (1992) Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) has been used extensively in previous studies on values (e.g., Bardi, Lee, Hofmann-Towfigh, & Soutar, 2009; Knafo
Moreover, SVS is developed based on strong theoretical explanation that can relate to commitment HR practices. Thus, this measure was regarded as an appropriate measure for the current study. However, SVS was not developed for research in work organizations, and several items seem to have little relevance to organizational study. Thus, I decided to use an adapted set of value survey items based on the work of Brown and Trevino (2009). They excluded several items that are not relevant to the organizational work context (e.g., love, family, and nature) and added several items from Organizational Work Profile (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). In addition to SVS, Organizational Work Profile has been widely accepted as a value-based instrument. Items drawn from both sources are well validated in previous studies and seem to be an effective combination for value studies in the organizational context.

The final version included 14 items from Schwartz’s work and 4 items from the work of O’Reilly et al. Among these 18 items, 5 values were included in the measure of self-transcendence (altruism, justice, helpfulness, teamwork, and equality). The scales range from -1 to 7 (-1 = opposed to my values, 0 = not important, 7 = of supreme importance). This measure was collected at Time 1 for both FLMs and employees. The Cronbach alphas for this measure were .89 and .82 for FLMs and employee, respectively.

4.2.5 Organizational citizenship behavior

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior was first introduced by Organ (1998), based on the work of Katz and Khan (1966, 1978). Organ initially proposed five dimensions of the construct, which is composed of altruism, conscientiousness, civic
virtue, sportsmanship, and courtesy. The current study is focused on the effect of implemented commitment HR practices on employees’ extra-role behaviors toward an organization through employees’ interpretation of HR practices. Thus, I used a measure used by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) to measure unit-level OCB. In total, four items were used. FLMs were asked to rate each subordinate on those eight items. The scales range from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The sample items include “(This person) makes suggestions to improve this work place” and “(This person) is willing to do things that help this work place outside of my normal duties.” This measure was collected at Time 2 and the Cronbach alpha was .85.

4.2.6 Control variables

In terms of testing the hypothesized models, I included several control variables. At the organization level, two dummy variables were included, which are industry and organization type (profit vs. non-profit). It is possible for organizations to display systematic differences in terms of the use of commitment HR programs, depending on the nature of the business and the roles required by the employees. For example, studies conducting comparative analyses reported differences in adoption of commitment HR systems across industries (Hogue, 1999). At the FLM level, demographic data such as FLMs’ gender, tenure, education, and employment type were included (FLM control variables). These variables are frequently included in individual-level studies because individual differences based on demographic information would mean differences in cognitive processes and interpretations of the same information. Thus, it is important to control for the effects of the inherent heterogeneity represented by various individuals in
the current study because the suggested models focus on testing the effect of individual differences in attributional process and self-transcendence. At the employee level, the same control variables used for the FLM model were included, such as gender, tenure, education, and employment type (Employee control variables), which were collected from employees. With regard to testing H3 and H4 of the FLM model, male employee percent and permanent employee percent were calculated from the demographic information of employees.

Finally, I decided to include self-enhancement in models testing interactions between self-transcendence and other variables (H2, H4, H6, H8, H10, and H12). As described in the literature review, self-enhancement is conceptually opposed to self-transcendence (Schwartz, 1992). For this reason, it is possible for survey respondents to use only several scales indicating high levels of self-transcendence rather than to use the whole scale if only self-enhancement is measured in the survey. This could happen because some scales indicating low levels of self-transcendence could reflect the condition of being psychologically blocked, and could be considered to be used for self-enhancement values. Thus, self-enhancement was included in the survey and the analysis as a control variable to avoid measurement errors and to eliminate alternative explanations. Information related to data collection plan for all variables included in the current can be found in Table 2.
## Table 2

**Sources and Sequence of Data Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Department</td>
<td>-Organizational information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontline Manager</td>
<td>-FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR practices</td>
<td>-FLMs’ attributions of commitment HR practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-FLMs’ Implementation of commitment HR practices</td>
<td>-FLMs’ self-transcendence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-FLMs’ self-transcendence</td>
<td>-Employee OCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Demographic information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>-Employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices</td>
<td>-Employees’ attributions of commitment HR practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Employees’ self-transcendence</td>
<td>-FLMs’ Implementation of commitment HR practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Demographic information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

In this chapter, I describe the results testing the three models that I proposed in this study. In doing so, I begin with the FLM model followed by the employee model and multi-level model in order.

5.1 Results of the Frontline Manager Model

Before describing correlations, means, and standard deviations of the FLM model, I present exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of HR attributions that I used to create commitment HR attributions in this study.

5.1.1 Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Frontline Manager Model

As mentioned previously, the measure of commitment HR attributions was adapted from the study by Nishii et al. (2008). Because their study is the only empirical study measuring HR attributions, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted to check the dimensionality of HR attributions. First, I ran EFA with Varimax rotation. Based on a minimum eigenvalue criterion, I found that multiple items were cross-listed in six factors.

The EFA result did not support the five-factor structure (quality, employee well-being, cost-reduction, employee exploitation, and external HR attributions; see Nishii et al., 2008 for details). However, I proceeded to CFA to check whether the data support the five-factor structure that Nishii et al. originally proposed or the three-factor structure that they empirically found in their CFA. In the first model of CFA, I tested the five-factor structure by loading 25 items to five dimensions. For example, the five items referencing
quality attributions were loaded onto a single factor and all other factors were created following the same procedure. In the second model of CFA, I tested the three-factor structure. Specifically, the items measuring quality and well-being dimensions were loaded onto a single factor, and the items measuring cost-reduction and employee exploitation were loaded onto another single factor.

The results showed that both models had poor fit to the data and did not fulfill the commonly used cut-off criteria (five-factor model: $\chi^2_{(265)} = 642.29; \text{CFI} = .67; \text{RMSEA} = .15; \text{NFI} = .56$, three-factor model: $\chi^2_{(272)} = 687.83; \text{CFI} = .64; \text{RMSEA} = .16; \text{NFI} = .53$). Although the five-factor model showed slightly better fit than the three-factor model, both CFI and NFI were below .9 (Bentler, 1990, 1992) and RMSEA was much higher than the .08 cut-off (Byrne, 1998). Finally, I ran two more SEM models only with quality and employee well-being items. In the first two-factor model, fit statistics were acceptable without dropping any items ($\chi^2_{(25)} = 37.95; \text{CFI} = .96; \text{RMSEA} = .09; \text{NFI} = .90$). In the second one-factor model, several items needed to be dropped to find acceptable fit statistics. As these SEM results showed, the dimensionality Nishii et al. found in their study was not replicated; quality and employee well-being attributions emerged as two separate factors in the current study.

There could be multiple reasons for the inconsistent findings between the study by Nishii et al. and the current study. As far as I recognize, the HR attributions measure suggested by Nishii et al. (2008) has not been replicated or used in any other empirical studies yet. For this reason, the findings of the previous study might be untenable across multiple studies or context. Specifically, the repeated use of the question stems across different types of HR attributions can be problematic. For example, in the five survey
questions asking about the purpose of the training that their organizations provide, “Our organization provides employees the training that it does…” was repeatedly used in five different types of HR attributions. When a specific question stem like this is repeatedly used in multiple consecutive questions, survey responses can be correlated (Bollen & Lennox, 1991). Relatedly, the manner of how the construct was measured could have been problematic. Specifically, the lay-out of the questions in the survey could have been a source of somewhat unclear dimensionality. Questions are grouped based on HR functional areas such as promotion, compensation, and so on, not based on HR attributions such as quality, cost reduction, or employee well-being. Moreover, HR attributions were measured from the same source by using the same method. Thus, how the construct was measured could have been another source of the current variance of findings. Finally, it is possible that sample characteristics could have made a difference. Specifically, Korean managers may not have strong perceptions that HR practices related to promotion and performance appraisal could be used as ways to promote employee well-being. In Korea, many organizations still conduct performance evaluation to justify promotion decisions that are frequently based on seniority or organizational tenure. Also, using a sample from multiple organizations with different HR emphases would have been a source of unclear dimensionality.

The purpose of the current study is not to replicate the dimensionality found in the study by Nishii et al. (2008). Instead, I sought to explore the roles of the combined two dimensions of HR attributions (quality and well-being) in the relationship between frontline managers’ awareness of commitment HR programs and implementations of commitment HR practices. Moreover, patterns of relationships between dimensions of
HR attributions that Nishii and associates found in the three-factor model appear to be consistent with the current study. Specifically, in the study by Nishii et al., the correlation between quality/well-being and cost/exploitation attributions was .38 (p<.01), the correlation between quality/well-being and external attribution (e.g., union compliance) was .17 (p<.01), and the correlation between cost/exploitation and external attribution was .56 (p<.01). In the current study, the correlation between quality/well-being and cost/exploitation attributions was .51 (p<.01), the correlation between quality/well-being and external attribution (e.g., union compliance) was .27 (p<.01), and the correlation between cost/exploitation and external attribution was .59 (p<.01). Finally, I believe that the items used to measure quality/employee well-being have strong face validity to tap into the construct of commitment HR attributions that were outlined in the theory section. Based on these rationales, I decided to proceed on further analyses.

5.1.2 Descriptive Analysis of the Frontline Manager Model

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations of all variables in the frontline manager model. An examination of Table 3 revealed that FLMs’ commitment HR attribution was positively associated with awareness of FLMs’ commitment HR programs (r=.44, p<.01) as well as employee-rated FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices (r=.29, p<.05). The correlation between FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs and employee-rated FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices was not statistically significant (r=.22, p=.10). Finally, self-transcendence of FLMs was positively associated with both FLMs’ commitment HR attributions (r=.43, p<.01) and employee-rated FLMs’ implementation
of commitment HR practices (r=.31, p<.05). These correlations were supportive of the hypothesized relationships between the variables in general. One unexpected finding was a high correlation between self-transcendence and enhancement (r=.70, p<.01), which I discuss further in section 6.2.1 Frontline Manager Model below.
### Table 3

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-order Correlations of the FLM Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization Type</td>
<td>1</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>2. Industry</td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>1</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>3. Employee Tenure</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</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>4. Employee Education</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Male Employee Percent</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Permanent Employee Percent</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Manager Tenure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Manager Education</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manager Gender</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Awareness of HR Policy</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self-Enhancement</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-Transcendence</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Commitment HR</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 25  34  50  2.8  0.66  9.3  3.15  0.11  3.67  4.96  5.13  3.89  3.56
Standard Deviation: 0.43  0.48  3.3  0.51  0.35  0.18  7.02  0.57  0.32  0.72  1.05  1.07  0.57  0.57

Note. N=58-61. * p<.05, **p<.01. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1.
5.1.3 Tests of Hypotheses for the Frontline Manager Model

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was used to test all hypotheses that were suggested in the FLM model. In doing so, two sets of control variables were used to rule out alternative explanations associated with multiple hypotheses. In terms of testing H1 and H2, control variables associated with FLMs’ characteristics (FLM control variables; see the measures section for details) were used along with organizational control variables. Given that the sample size was quite modest, the use of organizational control variables was limited to two variables, which are organization type and industry. With regard to testing H3, H4, H5, and H6, control variables associated with employee characteristics (employee control variables; see the measures section for details) were used along with organizational control variables. Finally, I included self-enhancement for models testing interactions between self-transcendence and other variables (H2, H4, and H6).

H1 stated that FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs is positively associated with FLMs’ commitment HR attribution. To test H1, I ran two regression models. In Model 1 (Table 4), I entered all organizational control variables and FLM control variables. In Model 2, I added FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR to the regression model. This model explained 27% of the variance of the DV. Model 2 shows that FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR is a positive predictor of FLMs’ commitment HR attribution (b=.39, p<.01), and the addition of this predictor to Model 1 explained an additional 15% of the variance (p<.01), compared to Model 1, which includes only control variables. Thus, H1 was supported.
H2 stated that the relationship between FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR and FLMs’ commitment HR attribution is dependent on the levels of self-transcendence values of FLMs. To test this hypothesis, I ran two more regression models in a hierarchical manner. In Model 3 (Table 4), I entered organizational control variables, FLM control variables, and awareness of commitment HR programs. Additionally, I included self-enhancement of FLMs as a control variable. This model explained 34% of the total variance of the DV (p<.01). Before running Model 4, I created an interaction term by multiplying FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR with FLMs’ self-transcendence by following the procedure suggested by Aiken and West (1991). This interaction term was entered into the regression model. As Table 4 shows, although the addition of the interaction term explained an additional 4% of the variance in the model, the change of R-square was not significant. Thus, H2 was not supported.
### Table 4
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for H1 and H2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Tenure</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Education</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Gender</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Commitment HR</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Transcendence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness × Transcendence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=58-61. * p<.05, **p<.01. Coefficients were standardized. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1.

H3 hypothesized that FLMs’ commitment HR attribution is positively associated with employee-rated implementation of commitment HR practices. To test H3, I ran two regression models. In Model 1 (Table 5), I entered all control variables (organization and employee control variables). This model explained 15% of the total variance of FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices. In Model 2, I added FLMs’ commitment HR attribution to the regression model. This model showed that commitment HR attribution is a significant predictor of commitment HR implementation ($b=.44$, $P<.01$). The inclusion of this variable explained an additional 17% of the total variance ($p<.01$). Thus H3 was supported.
H4 stated that the association between commitment HR attribution and implementation of commitment HR practices will be dependent on the levels of self-transcendence of FLMs. In Model 3 (Table 5), I entered all control variables, commitment HR attribution, and self-enhancement of FLMs. To test the hypothesized interaction, I created an interaction term by multiplying commitment HR attribution with self-transcendence by following the procedure described above. In Model 4, I added the interaction term to the regression model. The results showed that the addition of the interaction explained an additional 4% of the variance but the interaction was not statistically significant. Therefore H4 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Tenure</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Percent Employee</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Employee Percent</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR Attributions</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Transcendence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR Attribution × Transcendence</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=58-61. * p<.05, ** p<.01. Coefficients were standardized. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1.
H5 proposed a direct association between awareness of commitment HR programs and implementation of commitment HR practices. I entered all control variables in Model 1 (Table 6). In the subsequent regression model (Model 2), I entered awareness of commitment HR programs to the regression model. The result showed a significant direct association (b=.31, p<.05) and this addition explained the variance of implementation of commitment HR practices by 9%, supporting H5. Although not hypothesized, I tested whether commitment HR attributions mediate the direct association found in H5. Adding commitment HR attribution to the regression model (Model 3) made awareness of commitment HR programs insignificant. This suggests full mediation (Barron & Kenny, 1987) of commitment HR attribution on the relationship found in H5.

Table 6
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for H5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Tenure</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Employee Percent</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Employee Percent</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Commitment HR</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR Attributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=58-61. * p<.05, ** p<.01. Coefficients were standardized. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1.
H6 stated that the indirect effect of awareness of commitment HR programs on the implementation of commitment HR practices through commitment HR attribution would be dependent on the levels of self-transcendence. To test this hypothesis, I ran moderated-mediation analysis (Muller et al., 2005; Edward & Lambert, 2007; Preacher et al., 2007). This test provides the advantage of testing moderation and mediation simultaneously in a single model. Combined with bootstrap analysis, moderated-mediation can provide more accurate estimations for the statistical significance of the proposed model.

The findings from moderated-mediation analysis were not statistically significant and consistent with non-supported findings from the two previous interaction tests (H2 and H4). The conditional indirect effects were presented in Table 7. Although conditional indirect effect was significant at the high level of self-transcendence, the findings from the two interaction terms in the analysis of moderated-mediation did not provide support for H6.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional Indirect Effect for H6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV=Implementation of Commitment HR Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Transcendence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 SD (-1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (1.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 58. Confidence interval=95%. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000
5.2 Results of the Employee Model

The employee model also includes the measure of commitment HR attribution. Because this measure was rated by employees in this model, I conducted separate EFA and CFA as I did for the FLM model. Following this, the descriptive statistics and results of hypothesis tests for the employee model were presented.

5.2.1 Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Employee Model

I ran EFA and a series of CFA to check the dimensionality of HR attributions as responded by employees following the procedure I did for the FLM model. First, I ran EFA with Varimax rotation to see if HR attributions have the five-dimension structure that was initially suggested by Nishii et al. (2008). Based on a minimum eigenvalue criterion, I found a six-factor structure that includes multiple items cross-listed in multiple factors.

Although EFA did not support the five-factor structure, I proceeded to CFA to check if the data support five-factor or three-factor structure (again, Nishii and associates found a three-factor structure in CFA). In terms of the procedure, I followed the same procedure I used for the manager model. The 25 items were loaded onto five factors with 5 items for each factor. Initially, the five-factor model did not show an acceptable fit. After dropping a few items and correlating the error terms, I was able to get acceptable fit. I proceeded to the three-factor model to find a model with better fit. In the three-factor model, fit statistics were poor but I was able to get acceptable fit after dropping several items and correlating error terms. The model fit from the three-factor model was not any better than the five-factor model. The five-factor and three-factor models need to drop
many items to achieve acceptable fit statistics. Thus, I decided to run CFA with only quality and employee well-being items. To fit the two-factor model, it was necessary to drop a few items. However, the one-factor model showed an acceptable fit without dropping any items ($\chi^2_{(25)} = 57.63$; CFI=.97; RMSEA=.08; NFI=.94). Error terms were correlated in both models.

This finding is different from the manager model. In the manager model, I found two separate factors for quality and employee well-being attribution. However, the employee model showed one factor for the two types of HR attributions. This finding is consistent with the finding of Nishii et al. (2008). In their study, they tested employee HR attributions and found one factor for quality and employee well-being attributions. However, the fit for the overall dimensionality of HR attributions was not acceptable without dropping any items proposed by Nishii et al. In terms of the reason for poor fit statistics, the same justifications suggested for the manager model could apply. Since the current measure was not repeatedly used in any other empirical studies, validity of the measure is in question across multiple samples or contexts. Also, repeated use of the same question stems in multiple consecutive survey items and lay-out of questions based on sub-HR functionality rather than types of HR attributions would have caused employees to be confused (Bollen & Lennox, 1991). Finally, sample characteristics would have influenced the dimensionality of employees’ HR attributions. It is possible that Korean employees would not have clear understandings of the organizational intentions of using certain HR practices when FLMs, a major HR actor, do not have clear understandings of their HR practices or perceive inconsistencies in application.
5.2.2 Descriptive Analysis of the Employee Model

Table 8 presents the means, standard deviation, and zero-order correlations of all the variables in the employee model. An examination of Table 8 showed that employees’ commitment HR attribution is positively associated with both employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices ($r=.57$, $p<.01$) and FLM-rated OCB of employees ($r=.35$, $p<.01$). Moreover the association between awareness of commitment HR attributions and OCB was also positive and statistically significant ($r=.28$, $p<.01$). As was the case with the manager model, the correlation between self-transcendence and self-enhancement was also high ($r=.72$, $p<.01$) in the employee model. Finally, self-transcendence was positively correlated with commitment HR attributions ($r=.38$, $p<.01$), but the association with OCB was not statistically significant ($r=.11$, $p>.05$). The patterns of correlations were consistent with the hypothesized relationships between variables.
Table 8  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-order Correlations of the Employee Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization Type</td>
<td>1</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>2. Industry</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>1</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>3. Manager Tenure</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</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>4. Manager Education</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manager Gender</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee Tenure</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employee Education</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employee Gender</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employment Type</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Awareness of HR Practices</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self-Enhancement</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-Transcendence</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Commitment HR Attributes</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Employee OCB Rated by Managers</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=138-195. * p<.05, **p<.01. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1; Employment type: permanent=0, temporary=1.
5.2.3 Tests of Hypotheses for the Employee Model

To test the hypotheses, I ran multiple models of OLS regression. Consistent with the FLM model, I used two sets of control variables along with organizational control variables to rule out alternative explanations for the hypothesized relationships. Specifically, control variables associated with FLMs’ characteristics (FLM control variables; see the measures section for details) were included in the regression models to test H9, H10, H11, and H12. In terms of testing H7 and H8, I included control variables associated with employee characteristics (employee control variables; see the measures section for details) in the regression. Finally, I included self-transcendence in the regression for models testing interactions (H8, H10 and H12). The findings described below show the same pattern as the findings of the FLM model.

H7 stated that employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices is positively associated with employees’ commitment HR attribution. To test this hypothesis, I ran two regression models. In Model 1 (Table 9), I entered all organizational and employee control variables. This model explained 4% of the total variance of commitment HR attribution. In Model 2, I entered awareness of commitment HR practices along with all the control variables. Awareness was a significant predictor of commitment HR attribution (b=.56, p<.01), and this model explained 33% of the total variance. The increase of R-square was .29 (p<.01). Thus, H7 was supported.

H8 (Table 9) hypothesized that the association between employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices and commitment HR attribution will be moderated by levels of employees’ self-transcendence values. In this model, I included the control variables included in Model 7 and the procedure used to test H8 was consistent with the procedure
used for H4. Model 3 explained 36% of the total variance of commitment HR attribution.

In Model 4, the interaction term created by multiplying awareness and self-transcendence was not statistically significant, rejecting H8.

Table 9
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for H7 and H8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Tenure</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Gender</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Employment Type</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness of Commitment HR 0.56** 0.48** 0.46**
Self-Transcendence 0.16 0.16
Awareness × Transcendence 0.06

R² 0.04 0.33** 0.36** 0.36**
ΔR² 0.29** 0

Note. N=138-195. * p<.05, **p<.01. Coefficients were standardized. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1; Employment type: permanent=0, temporary=1.

H9 hypothesized that employees’ commitment HR attribution is positively associated with employees’ OCB, rated by FLMs. I ran two regression models to test this hypothesis. In Model 1 (Table 10), I entered all organizational and FLM control variables. This model explained 6% of the total variance of OCB. In the subsequent model (Model 2), I added commitment HR attributions to the model. This test indicated commitment
HR attributions as a significant predictor of OCB (b=.34, p<.01). This model explained an additional 10% of the total variance (p<.01), supporting H9.

In H10, I proposed the linkage between commitment HR attribution and OCB is moderated by the levels of employees’ self-transcendence values. I ran two more regression models to test this moderation hypothesis. In Model 3 (Table 10), I entered all organizational and FLM control variables along with self-transcendence and enhancement values. This model explained 16% of the total variance of OCB. In Model 4, I added an interaction term that I created from commitment HR attribution and self-transcendence. Although the addition of the interaction term explained an additional 2% of the total variance, it was not a statistically significant predictor of OCB failing to support H10.

Table 10
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for H9 and H10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Tenure</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Education</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Gender</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR Attributions</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Transcendence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR Attribution × Transcendence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=138-195. * p<.05, **p<.01. Coefficients were standardized. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1.
H11 suggested a direct impact of employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices on OCB. In Model 1 (Table 11), I entered organizational and FLM control variables in the model. This model explained 6% of the total variance of OCB. In the subsequent model (Model 2), I added awareness of commitment HR practices to the model. Awareness of commitment HR turned out to be a significant predictor of OCB (b=.26, p<.01), and this model explained an additional 7% of the total variance. Thus, H11 was supported. Although not hypothesized, I proceed on to test whether commitment HR attribution mediates the direct association between awareness and OCB. I added commitment HR attribution in Model 3, finding evidence for full mediation (Barron & Kenny, 1987). Specifically, awareness was not significant after adding commitment HR attribution in Model 3.

Table 11
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for H11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Tenure</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Education</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Gender</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Commitment HR</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR Attributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=138-195. * p<.05, **p<.01. Coefficients were standardized. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1.
H12 suggested that the indirect effect of employees’ awareness of commitment HR attribution on OCB through commitment HR attribution will be moderated by self-transcendence values of employees. The first interaction between awareness and self-transcendence was not statistically significant. The second interaction between commitment HR attribution and self-transcendence was significant, but the sign was opposite to the hypothesized direction (b=-0.21, p<.05). The conditional indirect effects were presented in Table 12. Although the conditional indirect effect was significant at the low and medium levels of self-transcendence, the findings from the two interaction terms in the analysis of moderated-mediation did not provide support for H12.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV=OCB</th>
<th>Self-Transcendence</th>
<th>Boot Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>Boot Lower CI</th>
<th>Boot Upper CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 SD (-1.16)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (-0)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 SD (1.16)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 137. Confidence interval=95%. Bootstrap sample size = 5,000.

5.3 Results of the Multi-level Model

This section describes the findings from testing multiple models of hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). Because this model tests the effect of FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices (Level-2) on employee commitment HR attribution (Level-1) and OCB (Level-1), HLM was considered to be an appropriate technique to test the
hypothesized model. Correlations, means, and standard deviations are presented followed by detailed descriptions of HLM findings.

5.3.1 Descriptive Analysis of the Multi-level Model

Table 13 presents the means, standard deviation, and zero-order correlations between variables at both employee (Level-1) and FLM (Level-2) levels. The employee-level table suggests a positive association between employees’ commitment HR attribution and FLM-rated employee OCB (r=.35, p<.01). To test the three hypotheses suggested for the multi-level model, I ran a series of hierarchical linear models (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). Consistent with the previous two models, I used the two sets of control variables (employee control and FLM control) along with organizational control variables.
Table 13
Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-order Correlations of the Multi-level Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLM level (Level-2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commitment HR Implementation</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee level (Level-1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employee Tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Employee Employment Type</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manager Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manager Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Manager Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commitment HR Attributions</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manager-rated Employee OCB</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=178-186 for level-1, N=58 for level-2. * p<.05, **p<.01. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1; Employment type: permanent=0, temporary=1.
5.3.2 Tests of Hypotheses for the Multi-level Model

H13 suggested a positive association between FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices and employees’ (subordinates) commitment HR attribution. To test the hypothesis, I ran two HLM models. In Model 1 (Table 14), I entered organizational control variables at the FLM level as well as employee control variables at the employee level. The deviance of this model was 382.49. In Model 2, I entered implementation of commitment HR practices (FLM level) to the model. The results showed that implementation was a statistically significant predictor of employees’ commitment HR attribution ($\hat{p} = .29$, $p < .01$). The addition of this level-2 predictor decreased model deviance by 3.15, supporting H13.

H14 (Table 14) hypothesized a positive association between FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices attribution and OCB. I ran two HLM models to test the hypothesis. Model 3 includes only control variables (organization and FLM control variables) and the model deviance was 320.70. In Model 4, I added commitment HR implementation to the model. However, this predictor was not statistically significant and the model deviance was slightly higher than Model 3, not supporting H14. Because there is no significant relationship between commitment HR implementation and OCB, this finding does not fulfill the first condition of the mediation test suggested by Baron and Kenny (1987). Thus, H15—suggesting mediation of employees’ commitment HR attribution in the relationship between FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices and FLMs-rated employee OCB—was rejected.
### Table 14

Results of Hierarchical Linear Modeling for H13, H14, and H15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DV=Commitment HR Attributions</th>
<th>DV=OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.22**</td>
<td>1.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Tenure</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Education</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Gender</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Employment Type</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Tenure</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Education</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Gender</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Deviance a</td>
<td>382.49</td>
<td>379.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=178-186 for level-1, N=58 for level-2. a Deviance is a measure of model fit; the smaller the deviance is, the better the model fits. Deviance = -2 × log-likelihood of the full maximum-likelihood estimate.

* p<.05, **p<.01. Organization Type: profit=0, nonprofit=1; Industry: service=0, manufacturing=1; Gender: male=0, female=1; Employment type: permanent=0, temporary=1.
Table 15 presents a summary of the analysis results testing hypotheses suggested for the FLM, employee, and multi-level models.

Table 15
A Summary of Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis (H)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>FLMs’ awareness of the programs offered by the organization is positively associated with their attributions.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>FLMs’ transcendence moderates the association between FLMs’ awareness of programs and attributions. Specifically, the association is more positive when the degree of transcendence is high than when it is low.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>FLMs’ attributions are positively associated with the implementation.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>FLMs’ transcendence moderates the association between FLMs’ attributions and implementation. Specifically, the association is more positive when transcendence is high than when it is low.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>FLMs’ awareness of programs is positively associated with their implementation.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>The relationship between awareness and attributions as well as attributions and implementation will be moderated by transcendence such that this mediated effect will be more positive when transcendence is high than when it is low.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Employees’ awareness of the practices offered by an organization is positively associated with their attributions.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Employees’ transcendence moderates the association between employees’ awareness and attributions. Specifically, the association is more positive when transcendence is high than when it is low.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Employees’ attributions are positively associated with OCB.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Employees’ transcendence moderates the association between employees’ attributions and OCB. Specifically, the association is more positive when transcendence is high than when it is low.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Employees’ awareness of the practices is positively associated with OCB.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between awareness and attributions as well as attributions and OCB will be moderated by transcendence such that this mediated effect will be more positive when transcendence is high than when it is low.

Not supported

H12

A FLM’s implementation is positively associated with employees’ attributions.

Supported

H13

A FLM’s implementation is positively associated with OCB.

Not supported

H14

The association between a FLM’s implementation and OCB will be partially mediated by employees’ attributions.

Not supported

H15

Note. Programs=commitment HR programs; Practices=commitment HR practices; Attributions=commitment HR attributions; Implementation=implementation of commitment HR practices; Transcendence=self-transcendence; OCB=organizational citizenship behavior.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

The goal of this dissertation is to understand the process of how organizations implement commitment HR practices by proposing three models: FLM, employee, and multi-level models. Understanding the process of commitment HR practice implementation is important to accumulate our knowledge in the area of human resource management given that strategic HRM literature has heavily invested in figuring out how a set of commitment HR practices impacts organizational performance (Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Guthrie, 2001; Combs at al., 2006; Jiang et al., 2012). Although researchers have developed understandings of which HR practices organizations use to promote organizational performance, less is known about how organizations implement their HR practices. This lack of understanding of HR practice implementation has been repeatedly pointed out as a major problem (e.g., Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Nishii et al., 2008; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007).

Tests of hypotheses based on the three models showed mixed support. The FLMs model showed strong support for the hypotheses testing attributional process of commitment HR practices (H1, H3, and H5). However, the hypotheses testing interactions of self-transcendence were not supported (H2, H4, and H6). In the employee model, the findings were consistent with those of the FLM model. Specifically, the hypotheses testing attributional process of commitment HR practices (H7, H9, and H11) were supported whereas the hypotheses testing interactions of self-transcendence (H8, H10, and H12) were not supported. Finally, in the multi-level model, the hypothesis proposing a positive association between FLM-implemented commitment HR practices
and employees’ commitment HR attributions was supported whereas the other two hypotheses were not supported.

6.1 Contributions of the Study

By integrating and extending the research on strategic HRM, attribution theory, and individual values, this dissertation contributes to the literature of strategic HRM. Overall, this study makes five main contributions. Details for each contribution are presented below.

First, this study contributes to the literature by focusing on how FLMs perceive, understand, and respond to the organizational call to implement commitment HR practices. In the previous study, Nishii et al. (2008) argued for individual differences of employees as a mechanism for employees’ differentiated interpretations of the goal of HR practices that their organizations choose to use. In the current study, I add to the individual difference perspective by including the attributions of FLMs who are considered to be the most important parties in implementing HR practices. Specifically, I focused on the motivational aspects of FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices. By using attribution theory, I examined how awareness of FLMs’ commitment HR programs can motivate FLMs to exert more effort to implement commitment HR practices. Tests of hypotheses indicated that FLMs implement commitment HR practices differently. By focusing on the role of FLMs, the FLM model identified one important source of the gap between the commitment HR programs that organizations report and employees’ experience of these HR practices.
Second, the current study adds to the previous study of HR attributions (Nishii et al., 2008) by providing explanations for how employees develop different understandings of their commitment HR practices. In the employee model, I tried to identify an antecedent of commitment HR attribution and proposed a potential boundary condition of the HR attribution process. In doing so, I applied the same theoretical lenses that were used for the FLM model to the employee model. Tests of hypotheses suggested that differences in the attribution process across employees represent within-group variance of commitment HR attribution across subordinates. In other words, employees could develop different HR attributions although they experience quite similar HR practices.

Although the theoretical foundations as well as the conceptual models of the FLM and employee models are essentially the same, the implications of the employee model are different. The goal of the FLM model is recognizing the role of inter-FLM variance. When FLMs implement commitment HR practices differently, employees in different work groups would experience such HR practices differently. For example, some FLMs could develop high levels of commitment HR attribution and actively implement commitment HR practices through providing intensive training, emphasizing promotion from within, or articulating organizational effort to provide job security. However, other FLMs could develop low levels of commitment HR practices, resulting in providing few opportunities for regular training or chances for promotion. Thus, employees in the same organization could experience very different HR practices, depending on how HR practices were delivered by their FLMs. In other words, the FLM model explains the gap between organization-reported and FLM-implemented commitment HR practices. However, the employee model focuses on the gap between FLM-implemented and
employee-perceived commitment HR practices. This gap generated from individual differences across employees becomes a source of within-group variance of employees’ perceptions of and reactions to implemented HR practices. Although the same logic applied to the two different levels, the implications of these two models are quite distinctive and unique.

The third contribution of this study is an empirical examination of the direct effect of FLMs on employees’ attributional processes and behaviors. The multi-level model focuses on the interactive relationships between FLMs and subordinates. In other words, this model focuses on the role of FLMs in employees’ development of commitment HR attributions. In terms of developing their understandings of HR practices, employees receive HRM-related information from several different sources, such as top executives, HR department, supervisors, and coworkers (e.g., Lepak et al., 2006; Osterman, 1994; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007; Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). Although several theoretical arguments suggested the critical role of FLMs in implementing HR practices, empirical evidence for this argument is scarce. Thus, it is necessary to estimate the impact of HR activities made by FLMs on employee commitment HR attribution and behavior at work.

Tests of hypotheses suggested that FLMs’ implementation (self-ratings) of commitment HR practices is a significant source of employees’ commitment HR attributions, although the direct relationship between FLMs’ implementation and OCB was not statistically significant. This insignificant direct relationship is consistent with findings from previous strategic HR studies (e.g., Liao et al., 2009; Aryee et al., 2012; Den Hartog et al., 2012). However, the multi-level model makes a significant contribution to the strategic HRM literature in that it showed significant influence of
FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices on employees’ commitment HR attribution and subsequent behaviors.

Fourth, testing the three hypothesized models required the introduction of new measures of commitment HR practices. This effort makes a contribution to understanding implementation of commitment practices. In particular, awareness and implementation of commitment HR practices were created from measures used in previous strategic HRM studies. Currently used measures of commitment HR practices do not distinguish the difference between awareness and interpretations of commitment HR practices. In this study, the introduction of these new measures enabled the examination of the psychological process of how FLMs and employees develop commitment HR attributions and engage in related activities. For example, the awareness measure suggests the role of communication effectiveness between organizations and FLMs in developing commitment HR attributions when organizations attempt to implement high levels of commitment HR practices. Moreover, the implementation measure provides insights about the consequence of commitment HR attribution in terms of implementation. The level of sophistication of measures used in a study could be directly related to more nuanced findings in the given field of study.

Fifth, the validity of the results in the current study is strengthened by using a rigorous study design in which data was collected from multiple respondents and sources across two periods of time. One limitation that has frequently been pointed out in the strategic HRM literature is the use of a single respondent to measure HR system variables (Arthur & Boyles, 2007; Boselie, Dietz, & Boon, 2005; Gerhart, Wright, Mahan, & Snell, 2000). To provide more valid assessment of the construct in question, multiple
subordinates were used to measure experienced commitment HR practices. Strategic HRM scholars argued that the use of cross-sectional or retrospective data threatens the validity of findings (Wright et al., 2005; Wall & Wood, 2005). As described in the method section, I have collected data from FLMs and employees in two temporally separate surveys. Although the gap between the first and second survey is quite short, this design improves on the use of cross-sectional data or retrospective data and is not subject to common method variance.

In the following section, the results of the hypotheses tests are reviewed with specific attention to how the current study could make a contribution to several key areas of the strategic HRM literature. Several post-hoc analyses are conducted and the implications from the post-hoc analyses are reviewed for future research. The chapter concludes with discussions of managerial implications and limitations of the study.

6.2 Implications of Findings from Each Model

The implications of the findings will be discussed in three parts. I begin with the FLM model, followed by the employee and multi-level models. Specifically, I discuss supported and non-supported findings in detail and suggest the direction for future studies.

6.2.1 Frontline Manager Model

In this study, I proposed a model of “FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices.” Although FLMs or supervisors are considered to be major HR actors in several published studies (e.g., Gilbert et al., 2011; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007; Nehles et al., 2006), these studies do not address details of “why” FLMs are regarded as major
actors in the implementation of commitment HR practices or “how” this happens. Thus, proposing a theory-based model and testing it to find empirical evidence is an important first step to develop more systematic understandings of the roles of FLMs in implementing commitment HR practices.

The FLM model showed support for several hypotheses (H1, H3, and H5). I hypothesized that FLMs would develop strong commitment HR programs when they have high levels of awareness of commitment HR attributions. Consistent with this prediction, I found support for this hypothesis. I also found support for the positive relationship between commitment HR attribution and implementation by FLMs. Finally, the hypothesis stating a direct relationship between FLMs’ awareness and implementation was supported. These findings are meaningful because future studies of strategic HRM could benefit from the findings of the well-developed leadership literature and studies based on attribution theories in several other areas. In the current study, I found that the observed FLMs’ attribution process of commitment HR programs is consistent with the leaders’ attributional process as proposed by Green and Mitchell (1979). Based on the current findings, strategic HRM researchers could begin more thorough investigations for the relationships between awareness, attributions, and implementation of commitment HR programs (practices).

However, several hypotheses testing interactions (H2, H4, and H6) were not supported. I proposed that the attributional process of commitment HR programs would be influenced by the levels of self-transcendence of FLMs. However, self-transcendence of FLMs did not behave as I expected. There could be multiple reasons for the insignificant findings. First, I presume that measurement errors could have been a
problem. The test of correlation showed a very high correlation between self-transcendence and enhancement ($r=.70$, $p<.01$). In his descriptions of dynamic value structure, Schwartz (1992, 2012) argued that the self-transcendence and self-enhancement are in conflict. Thus, the observed correlation in this sample is not usual. For example, Brown and Trevino’s study (2009) used the same measure we used in the current study but found a small correlation ($r=.27$, $p<.01$). Thus, this could be an indication of possible measurement errors. The potential explanation of this measurement error could be social desirability bias. In other words, survey respondents could have felt compelled to respond highly to most of the individual values items because those values represent organizationally desirable behaviors and values. Thus, it is possible that range restriction that originated from social desirability pressure would have been a problem in testing interactions.

Another reason for finding insignificant interactions would be the sample characteristics. As Hofsted (1984) observed, South Korea is a country with a high degree of collectivist culture. Given that self-transcendence is a related construct of collectivism, it can be argued that most Koreans have high levels of self-transcendence, also a source of range restriction. The sample characteristics could also provide a reason for finding a high correlation between self-transcendence and enhancement. Schwartz (1992) argued that value structure is context-specific and situational influences (e.g., culture) would shape expressed values of individuals. Specifically, in this study, Schwartz observed that multiple Chinese samples substantially deviated from the ideal values structure. Given that South Korea and China are geographically adjacent and have developed very similar
cultures throughout history, it is possible that the current Korean sample would have showed a similar value structure as was found in previous Chinese samples.

If the findings of insignificant interactions are not based on measurement errors or sample characteristics, it is possible that the hypothesized model is not correct. Thus, I ran post-hoc analyses to explore two other alternative models. First, I decided to test the FLM model with self-enhancement as a moderator instead of self-transcendence. Individuals with high levels of self-enhancement are self-oriented and have a strong orientation for personal achievement and success (Schwartz, 1992, 2012). Thus, I assume that people with high self-enhancement are more likely to pay attention to the intentions of organizations to find opportunities for success. In other words, they will develop high levels of commitment HR attribution when their organizations intend to implement high levels of commitment HR practices. Consequently, these FLMs will try hard to implement commitment HR practices to advance their careers.

Post-hoc analysis followed the same procedure adopted to test hypotheses in terms of the use of control variables and testing interactions. I tested H2 and H4 with self-enhancement as a moderator. The results showed that self-enhancement was a statistically significant moderator on the relationship between awareness and commitment HR attribution (b=.27, p<.05). However, self-enhancement did not moderate the relationship between commitment HR attribution and implementation. These findings suggest that not only self-transcendence but also self-enhancement of FLMs could function as a boundary condition in FLMs’ attributional process of commitment HR programs.
Along with testing the first alternative model, I tested another alternative model. In the current study, I combined quality and employee well-being attributions to create a measure of commitment HR attributions. This is consistent with what Nishii et al. (2008) did in their study of HR attributions. Although their empirical findings supported combining well-being HR attribution with quality HR attribution, the two types of HR attribution are initially theorized as two separate constructs, and the current study showed support for a two-factor structure. Thus, I decided to test a model that includes the two separate HR attributions (quality and well-being) as mediators between awareness of commitment HR programs and implementation of commitment HR practices.

In terms of testing this model, which tests the differential effect of the two types of HR attributions, I decided to include both self-transcendence and enhancement as moderators to the model. As explained in the literature review, self-transcendence is conceptually consistent with employee well-being HR attribution (Schwartz, 1992). Individuals with high levels of self-transcendence are other-oriented and more likely to help others. For this reason, self-transcendence was modeled as a moderator on the relationship between awareness of commitment HR programs and employee well-being HR attribution as well as on the relationship between employee well-being HR attribution and implementation of commitment HR practices. However, self-enhancement is conceptually related to high quality HR attributions. FLMs with high levels of self-enhancement are self-oriented and have strong aspirations for success and achievement (Schwartz, 1992). Thus, self-enhancement was modeled as a moderator on the relationship between awareness of commitment HR programs and quality HR attribution as well as on the relationship between quality HR attribution and implementation.
The analysis procedure was consistent with that of the previous post-hoc analysis. The results showed that self-enhancement moderated the linkage between awareness of commitment HR programs and quality HR attribution \((b=.27, p<.05)\). However, self-transcendence did not show significant interactions on the relationship between awareness of commitment HR programs and employee well-being HR attribution. With regard to the linkage from the two types of HR attributions to implementations of commitment HR practices, self-transcendence showed marginally significant interactions on the relationship between employee well-being HR attribution and implementations \((b=.22, p=.08)\). However, self-enhancement was not a significant moderator on the relationship between quality HR attribution and implementation. Although this alternative model found significant interactions, interpretations of the findings are somewhat unclear and attention is needed for further development.

6.2.2 Employee Model

The employee model is consistent with the FLM model and also based on attribution theory and individual values theory. However, the data used for the employee model were collected from employees. The current study is not the first to use of attribution theory to explain how employees develop their understandings of the organizational intentions of using certain HR practices. The positive association between commitment HR attribution and OCB appeared in the study by Nishii et al. (2008). However, their findings are somewhat different from this study because in their study 1) they did not measure a direct association between commitment HR attribution and OCB and 2) the linkage from employee attitudes to OCB was examined at the unit level. Thus,
their study does not provide empirical evidence for how commitment HR attributions affect employee OCB at the individual level.

The pattern of findings in the employee model was consistent with the FLM model. In particular, I found support for H7, H9, and H11. I hypothesized a positive association between employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices and commitment HR attribution, finding support for this hypothesis. I also found support for the positive association between employees’ commitment HR attributions and OCB. Finally, the hypothesis stating a direct relationship between employees’ awareness and OCB was supported. These findings suggested that the process of commitment HR attribution observed in the FLM model can be applied to understand employees’ commitment HR attribution processes.

However, as was the case with the manager model, the hypotheses testing interactions (H8, H10, and H12) were not supported. Specifically, self-transcendence did not turn out as a significant moderator on employees’ attributional processes of commitment HR practices. I presume that the reasons for these non-supported findings are consistent with the FLM model. Range restriction resulting from social desirability bias or sample characteristics could be potential explanations.

It is also possible that the theorized employee model is incorrect. Thus, I explored the two alternative models I tested for the FLM model. In doing so, the use of control variables and the statistical procedure were consistent with the two alternative models tested for the FLM model. In the first alternative model, I tested the employee model with self-enhancement based on the mechanism suggested for the first alternative model of the FLM model. Specifically, I tested H9 and H10 with self-enhancement as a moderator.
The results showed that self-enhancement was not a significant moderator for either the linkage between awareness and commitment HR attributions or the linkage between commitment HR attributions and OCB.

Given that the first alternative model did not show meaningful findings, I tested the second alternative model that I tested for the FLM model. According to findings, self-enhancement of employees was a significant moderator on the relationship between quality HR attribution and OCB. However, the sign of interaction was negative (b=-.18, p<.05). Finally, the other three interaction tests were not significant.

Compared to the findings from the manager model, the results of the employee model looked less promising. The FLM model showed several significant interactions and other non-significant interactions at least showed hypothesized directions. However, the employee model did not show a consistent pattern. I presume that the findings from the second alternative model are not at odds considering that the factor structure of employees’ commitment HR attributions is different from the factor structure of FLMs’ commitment HR attributions. Through a series of CFA, I found a two-factor structure for FLMs’ commitment HR attributions whereas I found a one-factor structure for employees’ commitment HR attributions. I expect it is hard to find differential effects when quality and employee well-being attributions formed one factor.

6.2.3 Multi-level Model

Compared to the FLM and employee models that describe the psychological process of FLMs and employees, the multi-level model aims for different contributions in that it focuses on the interactive nature between FLMs and subordinates. For this reason,
the multi-level model highlights the importance of the quality and nature of interactions between FLMs and subordinates. This model adds additional values to the findings from the employee model. In the employee model, awareness of commitment HR practices could have multiple sources such as senior managers, the HR department, and supervisors. Thus, employees’ understandings of the commitment HR practices are mixed effects of multiple HR actors. However, as I mentioned in literature review, I consider senior managers and the HR department as antecedents of FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices. Thus, FLMs are likely the most immediate factor of employees’ commitment HR attributions and examining the relationship between the FLMs’ implementation and employees’ commitment HR attributions is required to elaborate on how organizations implement commitment HR practices.

As can be seen in hypotheses tests, the positive association between FLMs’ implementation and employees’ attributions (H13) was statistically significant. I believe this finding is important because we do not have empirical evidence for antecedents of commitment HR attributions yet. This finding again proves the importance of managers or supervisors in terms of development of employees’ understandings or attitudes at work, although future studies should explore possible moderators for this linkage because it can be threatened by multiple contextual factors or individual differences.

However, the association between FLMs’ implementation and employee OCB was not statistically significant (H14), not fulfilling the first condition necessary to test H15. Given that the link between employees’ commitment HR attributions and OCB was statistically significant ($\hat{\beta}=.29, p<.01$) (Table 14), it is possible to hypothesize full mediation based on structural equation modeling (SEM) approaches. It is a well-known
tradition of SEM that the test of mediation starts with full mediation assumption (James, Mulaik, & Brett, 2006). Thus, it is not required to establish a statistically significant relationship between a predictor and criterion. However, the absence of a significant relationship could simply be because of a lack of statistical power. With a larger sample, it is possible to achieve a statistically significant relationship for the relationship.

Because the H14 was not supported, I tested an alternative model with employee-rated experience of commitment HR practices as a level-2 predictor. This measure is essentially employees’ evaluation of FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices (not FLMs’ self-ratings as in the initial multi-level model). After testing several HLM models, I found that this measure is a significant level-2 predictor of employee OCB ($\hat{r}=.49$, p<.05) as well as employees’ commitment HR attributions ($\hat{r}=.52$, p<.01). This finding suggests that organizational climate for commitment HR practices positively influences employees’ commitment HR attributions.

6.2.4 Future Research

Examining the three models—FLM, employee, and multi-level models—showed mixed support for hypothesized relationships. Based on these findings, several important insights and guidance to future research are presented below.

Although strategic HRM scholars have been working to understand the HR black box between a set of HR practices and organizational outcomes, findings have been quite limited so far. The reason for the restricted understanding of the HR practices-performance linkage is partly due to limited focus on HR practices implementation. As observed in the current study, FLMs and employees were critical sources of the gap
between organization-reported and employee-experienced commitment HR practices. Specifically, the findings suggest that there exists a cross-level linkage that starts from FLM’s awareness of commitment HR programs to employee OCB. Although multiple models were tested in the current study, I believe that effectively testing these findings in one research model would be useful to develop more integrative insights. In doing so, developing better understandings about how FLMs’ commitment HR attributions affect employees’ attributions, attitudes, and critical behavioral aspects would be useful. A cross-level linkage model, such as FLMs’ commitment HR attributions -> employees’ experience of commitment HR practices -> employees’ commitment HR attributions -> attitudes or behaviors, would be a promising model for future research.

In general, tests of interactions did not show meaningful patterns or did not look promising, although the FLM model showed some interesting results. However, this finding does not mean that self-transcendence (or even self-enhancement) cannot be a significant moderator on FLMs’ and employees’ attributional process of commitment HR programs (practices). Although the findings are not statistically significant, the direction of the interactions was, in general, as expected. As the interaction hypotheses were developed based on strong theoretical reasons, testing these interactions is still an ongoing research agenda, and strategic HRM researchers should be able to test this in a more effective manner.

Testing other powerful moderators might be another way to understand the nature of FLMs’ and employees’ attributional processes of commitment HR practices. For example, perceived levels of organizational justice of FLMs and employees might be a potential moderator of their attributional process. Although organizations report levels of
commitment HR programs, FLMs and employees would not develop high levels of commitment HR attributions when they feel that those programs (practices) are not being administered fairly within their organization. It is possible that different dimensions of organizational justice (procedural, distributional, and interactional justice) might have differential effects as distinctive moderators on the attributional process of FLMs and employees.

There are other individual differences that could behave as potential moderators. I expect that the levels of psychological contract of FLMs and employees could be another moderator. As mentioned previously, the core mechanism of commitment HR practices is heightened levels of employees’ commitment to their organization that develops from social exchange relationships with their organization through experience of multiple HR practices. When FLMs and employee maintain high levels of psychological contract, their exchange relationships with the organization would look safe and trustworthy to the members of the organization. Thus, it is possible that FLMs and individuals with higher levels of psychological contract are likely to see commitment HR programs (practices) more positive—as organizational investment to and concern for employees.

In terms of the multi-level model, one possible approach to develop the current model would be using employee attitudes as an outcome variable. In the current multi-level model, the direct relationship between FLMs’ implemented commitment HR practices and OCB was not significant. However employee attitudes such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction are more proximal to experiences of HR practices than behaviors such as OCB. Thus, a significant direct relationship could exist
between FLMs’ implementation and attitudes such as organizational commitment, even when the effect of implementation on OCB is less straightforward.

Another possible approach to the multi-level model would be examining why there exists a difference in findings between a model using FLMs’ self-rated implementation as an independent variable and a model using employees-rated implementation as an independent variable. In the current model, FLMs’ self-rated implementation was not a significant predictor of OCB. However employee-rated implementation was a significant predictor of OCB in an alternative model. Although common source variance might provide a partial explanation, these findings suggest that FLMs and employees see commitment HR practices implemented within their work group differently. Examining why and how this happens would be an interesting future direction of the multi-level model. One approach to studying the relationship between FLMs’ and employees’ perceptions of implemented HR practices would be to incorporate the findings of leader-member-exchange (LMX) research. LMX studies utilizing attribution theories (e.g., Martinko & Gardner, 1987; Martinko et al., 2012) appear to be especially relevant in addressing this issue. Finally, potential moderators on the attributional process of commitment HR programs (practices) mentioned above (organizational justice and psychological contract) can also be considered as potential moderators to understand the interactive nature between FLMs and subordinates in terms of the delivery of commitment HR practices.
6.3 Managerial Implications

This study exists within a broader context of understanding how managing people can make a contribution to increasing organizational performance. Although findings in the area of strategic HRM are impressive and ample enough to argue that a set of well-configured HR practices can impact organizational performance (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Huselid, 1995; Guthrie, 2001; Batt, 2000; Wright et al., 2005), the specific mechanism for this relationship is still not well understood by scholars in this field. To develop better insights for this mechanism, not only the content of HR practices but also the process of the use of HR practices should be considered simultaneously (e.g., Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). However, strategic HRM studies have focused primarily on identifying a “right” set of HR practices but have paid less attention to the implementation of HR practices.

An important implication of the current study is to direct further attention on the role of managers with regard to HR practices implementation.

Finding significant roles of FLMs provides actionable prescriptions for organizations to make their HR practices work. Having a right set of HR practices might not be hard in some sense because organizations or HR departments can copy HR practices from other successful organizations. However, this does not mean those HR practices would have equal utility in any other organization. In other words, adopting HR practices without having serious concern for implementation would not provide any sustainable, competitive advantage for organizations. Focusing on HR implementation may help to explain why HR practices do not work when organizations believe they have a right set of HR practices. Examining whether FLMs are effectively implementing HR practices would be one way to solve the problem. As the findings of the study suggest,
FLMs influence the development of employees’ commitment HR attributions. Thus, organizations can initiate an effective process of HR practice implementation by focusing on the role of FLMs.

Along with a shift of focus to FLMs, findings point to the importance of effective communication about HR programs. As the FLM model indicates, the level of FLMs’ understanding of the goals of commitment HR practices that their organizations use directly affect commitment HR attributions and administration of HR practices. FLMs implement commitment HR practices in part based on their understandings of the goals of their organizations. Moreover, the multi-level model showed how FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices affect individual employees’ attributions and subsequent OCB. Thus, organizations can strategically focus on improving communication with FLMs when addressing poor implementation of HR practices.

However, effective communication with FLMs is not enough. Maintaining effective communication with employees is another critical area when implementing high levels of commitment HR practices. According to the employee model, employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices influence commitment HR attributions and OCB. As addressed in the literature review, there are multiple antecedents of awareness. Senior managers, the HR department, and FLMs, and coworkers all become sources of HR-related information. Thus, conveying core HR messages to employees consistently across multiple communication channels and HR practices would be an effective strategy when organizations aim to implement high levels of commitment HR practices.

In the current study, self-transcendence was not a significant moderator although it may be possible to observe meaningful findings with better measurement of self-
enhancement and transcendence. Thus, organizations should pay attention to individual values when they hire or promote managers or employees. If they do not regard self-enhancement as a value guiding their behavior at work or in their life in general, the implementation of commitment HR practices could still be ineffective. This could mean that organizations are not getting as much as they can out of their investments in employees through commitment HR practices. To maximize return on investment, organizations should hire people who value organizational HR initiatives.

6.4 Limitations

Despite care used in developing theory, study design, and sample characteristics, the study is certainly not without limitations. Below, I summarize several possible limitations of the current study to aid future studies.

The first limitation of this study is the measurement of self-transcendence. Because I have used an organization-version of the individual values measure, it is possible that there was social desirability bias in the measure of self-transcendence. Given that the “organization-version” of individual values (Brown & Trevino, 2009) reflects organizationally desirable values or behavioral characteristics in the items measuring values, individuals would have felt social desirability pressure in terms of responding to those values items. With a more accurate measurement of self-transcendence, future studies can explore the moderating effect of self-transcendence on the attributional process of FLMs and employees.

Second, related to the previous point, there are opportunities for distortion of results coming from the managerial influence on employees who took the surveys. The
selection of survey participants was based on social networks of individuals who agreed to help out with data collection for the current study. For this reason, some individuals chose to use their (direct or indirect) subordinates for data collection. Although individual identity was not collected or completely disclosed, some individuals in the participating organizations could at least know who took the survey. An ideal case would have been to have the researcher visit the participating organizations and observe the entire data collection procedures; this was not an option in the current study because many organizations did not to formally plan survey administration.

Third, although I do not believe the findings would have been influenced, not being able to completely replicate the dimensionality of HR attributions of Nishii et al. (2008) needs to be mentioned here. Given that there is only one HR attribution measure available and that this measure was not replicated and used in any other empirical studies so far, I cannot rule out the inappropriateness of the current HR attribution measure that I used. Although the relationships between the sub-dimensions of the measure were consistent with the findings of the previous study (Nishii et al.), and the commitment HR attributions behaved as predicted, the findings should be interpreted with caution.

The fourth limitation would be the unclear causal directions in several findings. As mentioned in the method section, two waves of data were used in the study. However, some hypothesis tests included variables that came from the same survey. For these hypotheses, I separated the source of information. For example, in testing H3, I used commitment HR attributions rated by FLMs as a predictor but used employee-rated experience of commitment HR practices as a criterion. Although a study design like this
was useful to avoid common method bias, this test does not suggest causal direction between the two variables.

Fifth, the use of a Korean sample is another potential limitation in terms of generalizing the findings to other western countries. As the study by Hofstede (1984) found, Korea shows relatively high levels of collectivism compared to other western countries. Self-transcendence is conceptually redundant with collectivism. For this reason, measuring self-transcendence among Koreans would have shown relatively lower variance than measuring in relatively low collectivist cultures, resulting in limiting the chances to observe significant interactions.

Finally, a small sample size could have been a limitation of the current study. The total number of groups in the sample was 61 and the average size of the groups was 3.20. For this reason, the sample would not have been able to provide enough statistical power to test interactions. Moreover, group average scores of employee experience based on small group sizes could be less reliable and could provide a chance for distortion of findings. Replicating the current findings by using a larger sample could strengthen the validity of the current findings and contributions of this dissertation.

6.5 Conclusions

With the purpose of investigating how organizations implement commitment HR practices, this study investigated three models, which are FLM, employee, and multi-level models. In the FLM model, the findings showed that FLMs’ awareness of commitment HR programs affect their implementation of commitment HR practices through commitment HR attributions. This finding basically indicates that effective
communication between organizations and FLMs would increase FLMs’ motivation to implement commitment HR practices when organizations intend to implement high levels of commitment HR practices. In addition, the employee model showed that employees’ awareness of commitment HR practices influence their OCB through commitment HR attributions. In other words, the employee model suggests that high levels of awareness of commitment HR practices would promote employees’ motivation to behave for the benefit of their organizations. Finally, the multi-level model indicates that FLMs are one of the most important HR actors in terms of implementation of commitment HR practices. Specifically, FLMs’ implementation of commitment HR practices was predictive of the level of employees’ commitment HR attributions.

This dissertation makes several contributions to the strategic HRM literature at three different levels of analysis through the FLM, employee and multi-level models. These findings indicate promising directions for future strategic HRM studies in terms of developing a better understanding of “how organizations implement HR practices.” The dissertation also provides meaningful managerial implications that can be used to achieve maximum organizational performance through human resource management.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Recruiting Letter

Dear XX,

A study of human resource management (HRM) practices of work organizations is conducted by a researcher of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The goal of the study is to better understand how frontline manager implement, and employees understand, HRM practices in work organizations. You are being invited to participate in a critical portion of this research by completing surveys assessing your perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors in implementing and interpreting HRM practices.

This survey will be given to you twice. After the first survey, you will be taking another survey in next 3 weeks. Each survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The survey is completely confidential, so please answer the questions honestly. Please take a few moments to contribute to this important research project. Your participation is voluntary and you can choose not to take this survey. Once completed, all surveys should be returned immediately in the enclosed envelope. Thank you in advance for you willingness to participate.

If you have any questions, please contact:

Jaewan Yang, Doctoral Candidate at (XXX) XXX- XXXX, <my email address>
APPENDIX B1: Employee (First Survey)

Employee (First Survey)

This survey is being conducted by researchers at Virginia Tech as part of a comprehensive study of management practices of working organizations. The information collected through this survey will be held in strict confidence by the researchers and the results will be presented in consolidated summary form only. Therefore, your cooperation and candid response is encouraged and appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation in this effort.

Last 2-digit of your cell phone number:

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling a 0 means you strongly disagree. Circling a 5 means you strongly agree with the statement.

HR Program Awareness: Please indicate the extent to which your organization has formal HR policies in the following areas, although these HR programs may not always be implemented.

1. The policy of our organization is to involve employees in problem solving activities.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

2. The policy of our organization is to share information about how the organization is performing.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

3. The policy of our organization is to allow employees to decide how to do their work.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

4. The policy of our organization is to provide continuous training to employees.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

5. The policy of our organization is to make employees qualified to perform more than one job through training or job rotation.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

6. The policy of our organization is to fill positions from within.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

7. It is our policy to look first to existing employees when filling open positions.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

8. The policy of our organization is to provide employees with feedback on their performance that helps them to improve.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

9. According to our policy, employees receive formal performance appraisals regularly.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

10. The policy of our organization is to provide employment security to employees who perform at a sufficient level.
    
    1 2 3 4 5

11. The policy of our organization is to avoid layoffs if at all possible.
    
    1 2 3 4 5

Organizational Commitment

1. I feel a high level of loyalty to this organization.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I care about the future of this organization.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

3. I feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

4. I am proud to be working for this organization.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I am thinking about leaving this organization.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

Leader-Member Relationship

1. How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs? (Very Well)
   
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work? (Very Likely)
   
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your supervisor has, what are the chances that he/she would “bail you out” at his/her expense? (Very Likely)
   
   1 2 3 4 5

4. I have enough confidence in my supervisor that I would defend and justify his/her decision if he/she were not present to do so.
   
   1 2 3 4 5

5. How well does your supervisor recognize your potential? (Very Well)
   
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Do you know where you stand with your supervisor? How well do you know how satisfied your supervisor is with what you do? (Very Well)
   
   1 2 3 4 5

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor? (Very Positive)
   
   1 2 3 4 5

Personal Values

Rating scale: Choose the importance of each value in guiding my behaviors. Scale ranges from -1 to 7.
-1. opposed to my values 0. not important 3. important 6. very important 7. of supreme importance

1. Taking initiative (enterprising, inventiveness)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Ambition (having high aspirations)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Success (achieving, accomplishing)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Helpfulness (working for the welfare of others)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Teamwork (working together, cooperation)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Equality (ensuring equal opportunity for all)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Caring, assisting others (altruism)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Treating others fairly (justice)
   
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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**Intention for Using Certain HR Practices**

**Our organization provides the level of job security that it does:**

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  1 2 3 4 5
2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being.  1 2 3 4 5
3. to try to keep costs down.  1 2 3 4 5
4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  1 2 3 4 5
5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  1 2 3 4 5

**Our organization provides employees with the employee involvement programs that it does:**

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  1 2 3 4 5
2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being.  1 2 3 4 5
3. to try to keep costs down.  1 2 3 4 5
4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  1 2 3 4 5
5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  1 2 3 4 5

**Our organization provides employees the training that it does:**

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  1 2 3 4 5
2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being.  1 2 3 4 5
3. to try to keep costs down.  1 2 3 4 5
4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  1 2 3 4 5
5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  1 2 3 4 5

**Our organization tries to fill job openings with current employees:**

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  1 2 3 4 5
2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being.  1 2 3 4 5
3. to try to keep costs down.  1 2 3 4 5
4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  1 2 3 4 5
5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  1 2 3 4 5

**Our organization provides employees the performance appraisals that it does:**

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  1 2 3 4 5
2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being.  1 2 3 4 5
3. to try to keep costs down.  1 2 3 4 5
4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  1 2 3 4 5
5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  1 2 3 4 5

---

**Experienced HR Practices:** Please indicate the extent to which you **actually experience** the following HR practices in your work group.

1. My supervisor encourages people in our work group to be involved in problem solving activities.  1 2 3 4 5
2. My supervisor actively lets people know about how the organization is performing.  1 2 3 4 5
3. My supervisor encourages people to decide for themselves the best way to do their work.  1 2 3 4 5
4. My supervisor is committed to offering people opportunities to receive formal training.  1 2 3 4 5
5. My supervisor is committed to helping people perform more than one job through training or job rotation.  1 2 3 4 5
6. If my supervisor has a chance, he/she will fill open positions with current employees.  1 2 3 4 5
7. My supervisor is committed to offering people chances to successfully move up in the organization.  1 2 3 4 5
8. My supervisor provides me with feedback on my performance that helps me to improve.  1 2 3 4 5
9. My supervisor regularly provides me with high quality feedback.  1 2 3 4 5
10. My supervisor communicates with people that employees in our organization can expect to stay for as long as they continue to perform effectively.  1 2 3 4 5
11. My supervisor actively communicates with people that our organization tries to avoid layoff as much as possible.  1 2 3 4 5
Psychological Contract: To what extent do you agree that you (your organization) have promised to do following for your organization (you)?

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling 1 means you strongly disagree. Circling 5 means you strongly agree with the statement.

Your organization promised you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Benevol</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High pay</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pay based on current level of performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Long-term job security</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support with personal problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You promised your organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Benevol</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Working extra hours</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loyalty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volunteering to do non-required tasks on the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advance notice if taking a job elsewhere</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Willingness to accept a transfer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Refusal to support the employer’s competitors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Protection of proprietary information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spending a minimum of two years in the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent Information

1. Number of years in the industry: _______ years
2. Length of service with the current organization: _______ years
3. Length of service in the current work group: _______ months
4. Tenure in the relationship with the current supervisor: _______ months
5. Age: _______ years old
6. Employment status: ☐ Permanent ☐ Temporary
7. Highest level of education: ☐ High school ☐ 2-year college ☐ 4-year college ☐ Master ☐ Doctoral
8. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Thank you for completing the survey.
APPENDIX B2: Employee (Second Survey)

Employee (Second Survey)

This survey is being conducted by researchers at Virginia Tech as part of a comprehensive study of management practices of working organizations. The information collected through this survey will be held in strict confidence by the researchers and the results will be presented in consolidated summary form only. Therefore, your cooperation and candid response is encouraged and appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation in this effort.

Last 2-digit of your cell phone number: __________

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling a 5 means you strongly disagree. Circling a 1 means you strongly agree with the statement.

Experienced HR Practices: Please indicate the extent to which you actually experience the following HR practices in your work group.

1. My supervisor encourages people in our work group to be involved in problem solving activities.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. My supervisor actively lets people know about how the organization is performing.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. My supervisor encourages people to decide for themselves the best way to do their work.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. My supervisor is committed to offering people opportunities to receive formal training.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. My supervisor is committed to helping people perform more than one job through training or job rotation.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. If my supervisor has a chance, he/she will fill open positions with current employees.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. My supervisor is committed to offering people chances to successfully move up in the organization.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. My supervisor provides me with feedback on my performance that helps me to improve.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. My supervisor regularly provides me with high quality feedback.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. My supervisor communicates with people that employees in our organization can expect to stay for as long as they continue to perform effectively.
    1 2 3 4 5

11. My supervisor actively communicates with people that our organization tries to avoid lay-off as much as possible.
    1 2 3 4 5

Leader-Member Relationship

1. How well does your supervisor understand your job problems and needs?
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that your supervisor would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work?
   1 2 3 4 5

Personal Values

Rating scale: Choose the importance of each value in guiding my behaviors. Scale ranges from -1 to 7.
-1, opposed to my values 0, not important 3, important 6, very important 7, of supreme importance

1. Taking initiative (enterprising, inventiveness)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Ambition (having high aspirations)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Success (achieving, accomplishing)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Helpfulness (working for the welfare of others)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Teamwork (working together, cooperation)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Equality (ensuring equal opportunity for all)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Caring, assisting others (altruism)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Treating others fairly (justice)
   -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Intention for Using Certain HR Practices

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling a0 means you strongly disagree. Circling a5 means you strongly agree with the statement.

Our organization provides the level of job security that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. to try to keep costs down.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  
   1 2 3 4 5

Our organization provides employees with the employee involvement programs that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. to try to keep costs down.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  
   1 2 3 4 5

Our organization provides employees the training that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. to try to keep costs down.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  
   1 2 3 4 5

Our organization tries to fill job openings with current employees:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being.  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. to try to keep costs down.  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. in order to get the most work out of employees.  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations).  
   1 2 3 4 5

Our organization provides employees the performance appraisals that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality.  
   1 2 3 4 5

Psychological Contract: To what extent do you agree that you (your organization) have promised to do following for your organization (you)?

Your organization promised you:

1. Promotion  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. High pay  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Pay based on current level of performance  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Training  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Long-term job security  
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Career development  
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Support with personal problems  
   1 2 3 4 5

You promised your organization:

1. Working extra hours  
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Loyalty  
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Volunteering to do non-required tasks on the job  
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Advance notice if taking a job elsewhere  
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Willingness to accept a transfer  
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Refusal to support the employer’s competitors  
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Protection of proprietary information  
   1 2 3 4 5

8. Spending a minimum of two years in the organization  
   1 2 3 4 5

Respondent Information

1. Number of years in the industry: ________ years

2. Length of service with the current organization: ________ years

3. Length of service in the current work group: ________ months

4. Tenure in the relationship with the current supervisor: ________ months

5. Age: ________ years old

6. Employment status: □ Permanent □ Temporary

7. Highest level of education: □ High school □ 2-year college □ 4-year college □ Master □ Doctoral

8. Gender: □ Male □ Female

Thank you for completing the survey.
APPENDIX B3: Frontline Manager (First Survey)

Supervisors (First Survey)

This survey is being conducted by researchers at Virginia Tech as part of a comprehensive study of management practices of working organizations. The information collected through this survey will be held in strict confidence by the researchers and the results will be presented in consolidated summary form only. Therefore, your cooperation and candid response is encouraged and appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation in this effort.

Last 2-digit of your cell phone number: ______________

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling 1 means you strongly disagree. Circling 5 means you strongly agree with the statement.

**HR Program Awareness:** Please indicate the extent to which your organization has formal HR policies in the following areas, although these HR programs may not always be implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The policy of our organization is to involve employees in problem solving activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The policy of our organization is to share information about how the organization is performing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The policy of our organization is to allow employees to decide how to do their work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The policy of our organization is to provide continuous training to employees.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The policy of our organization is to make employees qualified to perform more than one job through training or job rotation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The policy of our organization is to fill positions from within.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is our policy to look first to existing employees when filling open positions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The policy of our organization is to provide employees with feedback on their performance that helps them to improve.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. According to our policy, employees receive formal performance appraisals regularly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The policy of our organization is to provide employment security to employees who perform at a sufficient level.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The policy of our organization is to avoid lay-offs if at all possible.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**You promised your organization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Working extra hours</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loyalty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Volunteering to do non-required tasks on the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advance notice if taking a job elsewhere</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Willingness to accept a transfer</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Refusal to support the employer’s competitors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Protection of proprietary information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spending a minimum of two years in the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Values**

Rating scale: Choose the importance of each value in guiding my behaviors. Scale ranges from 1 to 7.
- 1. opposed to my values 0. not important 3. important
- 6. very important 7. of supreme importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Taking initiative (enterprising, inventiveness)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ambition (having high aspirations)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Success (achieving, accomplishing)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Helpfulness (working for the welfare of others)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teamwork (working together, cooperation)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equality (ensuring equal opportunity for all)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Caring, assisting others (altruism)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Treating others fairly (justice)</td>
<td>1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intention for Using Certain HR Practices

Our organization provides the level of job security that it does:
1. In order to help employees improve product quality. 1 2 3 4 5
2. So that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being. 1 2 3 4 5
3. To try to keep costs down. 1 2 3 4 5
4. In order to get the most work out of employees. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations). 1 2 3 4 5

Our organization provides employees with the employee involvement programs that it does:
1. In order to help employees improve product quality. 1 2 3 4 5
2. So that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being. 1 2 3 4 5
3. To try to keep costs down. 1 2 3 4 5
4. In order to get the most work out of employees. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations). 1 2 3 4 5

Our organization provides employees the training that it does:
1. In order to help employees improve product quality. 1 2 3 4 5
2. So that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being. 1 2 3 4 5
3. To try to keep costs down. 1 2 3 4 5
4. In order to get the most work out of employees. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations). 1 2 3 4 5

Our organization tries to fill job openings with current employees:
1. In order to help employees improve product quality. 1 2 3 4 5
2. So that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being. 1 2 3 4 5
3. To try to keep costs down. 1 2 3 4 5
4. In order to get the most work out of employees. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations). 1 2 3 4 5

Our organization provides employees the performance appraisals that it does:
1. In order to help employees improve product quality. 1 2 3 4 5
2. So that employees will feel valued and respected to promote employee well-being. 1 2 3 4 5
3. To try to keep costs down. 1 2 3 4 5
4. In order to get the most work out of employees. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations). 1 2 3 4 5

HR Practices Implementation: Please indicate the extent to which you actually use the following HR practices in your work group.

1. I encourage my subordinates to be involved in problem solving activities. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I actively let my subordinates know about how the organization is performing. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I encourage my subordinates to decide for themselves the best way to do their work. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I am committed to offering my subordinates opportunities to receive formal training. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I am committed to helping my subordinates perform more than one job through training or job rotation. 1 2 3 4 5
6. If I have a chance, I will fill open positions with current employees. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I am committed to offering my subordinates chances to successfully move up in the organization. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I provide my subordinates with feedback on their performance that helps them to improve. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Regularly provide my subordinates with high quality performance feedback. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I actively communicate with my subordinates that employees in our organization can expect to stay as long as they continue to perform effectively. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I actively communicate with my subordinates that our organization tries to avoid lay-off as much as possible. 1 2 3 4 5

Respondent Information
1. Number of years in the industry: ________ years
2. Length of service with the current organization: ________ years
3. Length of service in the current work group: ________ months
4. Length of service in the current work group as a supervisor: ________ months
5. Number of subordinates in your work group: ________ subordinates
6. Age: ________ years old
7. Employment status: □ Permanent □ Temporary
8. Highest level of education: □ High school □ 2-year college □ 4-year college □ Master □ Doctoral
9. Gender: □ Male □ Female

Thank you for completing the survey.
APPENDIX B4: Frontline Manager (Second Survey)

Supervisors (Second Survey)

This survey is being conducted by researchers at Virginia Tech as part of a comprehensive study of management practices of working organizations. The information collected through this survey will be held in strict confidence by the researchers and the results will be presented in consolidated summary form only. Therefore, your cooperation and candid response is encouraged and appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation in this effort.

Last 2-digit of your cell phone number: ____________

HR Practices Implementation: Please indicate the extent to which you actually use the following HR practices in your work group.

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree. Circling a 6 means you strongly agree with the statement.

1. I encourage my subordinates to be involved in problem solving activities.

2. I actively let my subordinates know about how the organization is performing.

3. I encourage my subordinates to decide for themselves the best way to do their work.

4. I am committed to offering my subordinates opportunities to receive formal training.

5. I am committed to helping my subordinates perform more than one job through training or job rotation.

6. If I have a chance, I will fill open positions with current employees.

7. I am committed to offering my subordinates chances to successfully move up in the organization.

8. I provide my subordinates with feedback on their performance that helps them to improve.

9. I regularly provide my subordinates with high quality feedback performance.

10. I actively communicate with my subordinates that employees in our organization can expect to stay for as long as they continue to perform effectively.

11. I actively communicate with my subordinates that our organization tries to lay-off as much as possible.

Personal Values

Rating scale: Choose the importance of each value in guiding my behaviors. Scale ranges from -1 to 7.

-1. opposed to my values 0. not important 3. important 6. very important 7. of supreme importance

1. Taking initiative (enterprising, inventiveness) ____________

2. Ambition (having high aspirations) ____________

3. Success (achieving, accomplishing) ____________

4. Helpfulness (working for the welfare of others) ____________

5. Teamwork (working together, cooperation) ____________

6. Equality (ensuring equal opportunity for all) ____________

7. Caring, assisting others (altruism) ____________

8. Treating others fairly (justice) ____________

Intention for Using Certain HR Practices

Our organization provides the level of job security that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being

3. to try to keep costs down

4. in order to get the most work out of employees

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations)

Our organization provides employees with the employee involvement programs that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being

3. to try to keep costs down

4. in order to get the most work out of employees

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations)

Our organization provides employees the training that it does:

1. in order to help employees improve product quality

2. so that employees will feel valued and respected-to promote employee well-being

3. to try to keep costs down

4. in order to get the most work out of employees

5. because they are required to do (e.g., government regulations)
Citizenship Behaviors and Job Performance

Rating scale: Please write down the last 2-digit of cell phone numbers of all your subordinate at the very left column. For each individual, please rate their levels of citizenship behaviors and job performance based on your reflection. If you have more than 10 subordinates, you can draw more lines in the empty space in the below.

1. needs much improvement, 2. needs some improvement, 3. satisfactory, 4. good, and 5. excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last 2-digit of subordinate cell phone number</th>
<th>Make suggestions to improve this work place.</th>
<th>Volunteer for tasks that are not required.</th>
<th>Willing to do things that help this work place outside of my normal duties.</th>
<th>Willing to work harder than I have to in order for this work place to do well.</th>
<th>Quantity of work output</th>
<th>Quality of work output</th>
<th>Accuracy of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent Information

1. Number of years in the industry: _____ years
2. Length of service with the current organization: _____ years
3. Length of service in the current work group: _____ months
4. Length of service in the current work group as a supervisor: _____ months
5. Number of subordinates in your work group: _____ subordinates
6. Age: _____ years old
7. Employment status: □ Permanent □ Temporary
8. Highest level of education: □ High school □ 2-year college □ 4-year college □ Master □ Doctoral
9. Gender: □ Male □ Female

Thank you for completing the survey.
APPENDIX B5: HR Department Survey

HR Department Survey

This survey is being conducted by researchers at Virginia Tech as part of a comprehensive study of management practices of working organizations. The information collected through this survey will be held in strict confidence by the researchers and the results will be presented in consolidated summary form only. Therefore, your cooperation and candid response is encouraged and appreciated. Thank you for your time and cooperation in this effort.

1. Does your organization have work sites in multiple geographic locations? Yes___ No____
2. Is your work site the headquarters of your organization? Yes___ No____ N/A____
3. Approximately how many full-time and part-time employees (including employees who work at affiliate work units located in other geographic locations) are employed by the company? ________ employees
4. Does your organization have a department dedicated to human resource management function (not housed in a department such as general administration or business planning)? Yes____ No____
5. The year that your company was founded: __________

Rating scale: Please think about each statement and circle the number that indicates the degree to which you agree with each statement. Circling a 1 means you strongly disagree. Circling a 5 means you strongly agree with the statement.

HR Program Awareness: Please indicate the extent to which your organization has formal HR programs in the following areas, although these HR programs may not always be implemented.

1. The policy of our organization is to involve employees in problem solving activities 1 2 3 4 5
2. The policy of our organization is to share information about how the organization is performing 1 2 3 4 5
3. The policy of our organization is to allow employees to decide how to do their work 1 2 3 4 5
4. The policy of our organization is to provide continuous training to employees 1 2 3 4 5
5. The policy of our organization is to make employees qualified to perform more than one job through training or job rotation 1 2 3 4 5
6. The policy of our organization is to fill positions from within 1 2 3 4 5
7. It is our policy to look first to existing employees when filling open positions 1 2 3 4 5
8. The policy of our organization is to provide employees with feedback on their performance that helps them to improve 1 2 3 4 5
9. According to our policy, employees receive formal performance appraisals regularly 1 2 3 4 5
10. The policy of our organization is to provide employment security to employees who perform at a sufficient level 1 2 3 4 5
11. The policy of our organization is to avoid lay-offs if at all possible 1 2 3 4 5

Employee-Centered HR Philosophy

1. We take care of our workforce, no matter what business challenges we face 1 2 3 4 5
2. We would suffer lower profits before terminating employees 1 2 3 4 5
3. We invest heavily in our employees because we know that they determine the success of our business 1 2 3 4 5
4. We maintain a long-term commitment to the growth and well-being of our employees 1 2 3 4 5

Discretion in designing HR practices

The degree that your work location designs its own human resource management practices 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for completing the survey.