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Abstract

When examining diversity, most researchers look at cultural or gender aspects of diversity. However, generational expectations are yet another type of diversity that is rarely examined, although it should be researched more often. Generation Y employees are only just beginning to enter the workplace, but little is know about them as prospective employees. This study examined how cultural beliefs influenced the temporal aspect of organizational normative commitment. Ordinal and multinomial regression analyses were performed to examine the predictive power of cultural beliefs on the temporal aspect of normative commitment. Descriptive statistics showed that the highest percentage of participants selected “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the HR practice” as their answer to the length of time an employee should remain with an organization in exchange for certain HR practices. The findings show that this generation views the reciprocity exchange between the organization and the employee as a psychological contract which is formed at the on-start of employment. Once the HR practice is taken away from the employee, the psychological contract is viewed as violated and thus the employee can leave the organization at any point. In terms of cultural beliefs and their influence on the temporal aspect of normative commitment, it was found that social cynicism, reward for application, social flexibility, interpersonal harmony and fate control were predictive of the time an employee should remain with an organization for certain HR practices but not for all of them.
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CHAPTER I

Literature Overview

Employment attitudes and expectations need to be examined every time a new generation enters the workforce to ensure organizational commitment is maintained (Morton, 2002). Today’s workforce can be divided into three distinct generational groups of people: Baby Boomers (born between 1945 and 1964), Generation X (“Xers”, born between 1965 and 1980), and Generation Y (“Yers”, also known as Dotcom or Millennial generation, born after 1981; Hui-Chan et al., 2003). Generation Y represents the workforce of the future. Understanding the factors that shape generation Y’s work attitudes and behaviors over time is vital to understanding the circumstances in which this group will become committed to the organization they work in. The concept of organizational commitment has interested researchers studying behavior in workplaces for many years. As a concept, organizational commitment has been widely studied in North America. Inquiries into organizational commitment have recently expanded to regions outside of North America (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Nevertheless, research in other cultural settings is still rather limited. Although many other forms of commitment exist, organizational commitment has been the most widely researched form of commitment (Morrow, 1993). Such attention has given rise to a number of perspectives regarding the fundamental nature of organizational commitment. Drawing on early work in the field (e.g. Becker, 1960; Weiner, 1982), Allen and Meyer (1990) proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment.

The three components of Allen and Meyer’s model are: (1) affective commitment, (2) continuance commitment, and (3) normative commitment. Affective commitment
Normative commitment reflects an emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Continuance commitment is based on the perceived costs associated with discontinuing employment with the organization. Lastly, normative commitment reflects a sense of obligation on the part of the employee to maintain membership in the organization. The most researched component of Meyer and Allen's organizational commitment model is affective commitment, followed by continuance commitment, and lastly normative commitment. Given the scarce research concerning normative commitment, this study will examine this form of commitment. An employee with strong normative commitment is tied to the organization by feelings of obligation and duty. Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that generally, such feelings will motivate individuals to behave appropriately and do what is right for the organization. Interestingly, little is known about the relationship between organizational commitment and work expectations of generation Y. This study will specifically examine the relationships between normative commitment, culture and Gouldner's (1960) reciprocity norm in terms of the expectations members of generation Y have of their organizations. This study examined the effects of the reciprocity norm in terms of an exchange relationship between the organization and its employees on normative commitment. In such an exchange relationship, the organization provides Human Resource ("HR") practices in exchange for the employees' commitment to remain with the organization for a longer time. The temporal aspect of normative commitment reflects a more practical aspect of the reciprocity norm.
Generational Aspect

Diversity continues to change dramatically in the modern workplace. One of the factors contributing to this diversity is younger workers playing a greater role in the workplace due to a disproportionate number of Baby Boomers exiting the work force and a disproportionate number of generation Yers entering the work force (Hatfield, 2002). However, generation Y workers are only just entering the workplace and therefore, their influence on the workplace is still emerging.

Research coming from North America and Europe has found clear gaps between the Baby Boomers and generation Xers in terms of work values, work attitudes, and work expectations (Hui-Chan & Miller., 2003). Hui-Chan et al. found significant differences between the Baby Boomers and generation Xers in all aspects of work characteristics in the Taiwanese manufacturing industry. These results are consistent with prior North American studies. However, Hui-Chan et al. did not find any differences between these two generational groups in the Taiwanese education sector, an inconsistency found in previous North American studies. This finding may be due to the different nature of the two industries under examination. In the education sector, most of the employees place great importance on personal development, job autonomy, job involvement, social recognition, power and prestige. It was found that both baby boomers and generation Xers regard social recognition as an important reward. Power and prestige in terms of rewards, on the other hand, were generally seen as less important for both of these generations (Hui-Chan et al., 2003). As well, both baby boomers and generation Xers in both manufacturing and education tended to lean towards Hofstede's (1980) dimension of individualism rather than collectivism. Thus, Hui-Chan et al. conclude that Taiwanese
culture is generally shifting towards being more individualistic and lower in power
distance, this being particularly true of generation X.

Studies conducted in North America have found that most aging employees
within organizations believe that many of today’s young professionals do not feel they
owe anything to their organization, that young professionals are not loyal to their
organization, and that young professionals lack a sense of tradition and dedication (Levin,
2001). However, this type of discontent between the generations is not one of different
values but of different currencies. To baby-boomers, the currency was money or the cost
of living. To generation X, the currency is access to information and where that
information can be acquired, regardless of cost. To generation Y, the currency is time, or
where will they find the time to do all the things they need to do. In order for
organizations to gain the loyalty of generation Y, which is the next generation to enter the
workforce, organizations need to deal with the right currency (Levin, 2001).

The Making of a Generation

Barnard, Cosgrave, and Welsh (1998) believe that the “Nature/Nurture Debate”
can be applied to generations as well. They apply the “Nature/Nurture” questions to
generations by asking the following question: Are generation’s characteristics simply
reflections of human nature, or do environmental factors play a stronger mitigating role?
Is a twenty five year old, always a twenty five year old, regardless of the generation s/he
is a part of? On the other hand, would someone who grew up during the Great Depression
be the same as adults from those raised during the excess of the 1980s? There is no
simple answer to these questions. Generations have similarities and they have
differences. Generations can be thought to possess generational genes that account for the
similarities between them, where these genes influence different generations in a consistent manner. However, generations can also be thought to go through a process of generational conditioning resulting in the differences between generations, where the formative years of a generation condition it and help shape its unique set of values (Barnard et al., 1998).

In general, generations are defined not by formal processes, but rather by demographers, the press and media, popular culture, market researchers, and by members of the generation itself, there is no precise consensus as to which birth years constitute a generation. Although different groups of individuals consider a different range of years to constitute Generation Y, that range of years is almost always within the outer bounds of 1976 as the earliest possible year and 2001 as the latest. The ongoing debate is in part due to the lack of a single remarking event or events, analogous to the end of World War II for the baby boomers that can demarcate the start or end of this generation. Some events have been proposed, but there is not yet universal agreement, as is typical of the baby boomers. For the purpose of this study, generation Y will consist of people born after 1981, because most of the data supporting all other constructs in this paper refer to generation Y thus.

Howe and Strauss’ first book, “Generations” (1991), tells the history of America as a succession of generational biographies from 1584 to the present. The authors identify a pattern in these generations: each can be seen as belonging to one of four archetypes that repeat sequentially. Every generation therefore, shows a remarkable parallel in character with generation of the same type throughout history. The book plots a recurring cycle of spiritual awakening and secular crises in American history, from the founding
colonials through the present day. Howe and Strauss define "a generation" as a cohort-group, whose length approximates the span of a phase of life that approximates 22 years, and whose boundaries are fixed by peer personality.

Since a generation moves through four phases of life, at different points in time there are different types of generations occupying the age brackets of the life phases. For example, in one era there may be a risk-taking generation in young adulthood; in another, a cautious generation. The arrangement of the archetypes within the life phases in an era is the generational constellation, the makeup of which determines the mood and inclination of society in that era. The change in the constellation as the generations age, drives a cycle, which has four turnings. A generation's formative phase of life is its childhood. It is during this period that a generation's collective persona develops, determining its archetype. As the years pass, child rearing patterns alter to suit changes in society's priorities, insuring that each generation develops a unique persona.

The cycle begins in the aftermath of an epic struggle which remakes the society's political structure and empowers the rising generation to lead the new regime. In this First Turning of the cycle, the society expands and prospers, while its children are raised optimistically in a secure environment and encouraged to explore the frontiers of social values in an atmosphere of increasing freedom. When it enters young adulthood, this generation defies the political regime, which at that point seems overly repressive and out of touch with reality. Thus, the Second Turning begins, in which the society is shaken to the core by a dramatic challenge to its basic values and institutions. Spiritual fervor sweeps the land, and children are more or less left to themselves as adults become preoccupied with self discovery and new movements. The under-protected children
develop into a generation named Nomad, that is tough and wild, who earn a bad reputation and bear the brunt of the blame for the ensuing social chaos. With the society's institutions discredited, civic decay sets in and the Third Turning begins. The Nomad generation has a rough and tumble coming of age, as traditional bonds and associations are broken and scattered. Meanwhile, children are raised pessimistically in a dangerous environment, restricted by ever-tightening codes and harsh judgments from their elders.

One can see a trend of increasing protection of children in the recent American experience. Zero-tolerance rules and endless political strife over the educational system are all indicators of the Third Turning child rearing mode. The urgency and concern of adults help to develop a new generation named Hero, which is civic-minded and optimistic, and is destined to provide the politically powerful leaders of America's next regime. Generation Y is named Millennial by Strauss and Howe. According to their theory, generation Yers belong to the Hero generation persona.

**Generation Y**

Generation Yers share some similarities with the preceding generation X, although there are some differences as well. Generation Y is more technology savvy than any previous generation and it views technology in the workplace as a natural occurrence. Growing up with technology, such as personal computers and the Internet, has had the major effect of affording generation Yers a high comfort level with technology and the expectation that they will have the opportunity to use it (Hatfield, 2002; Heselbarth, 1999; Lovem, 2001).

Research has found that young people's understanding of work and employment is influenced by their parents' employment and economic circumstances (Dickinson &
Emler, 1992). Since during the 1980s and 1990s many young workers saw their parents and others around them having to deal with job insecurity and downsizing, these young workers' attitudes and behaviors towards work demonstrate a sense of skepticism, self-reliance and no respect for authority. Generation Yers do not view work with an organization as an investment in their future and therefore are said to prefer more immediate payoffs from their organization. These payoffs include independence, flexible hours, casual dress, and having fun at work (Jurkeiwicz, 2000; Maccoby, 1995; Zemke et al., 2000). In addition, since this new cohort of young workers saw their parents making great sacrifices for their work with no direct or immediate benefits, these young workers may be less willing to make sacrifices for the sake of their jobs in terms of their work/life balance. Maccoby (1995) pointed out that generation Y seems to have an attitude of 'working to live' and not one of 'living to work' (See also Zemke et al., 2000).

Another characteristic of generation Yers is that they tend to be short-sighted with money, often spending it soon after they earn it (Heselbarth, 1999). This short-sightedness is in complete contrast to generation Xers, who expect to be highly paid upon entrance into the workforce and are highly motivated by money (Getting inside Gen. Y, 2001; Heselbarth, 1999). Generation Yers have a tendency to expect instant gratification (Skarra, Cronk & Nelson, 2001). Generation Yers follow instructions, usually doing what they are told, but do no more and no less than is required. Due to their extensive use of computers and lack of touch with "the real world" generation Yers may not be effective problem solvers (Heselbarth, 1999). However, due to educational experiences, generation Yers are very comfortable with working in groups (Lovern, 2001), thus creating an opportunity for the development of community-based problem-solving skills.
Generation Yers prefer work they see as viable and that makes a difference. They perceive themselves to be loyal and hardworking, as long as they perceive value in what they are doing, and will also be personally dedicated in this type of situation.

Additionally, generation Yers want to be involved in how their organization operates (Markley, 2002). They enjoy strong relationships at work and expect leaders to know them personally. They also want customized benefits and flexibility in meeting their individual needs. These needs include understanding career path opportunities, training, work assignments and projects (Markley, 2002). Finally, generation Yers highly value diversity and have grown up within a diverse peer group.

Morton (2002) found that 34% of generation Yers are minorities compared to 27% of the total population, thus, generation Yers have a growing tolerance for diversity. As well, Generation Y is comprised of about 70 million potential employees. By sheer numbers, it will influence the workplace and regional economies more dramatically than the Xers who came before. This exposure to a variety of viewpoints, from a multicultural stance, has ingrained in them an expectation that diverse viewpoints shall be an operational norm (Morton). The above workplace expectations that generation Yers have will influence their degree of organizational commitment. Thus, organizations that want to foster commitment should take a look at the work expectations of generation Yers and attempt to fulfill them.
Organizational Commitment

Having been influenced by the work of Becker (1960), Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) were among the first to explicitly define and operationalize organizational commitment. They defined calculative organizational commitment as “a structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organization transactions and alterations in side-bets or investments over time” (p. 556). In addition, Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) formulated the concept of attitudinal commitment, which is an employee’s identification and involvement in a particular organization. When studying organizational commitment, one can distinguish between attitudinal commitment and behavioral commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Mowday et al. described attitudinal commitment as a process by which people come to think about their relationship with the organization resulting in an individuals’ realization that their own values and goals are congruent with those of the organization. Conversely, behavioral commitment is “the process by which individuals become locked into a certain organization and how they deal with this problem” (Mowday et al., p. 26). For the purpose of this study, commitment will be treated as a psychological state, but with the understanding that this state can develop according to both the behavioral approach, retrospectively (as justification for an ongoing course of action), and the attitudinal approach, prospectively (based on perceptions of current or future conditions of work within an organization). In this study, organizational commitment is defined as “a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the
organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67).

Initially, Meyer and Allen (1984) proposed that a distinction be made between affective and continuance commitment, where affective commitment indicates an emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, while continuance commitment denotes the perceived costs associated with leaving the organization. Only later did Allen and Meyer (1990) suggest the third distinguishable component of normative commitment, which reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organization. This study followed the guidelines of Meyer and Allen’s (1990, 1991) multidimensional model of organizational commitment, which consists of all three components: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. According to Meyer and Allen (1991):

Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Finally, normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization. (p.67)

These three components of commitment proposed by Allen and Meyer (1990) are viewed as distinguishable components of commitment rather than different types of commitment, meaning employees can experience each of these psychological states to varying degrees. However, the nature of these psychological states differs in that each of the components of commitment is proposed to develop as a function of different antecedents and to have

Although Meyer and Allen (1991) insist that affective, continuance and normative commitment are distinguishable components of commitment, research using these three components has consistently yielded non-zero correlations between the scales. Mixed results were found regarding the dimensionality of the continuance commitment scale. Some researchers found evidence for a two dimensional structure (Hacket et al., 1994; Meyer et al., 1990), while others found the scale to be uni-dimensional (Dunham et al., 1994; Ko Price, & Mueller, 1997). When Meyer and Allen (1984) initially developed the 8-item continuance commitment scale (the CCS), they asserted this instrument to measure commitment as conceptualized by Becker (1960) in his “side bet” theory. Although internal consistency estimates for the CCS have generally been acceptable, a principal components analysis conducted by McGee and Ford (1987) found two factors instead of the single factor of continuance commitment. The first factor found was labeled Continuance Commitment: Low Alternatives (CC:LoAlt) and was defined by 3 items reflecting a perceived lack of alternative employment opportunities. The second factor was labeled Continuance Commitment: High Sacrifices (CC:HiSac), and was defined by 3 items reflecting perceived sacrifices associated with leaving the organization. McGee and Ford also noted that these subscales correlated significantly, and in opposite directions, with scores on the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS; CC:LoAlt correlated negatively, $r = -.21$, CC:HiSac correlated positively $r = .34$). Nevertheless, when the two dimensions were obtained, the factors were generally highly correlated (Meyer & Allen, 2002).
Another problem was found with respect to the normative commitment scale, where some investigators have questioned the use of normative commitment as a separate scale from affective commitment (Ko et al., 1997). Other researchers argue that regardless of the high correlations achieved, affective and normative commitment exhibit sufficiently different correlations with other variables professed to be outcomes of commitment and should be retained as separate components (Cohen, 1996; Meyer et al., 1993). In their meta-analysis, Meyer and Allen (2002) found that affective and normative commitment were indeed highly correlated, yet these correlations did not imply unity. Although affective and normative commitment showed similar patterns of correlations with antecedents, correlates, and consequence variables, the magnitude of the correlations was often different. There were also noteworthy differences in the moderating effects of geographic location on correlations involving affective and normative commitment. The negative correlation between affective commitment and withdrawal cognition was greater in studies conducted within North America ($\rho = -.58$) than outside North America ($\rho = -.49$). The reverse was true for correlations involving continuance commitment ($\rho = -.13$ within North America vs. $\rho = -.28$ outside North America) and normative commitment ($\rho = -.26$ within North America vs. $\rho = -.47$ outside of North America). As well, organizational citizenship behavior correlated more strongly with normative commitment in studies conducted outside North America ($\rho = .37$ vs. $\rho = .10$) than studies conducted within North America. The same pattern was observed for correlations involving affective commitment ($\rho = .46$ outside North America vs. $\rho = .27$ within North America).

Additionally, the strength of the correlation between affective and normative commitment differed depending on whether the factors were measured using the original
8-item Normative Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) or the revised 6-item (Meyer et al., 1993) version of the scale. Meyer and Allen (2002) explained this difference in correlation in terms of the relationship between affective and normative commitment. The initial 8-item version of the Normative Commitment Scale was based on Wiener's (1982) conceptualization of normative commitment and it emphasizes the internalization of social values. In contrast, the 6-item version focuses more directly on the sense of obligation to remain in the organization, regardless of the origin of this obligation. In other words, the 6-item scale allows for the possibility that employees can develop a sense of obligation to their organization for reasons other than socialization, including the receipt of benefits that invoke a need for reciprocity (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Scholl, 1981). Meyer and Allen (2002) also discussed the possibility that positive experiences, which contribute to strong affective commitment, may also contribute to a feeling of obligation to reciprocate. This can also explain why most of the work experience variables that correlate with affective commitment also correlate positively, albeit less strongly, with normative commitment.

Studies that have used regression analyses to assess the independent contributions of affective and normative commitment in the prediction of organizational behavior have yielded mixed results; some studies demonstrated significant increments in predictions by normative commitment (Lee, Allen, Meyer, & Rhee, 2001; Meyer et al., 1993), and others did not (Ko et al., 1997). Overall, these findings suggested that affective and normative commitment were not identical constructs, and that more attention needs to be paid to normative commitment in order to understand it more fully.
Normative Commitment

Normative commitment is based on an employee's belief that he or she is morally obligated to remain with the organization that he or she works in (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Meyer and Allen (1997) found that normative commitment was positively related to job performance, work attendance, and organizational citizenship. Since feelings of obligation are unlikely to involve the same enthusiasm and involvement associated with affective commitment, the relationship between normative commitment and the above mentioned behaviors was found to be weaker than the relationship with affective commitment. As well, normative commitment was found to have an important impact on how an employee carries out their work (Meyer & Allen). Employees may occasionally experience a sense of resentment for feeling obligated to the organization when experiencing strong normative commitment. Although this resentment might not prevent them from performing particular duties, it may influence how willingly they perform them (Meyer & Allen).

There are many factors that influence the development of all three components of commitment, the strongest of which seems to be situational factors (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Normative commitment is primarily influenced by familial, cultural or organizational socialization experiences that emphasize the appropriateness of continued service, and by the receipt of benefits from the organization that create a sense of obligation to reciprocate (Meyer, Allen, & Topolnytsky, 1998). Thus, there are three main antecedents to the formation of normative commitment: familial and cultural socialization, investments (i.e. psychological contracts, social exchange theory, and reciprocity norm).
Antecedents of Normative Commitment

Familial and Cultural Socialization

Weiner (1982) proposed that normative commitment develops on the basis of a collection of pressures that individuals feel during their early socialization from familial and cultural experiences and during their socialization as newcomers to the organization. Socialization experiences are very rich and varied and carry with them varying messages about the appropriateness of particular attitudes and behaviors. Through complex processes involving both conditioning and modeling, individuals learn what is valued and what is expected of them by the family, culture, or the organization. In the case of normative commitment, a belief about the appropriateness of being loyal to one's organization is internalized. Familial and cultural socialization focuses on the appropriateness of organizational loyalty in general terms (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organizational socialization specifically focuses on the particular organization to which the employee belongs.

Since no research has directly examined the impact of parental values or behaviors on normative commitment to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997), this study focused on the cultural values that often shape parental values and behaviors, and how those cultural values influence the temporal aspect of normative commitment. Vardi, Wiener, and Popper (1989) provide some evidence as to how cultural values influence normative commitment. They compared two organizations that were similar in all respects but for the extent to which each organization's values were congruent with the core values of the society in which the organization operated. In this study, the two organizations operated within the same culture. Vardi et al. found that employees in the
organization whose mission was consistent with cultural values had stronger normative commitment to the organization than did those in the other organization.

Another analytic approach to cultural socialization involves explicit cross-cultural comparisons. For example, one might expect that cultures that emphasize collectivist values and lengthy employer-employee relationships might experience higher aggregate levels of normative commitment than do cultures characterized by individualist values and greater employment mobility. Dunham et al. (1994), arguing that coworkers send each other signals about what is expected, found significant correlations between employees' normative commitment and that of their coworkers in two samples. Dunham et al. did not find a relationship between an obligation to be committed and tenure or age. However, they have suggested that age, reflecting some type of generational value or norm concerning obligations to the organization, may relate to normative commitment (Dunham et al).

Culture. Researchers are still struggling to define the concept of culture. In contemporary cross-cultural literature, societies are often described in terms of individualism and collectivism (cf. Triandis, 1994). Hofstede's (1980) work on work-related values is one of the most renowned methods to describe cultures. In his study of basic value structures that characterize cultures, Hofstede reported four cultural dimensions: power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity, and uncertainty avoidance. Power distance focuses on the degree of equality, or inequality, between people in the country's society. The individualism-collectivism dimension focuses on the degree the society reinforces individual or collective achievement and interpersonal relationships. The masculinity-femininity dimension focuses on the degree
the society reinforces, or does not reinforce, the traditional masculine or feminine work role models of male or female achievement, control, and power. Uncertainty avoidance focuses on the level of tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity within the society - i.e. unstructured situations. The Chinese culture connection (1987) identified an additional dimension that Hofstede did not capture: Confucian work dynamism, also known as the short-term versus long-term orientation (Hofstede, 1990). Long-term and short-term orientation explains the extent to which a society exhibits a pragmatic future oriented perspective rather than a conventional historic or short-term point of view.

For the purposes of this study, the measures of collectivism and power distance were elaborated on. The individualism-collectivism cultural dimension has been widely used for a wide range of cross-cultural studies (Triandis, 1995). Individualism and collectivism refer to the nature of the relationship between the individual and the group or the difference between self-actualization and collectivity (Parsons, 1949). According to Hofstede, in individualistic societies, “everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family,” while in collectivist societies, “individuals are, from birth onward, part of cohesive in-groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (p. 51).

The measure of individualism and collectivism (INDCOL), proposed by Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, and Gelfand (1995), distinguishes between horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism. The horizontal dimensions refer to equality among individuals, or in other words, the absence of power distance. The vertical dimensions stress inequality and hierarchical power relationships. Therefore, horizontal individualism (HI) emphasizes uniqueness and distinctiveness, as well as
equality in terms that no one is better than the other. The characteristics of the vertical individualism (VI) are illustrated by acquisition of higher status, becoming distinguished, and competitions. The features of horizontal collectivism include to perceive each other as similar, to share common goals, interdependence, and sociability. The emphasis on in-groups integrity, the readiness to sacrifice personal goals for the sake of the in-group, and support for in-group competition with out-groups is characteristic of vertical collectivism (VC; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Each society is characterized by patterns of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism. Support for this theory has been obtained on the individual level in studies conducted by Singelis et al., 1995 and Triandis and Gelfand, 1998.

Value dimensions have been the dominant construct used to guide cross-cultural research until Leung et al. (2002) developed the social axiom approach. It has been suggested that in order for the field of cross-cultural psychology to progress, to use general beliefs, i.e. social axioms to augment the value-based cultural dimensions (Leung et al., 2002). Beliefs vary widely along the continuum of specificity, a fact that distinguishes beliefs from values (Hahn, 1973). Some beliefs are very specific, being defined by the actors involved, the setting, and time period, while other beliefs are more general and can be viewed as “generalized expectancies” (Rotter, 1966). These general beliefs have a high level of abstraction, relating to social behaviors across a variety of context, actors, targets, and time periods. These general beliefs are labeled “social axioms” by Leung et al. because like mathematical axioms, these beliefs are basic premises that people endorse and use to guide their behavior in different situations, as
well as because they are often assumed to be true as a result of personal experiences and socialization rather than scientific validation.

According to Leung et al. (2002) “social axioms follow four major functions of attitudes: They facilitate the attainment of important goals (instrumental), help people protect their self worth (ego-defensive), serve as a manifestations of people’s values (value-expressive), and help people understand the world (knowledge)” (p.288). People in every culture have to deal with similar problems to function effectively in their environment. Thus, the emergence of similar types of social axioms across individuals from different cultural backgrounds will occur. Leung et al. define social axioms as “generalized beliefs about oneself, the social and physical environment, or the spiritual world, and are in the form of an assertion about the relationship between two entities or concepts” (p. 289). The structure of a social axiom typically involves a relationship in which A is related to B, where A and B can be any entities, and the relationship can be causal or correlational. In their conceptualization, Leung et al. distinguish between values, which assume the form of an evaluative belief so that “A is good/desirable/important,” and social axioms which state “A results in B.” As well, Leung et al. differentiated between normative beliefs, which are prescriptive statements that address what is regarded as a proper course of action, and social axioms which represent one’s view about how the world functions.

In their study, Leung et al. (2002) found six dimensions: cynicism, social complexity, reward for application, spirituality, fate control, and interpersonal harmony. Cynicism is similar to Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), which is the belief that being manipulated is an effective general strategy for getting ahead of others, but
cynicism is larger in scope. Cynicism, as well, includes a negative view of people, a mistrust of social institutions, and negative stereotypes about certain groups (Leung et al., 2002). It is suggested that an evaluative dimension stands out in people’s perception of the social world, and functions as a guide to their general expectations of upcoming events. The Social Complexity Scale measures whether the social world is complex, whether there are no general rules that will always work, and whether social behavior can be conflicting across different contexts. This dimension guides people when trying to decide whether to rely on methods that have worked before or behave according to situational changes. This dimension also resembles self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974), but it focuses on all aspects of the outside world in addition to others’ reactions to one’s behavior. Reward for Application is similar to the Protestant work ethic that emphasizes the benefits of effort and hard work. However, reward application is broader in scope because it includes the topic of a just world, which states that effort will lead to pay-offs. This dimension directs people to realize whether trying hard is useful in their social environment, as well as the coping strategy to be used depending on the outcomes from one’s social environment. Spirituality refers to the existence of supernatural factors, and the impact of religion on people’s lives. Since religious beliefs are prominent in all cultures, this dimension can influence a variety of behaviors, such as career choices and choice of leisure time activities and associates. Although fate control is related to locus of control, it is a broader construct because it includes the idea that events are both predetermined and predictable. Locus of control was originally developed by Julian Rotter in the 1950s. According to this concept, people tend to ascribe their chances of future successes or failures either to internal or external causes. Persons with an internal
locus of control see themselves as responsible for the outcomes of their own actions. These individuals often believe that they control their destiny, and are often observed to excel in educational or vocational realms. Someone with an external locus of control, on the other hand, sees environmental causes and situational factors as being more important than internal ones. These individuals would be more likely to see luck rather than effort as determining whether they succeed or fail in the future, and are more likely to view themselves as the victim in any given situation. Locus of control has been found to relate to a wide variety of behaviors, thus fate control that is broader in scope, has evident behavioral implications. Interpersonal harmony emphasizes the desire to maintain harmony in the environment one finds himself and to prevent conflict.

Leung et al. (2002) found these six dimensions by conducting two studies at the individual level and one study at the cultural level. The first study reviewed Euro-American literature, and input from one Asian group (Hong Kong Chinese) and one South American group (Venezuelans). Interviews with research participants and everyday cultural products from the two cultural groups were also examined. The second study was designed to assess the social axiom dimensions in three additional cultures: the United States, Japan, and Germany. The convergence of results from these two studies suggests that at least four factors identified by Lung et al. have the potential to appear across cultures.

In another study, the convergent validity of the SAS was tested (Singelis, Hubbard, Her, & An, 2003). Although the generalizability of those results was limited because of the sample being all female, the results supported the validity of the Social Axioms Survey. However, some may ask if the SAS is more useful than, or distinctive
from, other personality measures. Unlike most personality measures, the SAS is a pure measure of beliefs. Other personality measures for the most part are a mixture of values, attitudes, and sometimes beliefs. Some also contain items that tap the self-concept. By measuring only beliefs, the SAS stands alone from other measures and may provide information on the relative contributions of beliefs and values to behaviors. Furthermore, beliefs may be closely linked to culturally transmitted myths and stories, and therefore be more useful in understanding social behavior across cultures than more traditional, though perhaps related, personality measures. The development of the SAS from sources in Hong Kong, Venezuela, and the USA provided a universality that most personality measures do not possess. Data from over 30 countries has shown that the five dimension factor structure of the SAS is consistent across those countries (Bond, 2001). While other constructs in personality psychology may be similar to individual dimensions of the SAS, none have this international legacy, nor can any claim to have the breadth of belief dimensions contained in the SAS.

Although the dimensions of social axioms seem to be distinct and the nomological network indicated by Singelis et al. (2003) lends validity to the dimensions, the internal consistency for several of the dimensions continues to be problematic. The three dimensions of fate control, reward for application, and social flexibility each were found (Singelis et al.) to have mediocre Alpha coefficients. Although these internal consistencies were lower than desirable, they were not so low as to make the dimensions un-interpretable; the dimensions still correlated predictably with other personality measures. A similar lack of strong internal consistency has been an ongoing concern with other measures of cultural differences (Singelis et al.). In fact, this low internal
consistency may be the price paid for measures having sufficient range among the items to measure constructs at the level of abstraction useful in a variety of cultures.

Given that this measure was born of, and is primarily intended for, cross-cultural studies, the breadth of the items is quite large. This breadth provides the bandwidth for validity in multiple cultural systems, which may have varied emic (i.e. culture specific) aspects of the constructs being measured. For example, the construct of Fate Control may vary slightly across cultures necessitating a variety of items to cover these variations, and thus lowering the internal consistency within a given culture.

In their study, Singelis et al. (2003) found that the dimension of Fate Control positively, though weakly, correlated with external locus of control and moderately related to the belief in precognition and the supernatural. It was also found that this dimension correlated positively with the Paranormal Beliefs dimension of Spiritual Beliefs and negatively with Traditional Beliefs. Control by Fate not only represents a belief in fate but also the belief that some control over that fate is possible. The prediction that Reward for Application would be related to internal locus of control was not supported by Singelis et al., as a small trend in the predicted direction did not reach significance. However, Reward for Application was positively correlated with social desirability, indicating that in the USA, it is socially desirable to say that hard work will be rewarded. This finding makes sense since the Protestant work ethic is a part of the culture in the USA (Singelis et al.). As such, it is more than reasonable to expect that expressing this belief is to support the mainstream culture, and thus is socially desirable. The validity of this dimension was further established by the fact that those scoring higher on this dimension also reported that they try harder following an unsuccessful
event. For the dimension of Cynicism a positive correlation with external locus of control and negative correlations with interpersonal trust, cognitive flexibility, and social desirability was found. Clearly cynicism has extensive effects on the way that people view their social world. The correlation with external locus of control was stronger for this dimension than for fate control. Cynicism, as measured by the SAS, includes a component of lack of control over events. The negative relationship with social desirability shows that cynicism is not generally compatible with wanting to do socially proper acts. Spirituality was positively correlated with the Traditional Beliefs subscale of the Paranormal Beliefs Scale. It did not, however, relate significantly to the Spiritual Beliefs subscale. Furthermore, Spirituality was positively correlated with seeking advice from a spiritual advisor, praying, reading scriptures, and attending church. Thus, the authors conclude that for the specific sample of people they used for their study, Spirituality represents a rather conventional Christian religious orientation (Singelis et al.).

Investments. Another antecedent of normative commitment develops on the basis of particular kinds of investments that the organization makes in the employee, particularly the investments that seem difficult for employees to reciprocate (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Scholl, 1981). These investments may include tuition reimbursements or non-monetary benefits. The latest theory explaining this kind of exchange relationship between an employee and the organization in which the employee works has been the “Psychological Contracts Theory” (Rousseau, 1995). It has been suggested that normative commitment has developed on the basis of the “psychological contract” between an employee and the organization (Rousseau, 1995; Schein, 1980). This assumption is an
extension of the concept of normative commitment expanding on the basis of organizational investments. The theory of "psychological contracts" emerged from Blau’s (1964) exchange theory, which in turn was built on Gouldner’s (1960) concept of the reciprocity norm. Gouldner’s norm of reciprocity represents people’s belief that they ought to return benefits given to them in a relationship. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) builds on Gouldner’s concept (1960) by proposing that as one party provides benefits to another party, a sense of obligation is created that requires the receiving party to reciprocate in some way. Psychological contracts represent an individual’s system of beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange between himself / herself and the organization (Rousseau, 1989; Rouseau & Parks, 1993).

*Psychological contracts.* Psychological contracts consist of the belief of an exchange relationship regarding the reciprocal obligations of the parties involved (Rousseau, 1995). The psychological contract in employment refers to the system of beliefs that an individual and his or her employer hold regarding the terms of their exchange agreement (Rousseau, 1995, 2000). These beliefs are shaped by pre-employment factors, on-the-job experiences, and the broader societal context. Psychological contracts are subjective and, thus, might be viewed somewhat differently by the two parties (Rousseau). Although employees and employers often differ in their perceptions and interpretations regarding the terms of employment (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000, 2002; Porter, Pearce, Tripoli, & Lewis, 1998), some degree of mutuality or shared understanding is essential for the parties to achieve their interdependent goals (Rousseau, 1995).
In the context of psychological contract, mutuality describes the degree to which the two parties agree on their interpretations of promises and commitments each party has made and accepted, meaning the agreement on what each owes the other. Reciprocity refers to the degree of agreement about the mutual exchange, given that commitments or contributions made by one party obligate the other to provide an appropriate return.

Mutuality exists, for example, where both employee and employer agree that the employer has committed to providing specific HR practices. Failure to reach an objective agreement can give rise to psychological contract violation (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 1995), for instance, where the employee and employer, who have previously held similar notions of what HR practices should be offered in exchange for the employee’s commitment, now hold very different ideas. As well, employees and employers typically make every effort to maintain a fair balance in the reciprocal inducements and contributions each has offered the other (Blau, 1964). When one party’s contributions generate an imbalance in the relationship, the indebted party experiences feelings of obligation to the other and seeks to reciprocate as means of restoring the balance (Eisenberger et al, 1986; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Failure to reciprocate the other party’s actions undermines the quality of the exchange relationship (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 1995). Psychological contracts are also subject to change over time as one or both parties perceive obligations to have been fulfilled or violated (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). An employee who initially responds to an organizational investment with feelings of indebtedness may alter and re-evaluate these feelings later on if it is determined that the organization has violated some other aspect of the psychological contract, or that the obligation has already been reciprocated.
In general, an exchange relationship can involve economic resources such as money, goods, services, information, and/or more socio-emotional resources, such as status, love, devotion, and affection. However, reciprocity typically entails the return of relatively similar types of resources, particularly in work relationships as opposed to family or communal ones (Foa & Foa, 1980). In contrast to the more generalized reciprocity characterizing family or communal relationships, reciprocating behavior at work is found to be geared toward the entity from which benefits accumulate. Thus, reciprocity in commitments exist where the obligations an employee has toward his or her organization, i.e. commitment, is offered in exchange for corresponding organization obligations to that employee, i.e. HR practices.

Psychological contracts can take different forms, the most widely recognized being transactional and relational (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1989). Transactional contracts refer to collaborations of limited duration with well-specified performance terms that can be characterized as easy-to-exit agreements with relatively high turnover. Two dimensions that reflect the transactional psychological contract are the narrow involvement in the organization, which is limited to a few well-specified performance terms, and the short-term duration. Transactional contracts result in low levels of organizational commitment and weak integration into the organization and allow for high member rotation and freedom to enter new contracts. Conversely, relational contracts are open-ended collaborations with loosely specified performance terms. Relational contracts exemplify many symbolic characteristics of paternalistic relationships, including: high affective commitment, strong member-organization integration, and stability built on the traditions and the history of the relationship. Relational obligations include mutual
loyalty and long-term stability, often in the form of job security. Although transactional contracts and relational contracts as employment agreements have proven highly relevant to organizations for many years (Rousseau, 1990), employment arrangements have more recently manifested a mixed pattern, often characteristic of high involvement work and knowledge-based organizations operating in highly competitive markets (Pfeffer, 1994; Rousseau, 1995).

Transactional contracts tend to be somewhat more objective and based on principles of economic exchange, whereas relational contracts are more abstract and based on principles of social exchange. Of the two forms, relational contracts seem to be more relevant to normative commitment, while transactional contracts would relate to the development of continuance commitment (Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1995).

Most theories and research regarding psychological contracts concentrate on affective and continuance commitment. However, the literature also suggests that the specific form of commitment most closely associated with psychological contracts differs somewhat from both affective and continuance commitment (Rousseau, 1995). Robinson et al., (1994) observed that affective and continuance commitment “touch but do not directly confront the role of obligations, reciprocity and fulfillment” (p.149). Normative commitment, which places a distinct emphasis on obligations, might well be the missing link in the understanding of the influence of psychological contracts on employee commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Two studies examined the specific terms of the psychological contract and general level of agreement between workers and managers. Herriot, Manning, and Kidd (1997) conducted a nationwide survey, using the critical incident technique and
convenience samples of individuals, on workers and managers who represented a variety of firms and economic sectors. Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2000) examined between-group differences in the psychological contracts of workers and managers from a wide range of public service departments of the same large local authority. Both studies reported considerable overall agreement regarding the terms of the psychological contract but also significant differences regarding the saliency of mutual obligations. Herriot et al. found that while both groups endorsed similar sets of obligations, managers focused more on intangible employment terms, such as humanity and recognition, while workers focused more on fair pay, safe conditions, and job security. Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler established that while managers and employees agreed on the general nature of the employment relationship, managers reported higher scores than employees did on the issue of employer fulfillment of its commitments to employees. In addition, Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler explored the bi-directionality of the norm of reciprocity by analyzing the above data of a public sector organization over time. They found empirical support that the norm of reciprocity operates for both parties to an employment relationship, extending prior research that focused exclusively on the employee perceptions of reciprocity (Shore & Barksdale, 1998). These studies provided evidence of variations in between-groups agreement, but failed to examine the impact of joint perceptions.

Social exchange theory. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) builds on Gouldner's article (1960) by proposing that as one party provides benefits to another party, a sense of obligation is created that requires the receiving party to reciprocate in some way. A fundamental component of social exchange theory is the concept of equitable relationships, which occurs when the costs and benefits of a relationship are
equal. (Blau). Another important element of social exchange theory is the idea that discretionary benefits are more highly valued by recipients than are benefits that are required by circumstances beyond the donor’s control (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). Since some HR practices in an organization are not mandated by unions or by government policies, they represent resources that an organization can choose to provide, or not provide to employees (Eby, Allen, & Brinley, 2005), and it is these discretionary benefits which are more highly valued by the recipient social exchange theory has been used to understand a variety of organizational phenomena, such as citizenship behaviors (Moorman, 1991; Tsui et al., 1997), individual performances (Tsui et al., 1997), work attitudes (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986), and leader-subordinate relationships (Liden, Wayne, & Stillwell, 1993).

*The reciprocity norm.* Gouldner’s (1960) classical article on the subject of the reciprocity norm has received much attention from researchers and practitioners alike. Gouldner’s reciprocity norm simply argues that people believe they ought to return benefits given to them in a relationship. An analytical distinction can be made between reciprocity as a pattern of social exchange and reciprocity as a general moral belief. The moral reciprocity norm directs that ‘what one party receives from the other requires some return,’ while the more familiar concept of reciprocity as a pattern of exchange dictates the fulfillment of interlocking status duties that people owe one another, associating them with specific social ties (Uehara, 1995). Gouldner posits that people often live up to their obligations not simply because of mutual dependency, but also because the partners share the higher level of moral norms: ‘You should give benefits to those who give you benefits’ (Uehara, 1995).
Despite the broad attention the article has received in the last four decades, Ekeh (1974) points out a flaw in Gouldner’s statement on the reciprocity norm. Gouldner assumes that moral reciprocity obligations must be met by providing return directly to those who have provided benefit, while in fact many researchers have found that meeting reciprocity obligations depends on the specific norms associated with specific social relations and the networks within which these relationships are embedded (O’Connell, 1984; Antonucci & Jackson, 1989; Gottlieb, 1985). Thus, positive beneficial actions directed at employees by the organization create an impetus for employees to reciprocate in positive ways through their attitudes and/or behaviors.

HR practices. The literature on human resource management highlights the necessity of investing in human resources as a way of creating and sustaining a competitive advantage in the marketplace (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). Research in this area has demonstrated that investing in human resources can pay off in terms of lower turnover and higher corporate financial performance (Huselid, 1995; Shaw et al., 1998; Terpstra & Rozell, 1993). HR practices can contribute to and support a firm’s strategic objectives, complement its operating philosophy, and create value by utilizing HR practices that are not routinely used by its competitors (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000). Moreover, investment in human resource management activities is expected to enhance employee work attitudes, which, in turn, reduces turnover and enhances corporate performance (Shaw et al., 1998).

HR practices have been considered to be effective tools for enhancing organizational commitment (Ulrich, 1997). Ogilvie (1986) perceives HR practices as concrete, tangible programs designed to develop commitment. HR practices promote,
reinforce, and influence commitment through selection, placement, development, rewards, and retention (Wimalasiri, 1995). From among the various HR practices, it has been found that rewards have a great influence on organizational commitment (Mottaz, 1988; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Jaiswal (1982) and Ogilvie (1986) found relationships between specific practices, such as performance evaluation, promotion policies, compensation, and benefits, and affective commitment. Ogilvie defined organizational commitment in his study as a psychological identification with the goals and beliefs of the organization (affective commitment) combined with the idea of a cognitive evaluation of the costs and benefits of maintaining organizational membership (continuance commitment). Previous studies have identified career development as one of the primary factors in strengthening psychological contracts with employees and creating a strong commitment to the organization (Harel & Tzafrir, 1999; Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Ogilvie, 1986; Paul & Anantharaman, 2004). More than pay, employees give primary value to the growth opportunities in the organization. Growth opportunities are widely considered by individuals in deciding to join and remain in an organization.

There are many other HR practices, which may improve commitment to the organization. Training activities have been found to not only develop employees and improve their skills and abilities, but to also reduce employee turnover, enhance job satisfaction and improve employee commitment to the organization (Harel & Tzafrir, 1999; McEvoy, 1997; Laabs, 1997). Advanced compensation practices and rewards enable the organization to retain essential employees for longer periods of time, and to increase their organizational commitment (Lawler & Jenkins, 1992; Igbaria & Greenhaus,
Profit sharing and stock ownership lead to better cooperation, better communication and better participation, which in turn encourage team members to identify with the organization and work harder on its behalf (Pfeffer, 1998; Weitzman & Kruse, 1990). Pare, Tremblay, and Lalonde (2000) found that HR practices such as salary, promotional opportunities, recognition, empowerment, and competence development had a significant positive effect on organizational commitment among IT professionals (also see Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Paul & Anantharaman, 2004; Agarwal & Ferratt, 1999; Gomolski, 2000).

McElroy (2001) argues that to enhance organizational affective commitment through the use of HR practices, organizations need to employ practices that communicate to employees that the organization is supportive of their effort, that the organization treats its employees fairly, and that the organization is interested in building employees’ self-worth and importance. However, Pfeffer and Veiga (1999) noted that these commitment enhancing practices aren’t utilized in current business practices. Rather than treating employees as assets, there has been a tendency to buy and sell portfolios of businesses, and to downsize and outsource in an attempt to increase short-term profits through cost-cutting measures. McElroy (2001) argues that building commitment, rather than engaging in high-cost HR practices, is the key to an organization’s success.

Meyer and Allen (1997) also found that perceived organizational support has the strongest positive correlation with affective commitment. This result is consistent with the Eizenberger et al. (1986) argument stating that in order to have affectively committed employees, the organization in turn must demonstrate their own commitment by
providing a supportive work environment. Consequently, organizations interested in fostering commitment among their employees may want to implement human resources policies and practices which contribute to perceptions of support which in turn contribute to the development of affective commitment (Hutchinson, 1997; Meyer & Smith, 2001; Naumann, Bennet, Bies, & Martin, 1999).

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) make the observation that attempting to develop one form of commitment may result in a spillover effect to other forms of commitment. In other words, when examining how HR practices can be used to foster organizational commitment, researchers must be aware that the same practices may also influence continuance and normative commitment. For example, the practice of training may be used to increase affective commitment by creating the perception that the organization values its employees, thus bolstering the employees' self-worth. However, if employees perceive that the skills being obtained through training have limited transferability, their continuance commitment may be increased as well, making those additional skills a side bet that ties employees to the organization (Meyer & Herscovitch). Therefore, Meyer and Allen (1997) advise practitioners to incorporate HR practices that increase affective commitment, but at the same time have minimal adverse side-effects on other forms of commitment. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that normative commitment could emerge on the basis of an exchange relationship between the organization and the employee based on HR practices, where the organization provides HR practices to the employee in exchange for the employee's organizational commitment.
Gaps in the Literature

Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested that socialization and exchange are the two focal mechanisms that play key roles in the development of normative commitment. Weiner (1982) suggested that normative commitment develops as a result of normative pressures that are internalized through pre-entry (familial and cultural) and post-entry (organizational) socialization processes. Scholl (1981) suggested that the second mechanism that influences the development of normative commitment is the principle of exchange or the norm of reciprocity. According to this principle, normative commitment develops through the receipt of rewards from the organization, which instill a sense of obligation to reciprocate with commitment to the organization. Nevertheless, not all rewards are likely to encourage a sense of obligation. Scholl insisted that the norm of reciprocity is operative only under the condition that rewards provided to an individual by others go “beyond” what is expected. Conversely, Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda (1994) suggested that expected rewards can also instill a sense of obligation, but that the obligation arising from expected rewards is not as strong as the obligation arising from unexpected rewards.

Normative Commitment and Culture

All three components of commitment come in the form of normative beliefs (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In recent decades, there has been a growing interest in the study of organizational commitment in cross-cultural settings (Meyer & Allen). However, little research exists in relation to how culture and normative commitment interact. Culture has been found to be important theoretically, however the mechanisms of how these two concepts interact has not yet been tested. Most research pertaining to normative
commitment investigates the relationship between normative commitment and the individualist-collectivist dimension of culture. Research has found that people from collectivist cultures value behavior according to the norms of their in-group and the obligations and duties that are designed to maintain social harmony among the members of the in-group (Meyer & Allen). In other words, collectivist cultures maintain normative or obligatory relationships more often than individualistic cultures. Some researchers have argued that collectivists are more likely to feel a normative attachment to their organization than individualistic cultures (Meyer & Allen). Wasti (2003) investigated whether cultural values of individualism and collectivism measured at the individual level influence the salience of different antecedents of organizational commitment. The findings indicated that satisfaction with work and promotions are the primary determinants of affective and normative commitment for employees who endorse individualist values. For employees with collectivist values, satisfaction with supervisor was found to be an important commitment antecedent over and above satisfaction with work and promotions.

In their meta-analysis, Meyer and Allen (2002) attempted to address this generalizability problem and although there were still not enough studies to perform a systematic cross-cultural comparison, their findings did help to address this generalizability issue. Some of the more notable differences were the correlations among the commitment components, particularly between affective and normative commitment. The correlation between these two components of commitment was found to be greater in studies conducted outside North America, which might suggest that the constructs themselves are more closely related in other cultures; hence the difference between desire
and obligation is less distinct. However, Meyer and Allen didn’t rule out the possibility that the greater overlap results from difficulties in translation. Although some differences were found, the results from studies within North America versus outside North America were for the most part very similar. The similarities found by Meyer and Allen suggest that the Three-Component Model might indeed be generalizable and that any differences observed can be meaningful in that they may reflect true cultural differences and are not an artifact. Thus, Meyer and Allen view considering individual differences, such as personal values and dispositions that reflect cultural socialization, as a further avenue for research on the development of normative commitment. Two recent studies (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Wasti, 2003) found that individual differences in cultural values, such as individualism-collectivism and power distance (Hofstede, 1980) correlated positively with normative commitment to the organization. Provided that normative commitment correlates positively with desired outcome variables, such as performance, OCB, and so on, research in this area is greatly needed. Since commitment is a general attitude, it should be affected by one or more of the six social axioms. Bond et al. (2004) suggested that values and beliefs be examined together in order to better classify cultures. In this study, two measure of cultures will be used; the Social Axioms Survey (Leung et al., 2002), and the INDCOL (Singelis et al., 1995).

Normative Commitment and the Reciprocity Norm

Since the antecedents of normative commitment, socialization and organizational investments are difficult to measure, the most obvious gap in research pertaining to the Three-Component Model is in the area of normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 2002). Both socialization experiences and organizational investments appear to be idiosyncratic
and difficult to capture using standard research instruments. Since socialization experiences might vary considerably across cultures, there exists the possibility that cross-cultural research may provide greater insight into the development of normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Given the reciprocity norm (Gouldner, 1960), it is argued that employees might find the sense of imbalance or indebtedness that normative commitment arouses in them uncomfortable, and in order to resolve this imbalance, they will develop a sense of obligation to the organization. The current study posits that cultural differences exist to the extent to which people have internalized reciprocity norms and, therefore, to the extent to which organizational investments will lead to feelings of indebtedness.

Most previous studies concentrated on investigating the effects of HR practices on affective commitment. However, Meyer and Allen (1997) suggested that HR practices might also influence continuance and normative commitment. Employees who receive attractive benefits packages might come to perceive the organization as caring and supportive, and develop a strong affective commitment. They may also believe that to lose such a package would be costly, thus experiencing greater continuance commitment, and/or feel indebted to the organization, and therefore develop a stronger normative commitment. Organizations wanting to increase the commitment of their employees through their HR practices are likely to want to increase affective commitment, or normative commitment, without increasing continuance commitment. Normative commitment has been found to correlate positively with constructs such as organizational dependability and management receptiveness (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Therefore, it is possible that employees will also feel a greater sense of obligation to remain if they view
the organization as supportive. Normative commitment might be one manifestation of employees in response to organizations that are perceived to provide support as part of the psychological contract with their employees (Rouseau, 1995). In a study testing the relationship between HR practices and Meyer and Allen's (1990) three components model of commitment, it was found that benefits influenced normative commitment directly (Meyer & Smith, 2000). In addition, it was suggested by their findings that perceptions of HR practices are related to employees' normative commitment to the organization, although these relations are mediated by perceptions of procedural justice and organizational support. They also found that perceptions of HR practices and normative commitment were mediated by affective commitment, suggesting that an employee's sense of obligation to remain with an organization might be due to the same experiences that contribute to the employee's desire to remain.

Although very little research has concentrated on the interaction between HR practices and normative commitment, it is reasonable to assume that some of the HR practices offered by organizations may foster normative commitment instead of affective commitment. These HR practices may create a situation in which an exchange occurs where the organization provides incentives in the form of HR practices that create a sense of obligation in the employees.

The Temporal Aspect of Normative Commitment

Beck and Wilson (2001) discussed the impact of the "study of development" on work commitment. The study of development is "the description and explanation of time-graded trajectories in some characteristics of individuals" (p.258). Within the commitment literature, little research has focused directly and explicitly on identifying
changes in commitment over time or, in turn, on the factors associated with these changes. There is cross-sectional data which indicates that differences in commitment levels do exist across more extended periods (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Morrow & McElroy, 1987). The majority of the studies has concentrated on affective organizational commitment, and has generally indicated that affective commitment decreases on entry to an organization and subsequently increases with increasing tenure. However, no research has looked at the temporal aspect of normative commitment in terms of the length of time an employee will perceive as equitable in exchange for the various HR practices s/he will receive from the organization.

Organizations today are rarely static. More often than not, changes to processes, procedures, systems, and structures are being introduced by management to enhance efficiency, effectiveness, or morale. Thus, it is fair to assume that each component of commitment will have a temporal aspect. Continuance commitment by its definition has a temporal component to it. Since continuance commitment is the employee’s awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization, if the costs are minimized, the employee will most probably leave the organization. As well, the other hypothesized antecedent of continuance commitment, the employee’s perceptions of employment alternatives, also emphasizes the temporal aspect of continuance commitment. Once the employee perceives alternative employment opportunities, s/he will leave the organization. The same can be said about normative commitment. Normative commitment, being defined as an employee’s sense of obligation to remain with an organization, has a temporal aspect to it as well. It is unreasonable to expect employees to experience this sense of obligation indefinitely. Since normative commitment develops
on the basis of early socialization processes, it can be assumed that the amount of time a person will feel obligated to remain with an organization will depend on their interpretation of the exchange contract (i.e. the reciprocity norm) and their culture, among other things. This idea is especially true for generation Y. It is suggested that this generation, unlike its predecessor generations, values time and this is the currency that organizations will have to bargain over in the near future. Thus, this study will examine how culture and the reciprocity norm predict the length of time generation Yers perceive as equitable in the exchange relationship with the organization. In other words, this study will investigate the perceptions of the amount of time the psychological contract dictates for the employee to remain with an organization in exchange for the various HR practices that the organization offers. Normative commitment, in particular, is bound to last an amount of time that is constrained to the individual's perception of the amount of time s/he is obligated to remain with the organization based on the particular HR practice offered. In addition, the culture to which one belongs is expected to also predict the perception of the time owed to an organization. Previous studies have shown that different cultures experience different amounts of normative commitment (Wasti, 2003). This study will utilize individual-level analysis because it has the advantage of directly connecting the hypothesized aspect of culture to other constructs in the nomological network, as it measures the relative degree of value endorsement rather than aggregation according to nationality, which presumes that all cultural members share a given perspective equally and identically (Wasti). However, in some cultures the reciprocity norm may be perceived differently than in other cultures, which can affect the relationship between normative commitment and culture.
Hypotheses

HR practices are the organization's currency to bargain with in exchange for the employee's commitment. Due to the fact that the participants came from among the generation Yers, perceptions of reciprocity were hypothesized to be experienced only for certain HR practices. From the knowledge we have thus far about generation Yers, we know that they appreciate training that can further their careers, and anything pertaining to time related issues at work, such as more vacation, more flexibility in schedules, etc. Thus, the next hypotheses will be:

HR practices pertaining to flexibility in terms of schedules such as flextime, compressed work week will predict length of stay in an organization, such that more flexibility in schedules will be associated with longer stays. (H1)

HR practices pertaining to non-monetary benefits will predict perceptions of length of stay such that more non-monetary benefits will be associated with longer stays. (H2)

HR practices pertaining to training of employees will predict perceptions of length of stay such that more training will be associated with longer stays. (H3)

Since the cynicism dimension is characterized by mistrust of institutions, participants who score high on this dimension perceive that employees will not feel any sense of obligation towards the organization and not stay as long in an organization. People scoring high on cynicism will believe that the organization already takes advantage of them anyway, so staying with an organization longer won't be required in exchange for the HR practices. Thus the first hypothesis is:
Cynicism will predict perceptions of length of stay in an organization, such that higher levels of cynicism will be associated with expectations that one would stay a shorter length of time. (H4)

Since reward for application is the belief that if one works hard, one will be rewarded, many have associated it with the protestant work ethic. The protestant work ethic has been reputed to overlap with job, career and organizational commitment (Morrow, 1993). People scoring high on this dimension will perceive employees getting the opportunity to work hard and be rewarded, thus they should remain longer with an organization. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Reward for Application will predict perceptions of the length of stay in an organization, such that higher levels of Reward for Application will be associated with longer stays. (H5)

Many religions have ethical guidelines that promote moral behavior between individuals. Reciprocity norm has also been suggested to contain a moral component that encourages a fair exchange relationship between an individual and the organization. Therefore, these two seemingly different concepts contain the similar theme of morality. Thus, it is expected that participants scoring high on the spirituality dimension to perceive a sense of morality to stay longer with an organization.

Spirituality will predict length of stay in an organization, such that higher levels of spirituality will be associated with longer stays. (H6)

Bond et al. (2004) proposed that cultural values and beliefs be examined together to better measure culture. Thus, it is hypothesized that:
Cultural beliefs and cultural values together will predict normative commitment better than each of these measures individually. (H7)

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Sample and Procedure

Data for this study were collected from 156 students studying at the University of Windsor who are enrolled in the Psychology Participant Research Pool, as well as directly from other classes that do not participate in the participant research pool. All students participating in this study were 18-25 years old and belonged to generation Y. In order to deal with missing data, the responses of 7 participants were removed from the analysis since their questionnaires were missing a major part of the responses. The remaining analytic sample for this study consisted of 149 young students between the ages of 18-25 years old (M=21.6; SD=1.9). Approximately 72% of the participants were females and 27% were males; all in their 2nd 3rd or 4th year of their undergraduate degree. Most participants were predominantly Canadians (73.2%), and fluent in at least one language other than English (63.8%). Approximately 73% of the participants expressed that they were working at the time the survey was conducted. Approximately 53% of the participants said they worked part-time and 20.8% said they were working full-time. Only about 4% of the participants said they have never worked before completing this questionnaire. Approximately 11% said they have never worked before but were working at the time the questionnaire was administered. About 19% have had a job in the past but were not working at the time that the questionnaire was administered. The remaining
65% reported having had a job before and were working at the time that the questionnaire was administered.

Students were recruited in order to complete three questionnaires: the Social Axioms Survey (SAS; Leung et al, 2000), Individualism and Collectivism (INDCOL; Singelis et al, 1995), and a questionnaire containing HR practices (HRPQ). The questionnaires were administered by the researcher to students in groups. First the students were asked to consent to participate, after which they were asked to complete the three questionnaires. The questionnaires took approximately 45 minutes to an hour to complete. The students completing the questionnaires were ensured confidentiality.

**Measures**

*The Social Axiom Survey (SAS).* The SAS (Appendix A) was developed by Leung et al. (2002) to measure general social beliefs. It initially consisted of 182 items. The pool was reduced to 82 items through factor analyses of data from six cultures. However, the number of items loading on each dimension, as well as the reliabilities, varied across the dimensions. This study used the long version of the SAS containing 82 social axiom statements that imply a relationship between two concepts or events. The SAS asks respondents to rate on a 7-point Likert scale the degree to which they believe each statement to be true (with anchors of Strongly Disbelieve=1, and Strongly Believe=5). The scale includes six dimensions: Control by Fate, Reward for Application, Social Cynicism, Spirituality, Social Flexibility, and Interpersonal Harmony.

An example of the six dimensions of the SAS are: fate control (e.g. ‘Good luck follows if one survives a disaster’), reward for application (e.g. ‘Knowledge is necessary for success’), social flexibility (e.g. ‘A modest person can make a good impression on
people’), social cynicism (e.g. ‘Young people are impulsive and unreliable’), spirituality (e.g. ‘Religious faith contributes to good mental health’), and interpersonal harmony (e.g. ‘Life without love is flat and insipid’).

*Individualism/Collectivism (INDCOL)*. The INDCOL (Appendix B) was developed by Singelis et al. (1995) to subjectively assess perceived dimensions of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. It consists of 32 statements, each requiring an evaluation by means of a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly agree” (7) to “strongly disagree” (1). The dimensions of vertical and horizontal individualism (VI and HI) and collectivism (VC and HC) are each assessed by 8 items.

Since a characterization of a society by the global dimensions of individualism and collectivism alone offers too little information about its nature, the use of the horizontal and vertical dimensions is to be preferred to any other solution (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; see also Turiel & Neff, 2000). Therefore, Triandis (1995) developed the individualism and collectivism constructs further, and suggested that individualism and collectivism tend to occur either in forms stressing equality (i.e., horizontal) or forms stressing hierarchy and status differences (i.e., vertical). Singelis et al. (1995) found reliability coefficients for vertical individualism to range from .76 to .79, for horizontal individualism from .60 to .75, for vertical collectivism from .50 to .69, and for horizontal collectivism from .61 to .64. Since the INDCOL assesses culturally informed features, Triandis and Gelfand (1998) concluded that low to moderate reliability coefficients are normal for the vertical and horizontal dimensions of individualism and collectivism (p. 124, note 2; cf. Singelis et al., 1995).
Human Resource Practices Questionnaire (HRPQ). This HRPQ (Appendix C) included questions about HR practices and the extent to which these HR practices engender normative commitment. All HR practices were collected from the existing research literature, Workplace and Employee Survey Reports presented by Statistics Canada in 1999 and 2000, and from major companies operating in Canada (Royal Bank, Bank of Montreal, PetroCanada, Hudson’s Bay, and more). This questionnaire measured strength of normative commitment and perceptions of the temporal aspect of normative commitment through the use of HR practices as the bargaining currency. If an HR practice concept had the potential of containing business jargon that may be unfamiliar to the students, a definition of the HR concept was provided. An example of the questions that were asked is provided next: “How important would compressed work weeks be to you if you were looking for a job?” followed by “To what extent should an employee remain with an organization that provides compressed work weeks?” The participant then chose an answer ranging from 1 to 7, 1 representing “not at all” and 7 representing “greatly obligated,” after which the participant was asked “If an organization offers compressed work weeks, how long should an employee stay with the organization?” To answer this question, 7 optional answers were provided to the participant: 1- as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the compressed work weeks, 2- 0-3 months, 3-4-6 months, 4- 7 months-1 year, 5- 1-3 years, 6- 4-6 years, 7- 7+ years. An additional question was asked of the participants that asked them: “If an organization offers compressed work weeks, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?” In order for the participant to answer this question, a Likert scale was provided that ranges from 1- less effort to 7 more effort.
Demographic Questionnaire (Appendix D). Questions pertaining to personal demographic information were requested from the participants. Questions included information pertaining to the participants’ age, gender, religion, culture they identify with, country of birth, languages spoken, if they immigrated to Canada length of time since immigration, generation of immigrants in Canada, major, year of study, as well as current and previous work experience.

Statistical Analysis

Ordinal regression was performed on all the variables where the assumption of parallel lines was not violated. If the assumption of parallel lines was violated, multinomial regression analyses were performed for the remaining HR practices in this study. These analyses were employed since the dependent variable was ordinal. As well, correlations using Spearman’s rho were conducted between the perceived levels of obligation and perception of time an employee should remain with an organization. In social science research, about 10 participants per independent variable are needed for a multinomial regression to have stable results (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1989). Since the 6 cultural dimensions in the SAS are considered as predictors in this analysis, the amount of predictors was 6 predictors, necessitating at least 60 participants. The sample used in this study of 149 participants therefore, provided adequate power to these hypotheses.

CHAPTER III
RESULTS

Distribution of time length answers

Table 1 shows the distribution of responses of perceptions of length of time an employee should stay with an organization across the various HR practices. The answer
which was selected most frequently, regardless of the HR practice was “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the HR practice.” The highest percentage of participants that chose the option “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the HR practice” was for the Compressed Work Week practice (49.5%). The lowest percentage to select this option was for the Relocation Allowance practice (32.2%). If this option is not taken into account, the length of time of 0-3 months was selected as the next highest amount of time for 14 HR practices. In table 1, one can examine those HR practices at length. Participants selected job rotation (25.5%) as the second most frequent HR practice, and non-monetary recognition (12.1%) as the second least frequent HR practice. Individual incentives and relocation allowance had the same second highest rate of selection for the length of time of 7 months to 1 year (15.4%). Retention bonuses of up to $10,000 had the second largest rate of selection for the length of time of 1-3 years (20.8%). For tuition reimbursement of up to $2000, the second highest rate of selection for the length of time was 1-3 years (18.1%). Continuing education had the highest rate of selection for the length of time for 1-3 years (14.8%).

Examining the Spearman’s rho determined the relationship between perceptions of obligation levels and perceptions of length of time a person should remain with an organization. Some of the results were significant and some were not. Health related benefits ($p=0.225, p=0.006$), family/medical leave ($p=0.205, p=0.012$), voluntary leave ($p=0.330, p<0.001$), community service leave ($p=0.342, p<0.001$), RRSPs ($p=0.185, p=0.024$), employer sponsored pension plans ($p=0.212, p=0.009$), life/disability insurance ($p=0.241, p=0.003$), in-house training ($p=0.274, p=0.001$), empowering jobs ($p=0.410, p<0.001$), job rotation ($p=0.171, p=0.037$), and job enrichment ($p=0.369, p<0.001$) – all
presented a positive correlation between obligation levels and length of time. Thus, the higher the perception about the obligation levels of an employee being offered the HR practice, the more likely that participants felt that an employee should remain longer with the organization offering the HR practice.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Practice</th>
<th>0-3 months</th>
<th>4-6 months</th>
<th>7 months-1 year</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7+ years</th>
<th>As long as the HR is offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work week</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Medical Leave</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Leave</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leave</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRSPs</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPP</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life/Disability</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Plans</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Sharing Plans</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Incentives</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Allowance</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Bonus up to $10000</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement up to $2000</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Training</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Jobs</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary Recognition</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1. Looking at Table 1, Hypothesis 1 that states that HR practices pertaining to flexibility in terms of schedules such as flextime and compressed work weeks will predict length of stay in an organization, such that more flexibility in schedules will be associated with longer stays, is rejected. No correlations were found between the level of obligation an employee should experience and the length of time that employee should remain with the organization offering the HR practice (compressed work week, $\rho=-0.069, \alpha=0.406$; flextime, $\rho=0.066, \alpha=0.423$). It is clear that in terms of actual lengths of time, the HR practices pertaining to flexible work schedules do not have any predictive power in this sample.

Hypothesis 2. As for non-monetary recognition, again the distribution of answers across lengths of time an employee should remain with an organization was rather even across the 6 categories of length of time with the exception of the option of “as long as the employee can take advantage of the HR practice,” which was selected most often in this category (39.6%). As well, no correlation was found between the level of obligation an employee should experience and the length of time that employee should remain with the organization offering the HR practice ($\rho=0.011, \alpha=0.896$). Thus, hypothesis 2 is also rejected.

Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis proposed that HR practices pertaining to training of employees will predict perceptions of length of stay such that more training will be associated with longer stays. External training and continuing education didn’t result in the lengths of time an employee should remain with an organization as longer but rather shorter, however this was a non-significant finding. The only variable that resulted in a significant correlation between the level of obligation an employee should experience and
the length of time that employee should remain with the organization offering the HR practice was in-house training ($p = 0.274, \alpha < 0.001$). The strength of this correlation is low, thus not qualifying as a strong predictor of the dependent variable. A multinomial regression analysis was performed on these variables and it was found that perceptions of obligation predicted the length of time an employee should remain in an organization when offered continuing education, such that higher levels of obligation increased the likelihood that an employee would remain with an organization 1 to 3 years ($B = 1.035$, $df = 1, \alpha < 0.001$), 4 to 6 years ($B = 1.413$, $df = 1, \alpha = 0.001$), 7+ years ($B = 0.567$, $df = 1, \alpha = 0.008$), and "as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the HR practice" ($B = 0.476$, $df = 1, \alpha = 0.001$) more than 0 to 3 months.

Hypotheses 4-7: Cultural Beliefs

The SAS scales (social cynicism, reward for application, interpersonal harmony, spirituality, fate control, and social flexibility) resulted in the following Cronbach’s Alphas respectively: 0.808, 0.702, 0.689, 0.695, 0.710, 0.696. In order to increase the reliability of the dimensions, 11 items were removed from the various scales. Table 2 shows the likelihood ratio tests that all coefficients for all independent variables are equal to zero. This null hypothesis can be rejected for the 19 HR practices since the chi-square values are highly significant. For the three HR practices; relocation, external training and job enrichment, we fail to reject this null hypothesis.

**Ordinal Regression Results.** In order to explore whether hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 should be rejected or not, ordinal regression was performed on the 22 HR practices. Unfortunately, not all HR practices allowed for ordinal regression to be performed. When one fits an ordinal regression one assumes that the relationships between the independent
variables and the logits are the same for all the logits (Long, 1997). This means that the results are a set of parallel lines or planes—one for each category of the outcome variable. In other words, the regression coefficients are the same for all categories involved. This assumption was checked for each HR practice. For some of the HR practices, the assumption was validated, for others it was not. When the assumption of parallel lines was violated, a multinomial regression is recommended because it estimates separate coefficients for each category (Long, 1997). Thus, multinomial regression was performed for the HR practices for which the assumption of parallel lines was violated. For ordinal categorical variables, the drawback of the multinomial regression model is that the ordering of the categories is ignored (Long, 1997). The HR practices that allowed for an ordinal regression to be performed are: RRSPs, employer sponsored pension plans (ESPP), life / disability insurance, profit sharing, retention bonus up to $10,000, continuing education, and non-monetary recognition.

Overall, the SAS dimensions that had predictive power on perceptions of length of time an employee should remain with an organization were social cynicism, social flexibility and an additional dimension with predictive power for only the HR practice of continuing education – interpersonal harmony. The dimension of social flexibility was positively and significantly predictive for all 7 HR practices. In other words, participants who scored higher on the Social Flexibility dimension also expressed that an employee should stay longer with an organization if offered these 7 HR practices. It is important to note that those that answered “as long as an employee is able to take advantage of the HR practice” chose this option as the longest time period since it is assumed that if an HR practice is offered indefinitely, then this employee should remain with the organization
indefinitely. The dimension of Cynicism was negatively predictive of perceptions of length of time an employee should remain with an organization for 5 HR practices: RRSPs ($B=-0.334$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.012$), life / disability insurance ($B=-0.382$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.005$), retention bonus up to $10,000$ ($B=-0.277$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.036$), continuing education ($B=-0.296$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.025$), and non-monetary recognition ($B=-0.265$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.041$). In other words, participants scoring high on Social Cynicism expressed that an employee should stay a shorter length of time with an organization if offered these 5 HR practices than participants who scored low on Social Cynicism. The HR practice of continuing education was also negatively predicted by the dimension of Interpersonal Harmony ($B=-0.355$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.02$). Thus, participants who scored high in Interpersonal Harmony also expressed that an employee should stay a shorter length of time with an organization if offered continuing education. Table 3 shows the parameter estimate results for all 7 HR practices and their significant predictors.
Table 2

**Model Fit for Each HR Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Practice</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRSPs</td>
<td>30.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPP</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Sharing</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Education</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-monetary Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work week</td>
<td>89.49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>62.783</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>68.345</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>68.095</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement up to $2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Medical Leave</td>
<td>72.162</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Leave</td>
<td>57.020</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>71.809</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Leave</td>
<td>60.407</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Purchase Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Incentives</td>
<td>67.804</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>38.341</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Training</td>
<td>66.651</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Training</td>
<td>47.711</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Jobs</td>
<td>61.294</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation</td>
<td>55.534</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>46.000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Predictors achieved in the ordinal regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Practice</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRSPs</td>
<td>1. Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPP</td>
<td>1. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life/Disability Insurance</td>
<td>1. Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Sharing</td>
<td>1. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Bonus</td>
<td>1. Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Education</td>
<td>1. Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-monetary Benefits</td>
<td>3. I - H *</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I-H stands for the variable "Interpersonal Harmony"

Multinomial Regression Results. As mentioned above, the remaining 15 HR practices were analyzed using multinomial regression since they violated the parallel lines assumption for ordinal regression. The results of the model fit are presented by the chi-square values in Table 2. Three HR practices – relocation allowance, external training, and job enrichment - did not achieve model fit ($\chi^2=38.341$, df=36, $\alpha=0.364$; $\chi^2=47.711$, df=36, $\alpha=0.092$; $\chi^2=46$, df=36, $\alpha=0.123$ respectively). When the reduced model is the baseline model with the constant only, the likelihood ratio test tests the significance of the researcher's model as a whole. A well-fitting model is significant at the 0.05 level or better, meaning the researcher's model is significantly different from the one with the constant only. When this doesn't occur, it implies that none of the independents are linearly related to the log odds of the dependent. Model chi-square thus tests the null hypothesis that all population logistic regression coefficients except the
constant are zero. Thus, for these 3 HR practices, none of the independent variables – the SAS dimensions – had any significant predictive power.

Multinomial regression requires that one of the categories be compared with the other categories of the predicted variable. For the purposes of this type of analysis, the category of “0-3 months” was chosen as a comparison category in order to compare the perceptions of the participants that chose responses indicating that an employee should remain with an organization for little or no time with those that chose responses involving longer lengths of time. The direction of the relationship and contribution for the dependent variable are shown in Table 4. Parameter estimates focus on the role of each independent variable in differentiating between the categories specified by the dependent variable.

For a compressed work week, the significant predictors were interpersonal harmony, social cynicism, and social flexibility. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay for 4-6 months (B=1.298, df=1, α=0.004), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the compressed work week” (B=0.702, df=1, α=0.016) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of social flexibility also increased the likelihood that participants would perceive that an employee should stay with an organization for “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the compressed work week” (B=0.644, df=1, α=0.019) instead of 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decrease the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the compressed work week” (B=-0.627, df=1, α=0.009) instead of 0-3 months.
Table 4

Parameter Estimates for the Multinomial Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Practice</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>4-6 months</th>
<th>7 mos - 1 year</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7 + years</th>
<th>As long as the HR is offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed Work Week</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>1.630</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>4.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>-.673</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>2.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>1.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>2.595</td>
<td>-.471</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td>1.298*</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>4.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>1.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>-.353</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>1.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>1.713</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>2.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>-.647</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>-.582</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family / Medical Leave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.481*</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.392*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>2.627</td>
<td>0.585**</td>
<td>6.053</td>
<td>0.502*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Leave</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>-.759</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>-.417</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>-.458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>-.737</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>-.445</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>-.1295</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>-.445</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>1.077**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Correlation coefficients are given for each pair of variables. Significant correlations are indicated with * (p < 0.05) or ** (p < 0.01) markings. Further description or context is not provided within the observed text segment.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Leave</th>
<th>Social Cynicism</th>
<th>Reward for Application</th>
<th>Social Flexibility</th>
<th>Fate Control</th>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>Interpersonal Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.766</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>-.821*</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>-.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>-.568</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>-.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>-.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>-.626</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.136*</td>
<td>3.114</td>
<td>.919*</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>1.83** 6.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>-.821*</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>-.771</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>-.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>.919*</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>1.83**</td>
<td>6.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>.863*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>.822*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>-.777</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>-.464</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>-.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td>.284*</td>
<td>3.612</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>1.993</td>
<td>1.183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Individual Incentives</td>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td>Relocation Allowance</td>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>-.660</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement up to $2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.437</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>-.539</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>-.572</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The values in the table represent correlation coefficients. Positive values indicate a positive relationship, while negative values indicate a negative relationship. The significance levels are indicated with an asterisk (*) for p < 0.05 and double asterisk (**) for p < 0.01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reward for Application</th>
<th>Social Control</th>
<th>Interpersonal Harmony</th>
<th>Social Cynicism</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Social Flexibility</th>
<th>Interpersonal Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>-0.358</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>-0.758</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table shows correlation coefficients between different constructs.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Rotation</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
<th>Social Cynicism</th>
<th>Reward for Application</th>
<th>Social Flexibility</th>
<th>Fate Control</th>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>Interpersonal Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.027 0.973 -.173 0.842 -.050 0.951 -1.13* 0.324 -.476 0.621 -.461 0.631</td>
<td>.468 1.597 0.074 1.077 .361 1.435 -.404 0.667 .134 1.144 .373 1.452</td>
<td>.049 1.051 -.177 1.193 .365 1.440 .372 1.451 -.295 0.744 .351 1.420</td>
<td>.192 1.212 -.107 0.898 -.052 0.950 1.88** 6.56 -.530 0.588 -.007 0.993</td>
<td>-.202 0.817 .427 1.532 -.325 0.723 -.438 0.646 -.084 0.919 -.335 0.716</td>
<td>.196 1.216 .191 1.211 .485 1.625 .777 2.175 .640 1.897 .206 1.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Enrichment</th>
<th>Social Cynicism</th>
<th>Reward for Application</th>
<th>Social Flexibility</th>
<th>Fate Control</th>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>Interpersonal Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.458 0.632 .271 1.311 .152 1.164 -.579 0.560 -.302 0.739 -.468* 0.627</td>
<td>.223 1.249 .395 1.484 -.227 0.797 .298 1.347 .076 1.079 .395 1.484</td>
<td>.458 1.580 -.324 0.723 .478 1.613 .359 1.431 .115 1.122 .358 1.431</td>
<td>.390 1.477 -.524 0.592 -.325 0.722 .541 1.717 -.743 0.476 .013 1.014</td>
<td>-.307 0.736 .088 1.092 .450 1.568 .026 1.026 -.052 0.950 -.243 0.784</td>
<td>.082 1.085 .138 1.148 .311 1.364 .144 1.155 .294 1.342 .069 1.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For flextime, the main predictors were: interpersonal harmony and social cynicism. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay for 7+ years (B=1.273, df=1, \(\alpha=0.007\)), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of flextime” (B=0.749, df=1, \(\alpha=0.017\)) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decrease the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of flextime” (B=-0.494, df=1, \(\alpha=0.046\)) instead of 0-3 months.

For health related benefits, the major predictors were interpersonal harmony, social cynicism and social flexibility. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay for 1-3 years (B=1.324, df=1, \(\alpha=0.003\)) more 0-3 months. Higher scores of social flexibility increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay for “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the health related benefits” (B=0.690, df=1, \(\alpha=0.027\)) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decrease the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization 7+ years (B=-0.805, df=1, \(\alpha=0.025\)), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the health related benefits” (B=-0.597, df=1, \(\alpha=0.036\)) instead of 0-3 months.

For family/medical related benefits, the most significant predictors were social cynicism and interpersonal harmony. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay for 7 months -1 year (B=1.801, df=1, \(\alpha=0.002\)), 7+ years (B=1.779, df=1, \(\alpha=0.001\)), “as long
as the employee is able to take advantage of the family/medical related benefits” (B=1.416, df=1, α=0.002), 4-6 years (B=1.330, df=1, α=0.034), and 1-3 years (B=1.246, df=1, α=0.013) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decreased the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization 7+ years (B=-1.446, df=1, α=0.001), 4-6 years (B=-1.264, df=1, α=0.013), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the family/medical related benefits” (B=-1.077, df=1, α=0.003), 7 months – 1 year (B=-1.068, df=1, α=0.026), 1-3 years (B=-0.889, df=1, α=0.023) instead of 0-3 months.

For voluntary leave, the main predictors were interpersonal harmony and social cynicism. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7+ years (B=1.361, df=1, α=0.005), 4-6 years (B=1.301, df=1, α=0.049), 1-3 years (B=1.077, df=1, α=0.004), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the voluntary leave” (B=0.751, df=1, α=0.009) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decrease the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the voluntary leave” (B=-0.452, df=1, α=0.049) instead of 0-3 months.

For community service leave, the major predictors were interpersonal harmony and social cynicism. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7+ years (B=1.913, df=1, α<0.001), 4-6 years (B=1.830, df=1, α=0.006), 4-6 months (B=1.136, df=1, α=0.022), 7 months – 1 year (B=0.919, df=1, α=0.024), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the community service leave” (B=0.898, df=1,
Higher scores on social cynicism decreased the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization 7 + years (B=1.380, df=1, α=0.007), 4-6 months (B=-0.821, df=1, α=0.015), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the community service leave” (B=-0.772, df=1, α=0.003) instead of 0-3 months.

For stock purchase plans, the main predictors were reward for application, fate control and social flexibility. Higher scores of reward for application increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 1-3 years (B=0.863, df=1, α=0.035) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of social flexibility increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the stock purchase plans” (B=0.822, df=1, α=0.008) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of fate control increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 4-6 years (B=1.120, df=1, α=0.023), 1-3 years (B=0.822, df=1, α=0.026) more than 0-3 months.

For individual incentives, the main predictors were reward for application, social flexibility, and interpersonal harmony. Higher scores of reward for application increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 4-6 months (B=1.284, df=1, α=0.020), 1-3 years (B=1.183, df=1, α=0.011), 7+ years (B=1.096, df=1, α=0.029), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the individual incentives” (B=0.848, df=1, α=0.046) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of social flexibility increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 4-6 years (B=1.696,
df=1, α=0.003), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the individual incentives” (B=1.408, df=1, α=0.002), 7+ years (B=1.033, df=1, α=0.045) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony decreased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7 months-1 year (B=-1.377, df=1, α=0.005), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the individual incentives” (B=-1.308, df=1, α=0.018), 7+ years (B=-1.006, df=1, α=0.039), more than 0-3 months.

For tuition reimbursement of up to $2000, the main predictors were reward for application and social flexibility. Higher scores of reward for application increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7 months-1 year (B=2.168, df=1, α=0.035) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of social flexibility increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the tuition reimbursement of up to $2000” (B=3.013, df=1, α=0.029), 4-6 years (B=2.862, df=1, α=0.042) more than 0-3 months.

For in-house training, the major predictors were interpersonal harmony and social cynicism. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7 months-1 year (B=0.770, df=1, α=0.035) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decreased the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the in-house training” (B=-0.799, df=1, α=0.002), 7+ years (B=-0.782, df=1, α=0.028) instead of 0-3 months.

For external training, only social cynicism was a predictor. Higher scores on social
cynicism decreased the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization 7+ years ($B=-1.041$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.014$), 4-6 years ($B=-0.770$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.043$), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the external training” ($B=-0.750$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.014$) instead of 0-3 months.

For the empowering jobs, the main predictors were reward for application, interpersonal harmony, fate control, and social flexibility. Higher scores of reward for application increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7 months-1 year ($B=1.349$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.003$) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of interpersonal harmony decreased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 4-6 months ($B=-1.386$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.006$) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores of fate control decreased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 7+ years ($B=-1.060$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.014$) more than 0-3 months.

Higher scores of social flexibility increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 1-3 years ($B=0.732$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.029$), “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the empowering jobs” ($B=0.595$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.029$) more than 0-3 months. For job rotation, the major predictors were social cynicism and fate control. Higher scores of fate control increased the likelihood that the participant would perceive that an employee should stay with the organization for 4-6 years ($B=1.881$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.005$) more than 0-3 months. Higher scores on social cynicism decreased the probability of perceiving that an employee should remain with an organization 4-6 years ($B=-1.128$, $df=1$, $\alpha=0.015$) instead of 0-3 months.
Hypothesis 4. This hypothesis was found to be partially supported. Social cynicism predicted perceptions of the length of time an employee should stay in an organization, such that higher levels of cynicism were associated with expectations that one would stay a shorter length of time for these 14 HR practices – compressed work week, flextime, health related benefits, family/medical leave, voluntary leave, community service leave, stock purchase plans, in-house training, external training, job rotation, RRSPs, life/disability insurance, retention bonus up to $10,000, continuing education, and non-monetary recognition. Therefore, when considering only these 14 HR practices, hypothesis 4 was accepted in that social cynicism predicted perceptions of the length of stay with an organization, such that lower scores on the belief dimension of social cynicism were associated with longer stays.

Hypothesis 5. Reward for application was predictive only of 4 HR practices: stock purchase plans, individual incentives, tuition reimbursement up to $2000, and empowering jobs. For those three HR practices hypothesis 5 was accepted in that reward for application predicted perceptions of the length of stay with an organization, such that higher levels of reward for application was associated with longer stays.

Hypothesis 6. In terms of hypothesis 6 that stated that spirituality would predict length of stay in an organization, such that higher levels of spirituality will be associated with longer stays, we reject this hypothesis. It seems that spirituality had no predictive power in terms of perceptions of length of stay in an organization. Thus, hypothesis 6 was rejected.

However, there were cultural dimensions such as social flexibility, interpersonal harmony, and fate control that weren’t initially hypothesized to have any predictive
power, but ended having predictive power. For 13 HR practices – compressed work week, health related benefits stock purchase plans, individual incentives, tuition reimbursement up to $2000, empowering jobs, RRSPs, ESPPs, life/disability insurance, profit sharing, retention bonus up to $10,000, continuing education, and non-monetary recognition – social flexibility was a significant predictor, such that higher levels of social flexibility were associated with expectations that an employee should stay a longer length of time in an organization. Interpersonal harmony had predictive power for 11 HR practices. For 8 of these HR practices – compressed work week, flextime, in-house training, family/medical leave, health related benefits, voluntary leave, community service leave – the predictive power was such that higher scores on interpersonal harmony were associated with perceptions that an employee should remain with an organization for longer lengths of time. For the remaining 3 HR practices – empowering jobs, continuous education, and individual incentives – the association was opposite in that higher scores of the interpersonal harmony dimension predicted perceptions of shorter stays in an organization. Another dimension that seemed to have predictive power was fate control. Fate control predicted only 2 HR practices – empowering jobs and job rotation – such that for empowering jobs higher levels of fate control predicted perceptions of shorter stays in an organization, while for job rotation higher levels of fate control predicted perceptions of longer stay in an organization. Spearman’s rho correlations for the SAS dimensions and the temporal aspect of normative commitment can be seen in table 5.

Hypothesis 7. This hypothesis postulates that cultural beliefs and cultural values together predict normative commitment better than each of these measures individually.
In order to test hypothesis 7, a new value was computed by dividing the model fit chi-square into its respective degrees of freedom (see Table 6). Next, independent sample t-tests were computed to compare between the cultural beliefs and the cultural beliefs and values together. The same was done to compare the cultural values and cultural beliefs and values together. In the comparison analysis between the cultural beliefs and the cultural belief and values together, a significant difference was found ($t=3.407$, $df=23.449$, $\alpha=0.002$). However, from the analysis comparing the cultural values and cultural beliefs and values together, no significant difference was found ($t=1.268$, $df=42$, $\alpha=0.212$). Thus, it can be concluded that hypothesis 7 was partially supported in that cultural values resulted in adding a new dimension when analyzing culture however, the newer, cultural beliefs questionnaire did not add to the analysis of culture in terms of the temporal aspect of normative commitment.

Importance of HR practices.

Table 7 shows the means and standard deviation of the scale measuring how important each HR practice was to this sample. These results show that health benefits, family/medical leave, life/disability insurance ($M=6.07$, $SD=1.45$; mean=$5.87$, $SD=1.39$; $M=5.71$, $SD=1.44$ respectively) among others are important to this generation. The least importance was given to voluntary and community service leave ($M=3.68$, $SD=1.86$; $M=3.93$, $SD=2.02$ respectively).
Table 5

Spearman's Rho correlations between SAS dimension and HR practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Practice</th>
<th>Social Cynicism</th>
<th>Reward for Application</th>
<th>Social Flexibility</th>
<th>Fate Control</th>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>I-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work week</td>
<td>-.370**</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>-.288**</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.310**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>-.282**</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>-.267**</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>-.286**</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.352**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Medical Leave</td>
<td>-.302**</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-.243*</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.368**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Leave</td>
<td>-.228**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>-.229*</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Leave</td>
<td>-.283**</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>-.193*</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.371**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRSPs</td>
<td>-.295**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>-.223**</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.321**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPP</td>
<td>-.185*</td>
<td>.208*</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>-.189*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life/Disability Insurance</td>
<td>-.262**</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>-.178*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.297**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Sharing Plans</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Incentives</td>
<td>-.179*</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Allowance</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Bonus up to $1000</td>
<td>-.195*</td>
<td>.163*</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.200*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement up to $2000</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.247**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Training</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Training</td>
<td>-.179*</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>-.211*</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Jobs</td>
<td>-.195*</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>-.210*</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary Recognition</td>
<td>-.237**</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>.193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation</td>
<td>-.331**</td>
<td>.180*</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>-.221**</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.250**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>-.280**</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.199*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p=0.05  
** p=0.01
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### Table 6

**Comparison of Cultural Beliefs, Cultural Values and Both Together**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Practices</th>
<th>Cultural Beliefs Only</th>
<th>Cultural Values Only</th>
<th>Cultural Beliefs and Values Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work week</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Medical Leave</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Leave</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRSPs</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee sponsored Pension Plans</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life/Disability Insurance Plans</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Sharing</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Purchase Plans</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Incentives</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Allowance</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Bonus up to $10000</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement up to $2000</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Training</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Training</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Jobs</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary Recognition</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR practices</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work week</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.0537</td>
<td>1.95485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.3356</td>
<td>1.71878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefits</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6.0738</td>
<td>1.45237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Medical Leave</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.8725</td>
<td>1.39637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Leave</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.6779</td>
<td>1.86094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Leave</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.9329</td>
<td>2.01905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRSPs</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.3423</td>
<td>1.57588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee sponsored Pension Plans</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.6980</td>
<td>1.45984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life/Disability Insurance Plans</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.7114</td>
<td>1.44398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Sharing</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.4027</td>
<td>1.50638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Purchase Plans</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.3221</td>
<td>1.80939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Incentives</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.7181</td>
<td>1.17451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Allowance</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.3356</td>
<td>1.54487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Bonus up to $10000</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.6711</td>
<td>1.30717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Reimbursement up to $2000</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.6510</td>
<td>1.29409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Training</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.6577</td>
<td>1.57159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Training</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.8523</td>
<td>1.60815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.5705</td>
<td>1.32162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Jobs</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.7315</td>
<td>1.91237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary Recognition</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.7517</td>
<td>1.73168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.0470</td>
<td>1.85391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Enrichment</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.5906</td>
<td>1.80844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed work week</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.0537</td>
<td>1.95485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the predictive power of cultural beliefs on the temporal aspect of normative commitment for generation Y. Only one hypothesis was fully supported by the findings of this study while the other hypotheses were partially supported or rejected. Nonetheless, the study yielded some interesting and often unexpected results. Of particular note are the findings that social flexibility is a predictor for many HR practices. The study’s specific results and their relationship to the literature will be discussed first. This will be followed by an examination of the broader implications of the findings in the context of the theoretical and empirical literature. Finally, limitations of the study and suggestions for future research will be presented.

Norm of reciprocity

The most striking finding in this study was the high response rate for the option “as long as the employee is able to take advantage of the HR practice” among the participants regardless of what HR practice they were presented with. Participants chose this answer option 32%-49% of the time, making this answer rank in as the most selected answer of all 7 options. This finding may be explained by making reference to the “psychological contracts theory.” When an employee and employer reach an agreement for the employee to begin employment in a workplace, the employee is offered HR practices, such as salary, benefits, etc. If the HR practice ceases to be offered, the employee can view the psychological contract as violated and then decide to leave the organization. Thus, generation Yers seem to believe that taking away an HR practice which was initially provided is a violation of the psychological contract and that they can cease to fulfill their part in the contract – staying with the organization.
Another finding that was interesting pertains to the fact that the second largest response rate after the “as long as…” response was 0-3 months for 14 of the HR practices: compressed work weeks, flextime, health related benefits, family/medical leave, voluntary leave, community service leave, RRSPs, life/disability insurance plans, in-house training, external training, empowering jobs, non-monetary recognition, job rotation, and job enrichment. It seems that if the participants didn’t think of the HR practices in terms of a psychological contract, they thought of it as being entitled to receive this HR practice as a part of the employment package with no need on their part to reciprocate. In other words, these HR practices are considered by this generation to be an integral part of their compensation package for joining the organization. These HR practices don’t represent an extra benefit that the organization can bargain with, but they are a natural part of the organization’s compensation just as the salary is. This entitlement to receive these HR practices without the employees needing to feel any sense of obligation to reciprocate by remaining with the organization for a longer period of time may have its roots in the education that this generation has received. In comparison to the previous generations, it seems that generation Y represents one of the most educated generations yet.

Many business textbooks today discuss these HR practices as contributing to higher productivity, better employee morale, and motivated employees (Robbins & Langton, 2003). So in this sample of students that are presently in school, these HR practices may be viewed as something that they are entitled to. Another reason these HR practices may seem to be an entitlement for this generation is that these HR practices have been offered to employees as part of their compensation package in the past. Young
people have seen their parents receiving these HR practices and thus, believe they are also entitled to them. Only recently, have organizations started refusing to provide many of these HR practices to their employees due to their increasing costs which these organizations can’t seem to afford. The 2003 Benefits Survey from the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), released at the society's annual conference in Orlando in June, finds slight declines in programs ranging from group life and long-term care to prepaid legal and child care assistance. This survey also found that although the percentage of employers offering workers flexible schedules rose last year to 64% from 59% in 2001, flextime dropped this year to 55%. Forty percent of 80 mid-sized and large companies surveyed by Deloitte & Touche LLP (D&T) said their pension expenses will rise by more than 50 percent in 2003 (Taub, 2003). The large increase is mostly due to funding shortfalls. More than four out of 10 companies are either making or considering making fundamental changes to their defined benefit plans, according to D&T. In fact, 12 percent have already decided on changes and 31 percent are evaluating possible alternatives, such as changing to cash-balance or profit-sharing plans, according to the survey (Taub, 2003). David Hilko, a benefits consultant at D&T stated that he believes that companies that change their pension plans solely because of stock-market volatility and the current higher expenses could be making a serious mistake. He believes that recruiting and retention strategies should drive benefits (Taub, 2003).

Cultural Beliefs.

In terms of cultural beliefs and their predictive power over perceptions of length of time an employee should remain with an organization offering HR practices, social cynicism, reward for application, and spirituality were hypothesized to be among them.
None of the SAS dimensions seemed to have predictive power over all 22 HR practices, but social cynicism predicted perceptions of length of time an employee should remain with an organization in return for the HR practice for 14 of the HR practices: compressed work week, flextime, health related benefits, family/medical leave, voluntary, leave, community service leave, stock purchase plans, in-house training, external training, job rotation, RRSPs, life/disability insurance, retention bonus, continuous education, and non-monetary benefits. Since people who score high on social cynicism express a negative view of people and mistrust social institutions (Leung et al., 2002), this finding is not too surprising. If one mistrusts institutions and organizations, then HR practices such as stock purchase plans, the various training HR practices, non-monetary benefits and so on seem to be benefiting the organization more than the employee. Thus, a person scoring high in cynicism would believe that these HR practices are meant to benefit organizations and not themselves, and may not feel any obligation to remain with an organization for a long length of time to reciprocate for something they don’t believe requires any reciprocation.

Reward for application was hypothesized to predict more HR practices than it actually did. The results in this study showed that reward for application was a significant predictor for only stock purchase plans, individual incentives, tuition reimbursement up to $2000, and empowering jobs. It seems that reward for application in terms of what HR practice would require reciprocation seems to relate to HR practices which involve direct gain of money and the empowering job. People who score high in reward for application, believe that effort will lead to pay-offs and that hard work leads to positive outcomes, and in turn promotes academic, occupational, or interpersonal achievement. It seems that in
terms of HR practices those payoffs are monetary or involve some type of recognition that manifests itself in empowering jobs.

Surprisingly, spirituality wasn’t a predictor of perceptions of the temporal aspect of normative commitment for any of the HR practices. It seems that although many religions have ethical guidelines that promote moral behaviour between individuals, these guidelines don’t seem to relate to the workplace in this generation’s minds. The sense of morality found in religious beliefs doesn’t seem to have any connection to the sense of morality that is expressed through the norm of reciprocity.

People with high interpersonal harmony scores are expressing beliefs that social harmony can bring about positive outcomes (e.g. providing happiness, a balanced life and protection from loneliness), that harmony in one aspect of life (e.g. family) has consequences in others (e.g. performance and success), and that certain patterns of behaviour can bring about harmony (e.g. honesty within intimate relationships, mutual respect and compromise within partnerships. Knowing all this, it is not surprising that those that scored high on interpersonal harmony seemed to expect that HR practices that pertain to work/life balance and family should entice employees to remain longer with the organization offering these HR practices. The dimension of interpersonal harmony was found to be a significant predictor for 11 HR practices of which 8 were positively correlated: compressed work week, flextime, family/medical leave, health related benefits, voluntary leave, community service leave, in-house training and 3 were negatively correlated: empowering jobs, continuous education, and individual incentives. Those that scored high on interpersonal harmony, believed that employees should stay longer with an organization offering HR practices pertaining to longer vacations, family
related benefits and in-house training that has the potential to help the organization and not only the individual. However, participants scoring high on interpersonal harmony did not consider empowering jobs, continuous education and individual incentives to be contributing factors that would entice an employee to remain with an organization for longer lengths of time.

Ellen Galinsky, president of the Families and Work Institute in New York, believes that Generation X and Generation Y workers are more likely than boomers to put family before jobs (Elias, 2004). She compared the institute's survey of 2,800 employed adults with comparable surveys it did in 1992 and 1997. The 1997 Department of Labor survey found an equality of the sexes as more accepting of working mothers, younger workers viewed "job success at any cost" as less appealing, children get more time with their parents than they did 25 years ago in two-parent homes, and fathers are doing more child care than they used to (Elias, 2004). Many young workers grew up in an era of rising divorce rates and corporate layoffs. They witnessed their parents giving work loyalty to their organizations and not receiving much in return from the organization. Thus, this study supports the finding that generation Yers would put their family above their job in terms of what is important. This would be especially true for people scoring high on interpersonal harmony because of the value they place on family and community living.

Another dimension that was not hypothesized to have any predictive power but resulted in acting as one of the predictors is social flexibility. People who score high on social flexibility believe that the social world is complex, and that there are many venues to solve problems. Previous studies found that the trait of openness to experience and the
belief in social complexity both reflect divergent thinking and cognitive complexity, with flexibility in dealing with issues or problems, different ways of handling tasks, and innovative and unconventional approaches to changes and challenges. This dimension was a significant predictor of these 13 HR practices: compressed work week, health related benefits, stock purchase plans, individual incentives, tuition reimbursement up to $2000, empowering jobs, RRSP, ESPP, life/disability insurance, profit sharing, retention bonuses up to $10,000, continuous education, and non-monetary benefits. The results show that those who score high on social flexibility also believe that when an employee receives these HR practices, they should stay longer with that organization. Since people who score high on social flexibility express openness to experience, they may feel that HR practices pertaining to monetary benefits and their continuing career are important enough to cause an employee to remain in an organization for longer lengths of time. Due to their complex thinking and their belief that there are multiple ways of achieving a goal, they may take advantage of continuing education if offered by an organization.

The last cultural dimension that made an appearance unexpectedly was fate control. Fate control has been associated with locus of control, which is a general belief about the causes of events, and has been related to how people make sense of their personal successes and failures (see, e.g., Spector, 1982). Leung and Bond (2004), found a negative correlation between scores on fate control and both life satisfaction and occupational satisfaction. This dimension predicted only two HR practices: empowering jobs and job rotation. Since persons that score high on fate control believe that outside forces control their lives, it makes intuitive sense that people scoring high on this dimension would not want jobs that are empowering because those jobs would represent
receiving more responsibilities without any control over the events that would ensue at work. However, no explanation exists as yet as to why people scoring high on fate control would remain longer in an organization offering job rotation. The researcher considers this finding an aberrant finding.

The finding concerning cultural values and cultural beliefs combined as being better predictors of the temporal aspect of normative commitment than each individually has yielded interesting results as well. To explain the reason why the a significant difference was found between cultural beliefs and the combination of cultural values and cultural beliefs, but not between cultural values and the combination of cultural values and beliefs necessitates a brief examination of the conceptual theory of each of the measurement tools. Cultural values in terms of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism are very closely related constructs. They form a closely knit relationship between two continuums. However, the cultural beliefs constructs are widely dispersed. The 6 dimensions can be viewed as 6 continuums that do not always overlap.

As research on social axioms is just beginning, there is no previous work to guide the development of theory-based explanations of the results achieved from testing the hypotheses about the linkage between these general beliefs and the concept of organizational commitment examined in this study. The SAS is a relatively new instrument, and developing such a scale with sufficient cross-cultural validity that it approaches a true rather than an imposed etic (as Leung, Bond and colleagues have done) is certainly a considerable achievement. In this study, the SAS demonstrates how different sets of beliefs can predict the temporal aspect of normative commitment.
Importance of HR Practices to Generation Y

In terms of importance of these HR practices to Generation Y, health benefits, family/medical leave, and life/disability insurance were rated as the most important HR practices for this generation. However, if looking at the findings that show how long an employee should remain with an organization, we notice that although some HR practices are more important than others, they were all accepted as almost equal if they are offered at the beginning of the employment. If these HR practices are offered at the beginning of the employment, and later taken away, most participants believed they have the green light to leave that organization. More so, the second largest percentage of participants stated that they'd stay 0-3 months if given these HR practices. Thus, this generation may value these HR practices, but don’t perceive these HR practices as valuable enough to remain in an organization for a longer time.

Conclusion

Results in this study have shown that culture in the form of cultural beliefs does have an effect on normative commitment. As for the reciprocity norm, the results have shown that it has a significant influence on normative commitment, not in its original form (Gouldner, 1960) but in its more modern form of a psychological contract. Results have shown that this generation values most of these HR practices but that all HR practices are viewed as equal in the face of a psychological contract. If the organization thinks of offering an HR practice to the employees of generation Y, that organization needs to keep offering that HR practice if they want to keep their employer committed to the organization and in the organization.
Limitations

Although all possible ways to minimize the limitations of this study were addressed, there are a few that couldn't have been prevented. This study was conducted entirely using university students. Thus, interpreting the results as applying to the broader population of generation Y would be premature. The sample of this study was not random as well so any biases that apply to non-random samples apply to this study as well. The final drawback is that the dependent variable was ordinal, causing the analysis to be non-parametric. In the future it would be better to use continuous variables.

Future Research Directions

This study was exploratory in nature and relied on very little literature. It is important to continue this line of research especially concerning the subject of normative commitment, and its antecedents. Normative commitment is the least researched form of organizational commitment and numerous calls have been made in the past to perform research with this construct. This study, although contributing to the further understanding of normative commitment, still leaves a lot to be researched in this area.

Another area that may be highlighted by this paper concerns the temporal aspect of organizational commitment. If normative commitment, as evidenced from this study, has a temporal aspect to it, then so might the other constructs of organizational commitment: continuance commitment and affective commitment. Further research discovering this temporal aspect of organizational commitment is still needed. As well, as mentioned above, this study has only used university students from one university. A
larger sample is needed if these results are to be generalized to the whole generation Y population.

Comparison analysis with other generations is also needed. One suggestion is to compare the two future workforces, generation X and generation Y, in terms of organizational commitment. Moreover, very little research exists in the literature pertaining to generation Y. More research is needed since this generation is starting to enter the workforce and not much is known about them. Most literature predicts that this generation is very different than the baby-boomers and even from generation X. Thus, knowing how to cater to this generation in the workplace is very important and can have many implications for the organization as a whole. As well, longitudinal studies would also be beneficial to understand who generation Y is. Specifically, by conducting longitudinal studies, one can better understand whether the findings of this paper were a result of cohort effect or just the developmental stages each human being goes through.
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Appendix A

Social Axiom Survey (SAS)

Please read the following statements and indicate the extent to which you believe or disbelieve (1 = strongly disbelieve; 7 = strongly believe).

1 = Strongly Disbelieve
2 = Disbelieve
3 = Somewhat Disbelieve
4 = Neither Agree nor Disbelieve (undecided)
5 = Somewhat Believe
6 = Believe
7 = Strongly Believe

1. Religious faith contributes to good mental health.

2. Caution helps avoid mistakes.

3. Good luck follows if one survives a disaster.

4. Human behavior changes with the social context.

5. Religion makes people escape from reality.

6. If the two parties in an intimate relationship are open and honest with each other, the relationship will be better and last longer.

7. People may have opposite behaviors on different occasions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>not</th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>believe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>One's appearance does not reflect one's character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Fate determines one's successes and failures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A pleasant interpersonal environment and a sense of well-being lead to better performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Religious people are more likely to maintain moral standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ghosts or spirits are people's fantasy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Individual effort makes little difference in the outcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>There is a supreme being controlling the universe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Life without love is flat and insipid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieve</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>One who does not know how to plan his or her future will eventually fail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. There are phenomena in the world that cannot be explained by science.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

18. Art is a compensation for the dismal features of everyday life.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

19. Knowledge is necessary for success.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

20. Young people are impulsive and unreliable.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

21. Too much money ruins one's character

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

22. It is rare to see a happy ending in real life.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

23. Mutual tolerance can lead to satisfactory human relationships.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

24. Individual characteristics, such as appearance and birthday, affect one's fate.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

25. People behave differently although they do not differ in essence.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly not strongly
26. Females need a better appearance than males.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

27. Adversity can be overcome by effort.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

28. Every problem has a solution.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

29. Honesty is a prerequisite for a happy life.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

30. One has to deal with matters according to the specific circumstances.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

31. Competition brings about progress.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

32. There is usually only one way to solve a problem.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

33. Tranquility and serenity lead to a contented existence.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
disbelieve  sure  believe

34. Most disasters can be predicted.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly  not  strongly
35. To deal with things in a flexible way leads to success.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

36. Old people are usually stubborn and biased.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

37. An intimate relationship is an important foundation for a balanced life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

38. A person's talents are inborn.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

39. Good deeds will be rewarded, and bad deeds will be punished.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

40. One's behaviors may be contrary to his or her true feelings.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

41. A family provides security and protection against loneliness.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

42. There are certain ways to help us improve our luck and avoid unlucky things.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve

43. One will succeed if he/she really tries.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly 
not believe sure believe
disbelieve
44. Failure is the beginning of success.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

45. True partnership can only exist when there is mutual respect.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

46. Humility is dishonesty.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

47. To experience various life styles is a way to enjoy life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

48. Religious beliefs lead to unscientific thinking.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

49. One feels safer in the world through a belief in a supreme being.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

50. Social justice can be maintained if everyone cares about politics.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

51. Current losses are not necessarily bad for one's long-term future.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

52. To plan for possible mistakes will result in fewer obstacles.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

53. Power and status make people arrogant.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

54. It is hard to make friends with people who have different opinions from yourself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

55. All things in the universe have been determined.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

56. Powerful people tend to exploit others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

57. People will stop working hard after they secure a comfortable life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

58. A harmonious family life leads to career success.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

59. The various social institutions in society are biased towards the rich.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

60. Belief in a religion helps one understand the meaning of life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

61. A good relationship requires compromises from both sides.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>62.</th>
<th>It is easier to succeed if one knows how to take short-cuts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>63.</th>
<th>After life on earth, one carries on an existence in another form.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64.</th>
<th>Kind-hearted people are easily bullied.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65.</th>
<th>Acting according to principles prevents the need to make troublesome decisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>66.</th>
<th>Old people are a heavy burden on society.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>67.</th>
<th>If one is purely egoistic, then it will be impossible to develop good relationships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>68.</th>
<th>The just will eventually defeat the wicked.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>69.</th>
<th>To identify a problem, open criticism is important.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70.</th>
<th>A modest person can make a good impression on people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="strongly_disbelieve" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
<td><img src="not" alt="Likert Scale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
71. Belief in a religion makes people good citizens.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

72. One will not accomplish much if one does not put any effort into the important things in life.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

73. People deeply in love are usually blind.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

74. Rashly partitioning other people into social groups leads to prejudice and tension.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

75. Kind-hearted people usually suffer losses.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

76. To care about societal affairs only brings trouble for yourself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

77. There are many ways for people to predict what will happen in the future.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

78. Hard working people will achieve more in the end.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
strongly not strongly
disbelieve sure believe

79. Significant achievement requires one to show no concern for the means needed for that achievement.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disbelieve</th>
<th>not sure</th>
<th>strongly believe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

80. If one belongs to a marginal group, it is difficult to gain acceptance from the majority group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disbelieve</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly believe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81. Harsh laws can make people obey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disbelieve</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly believe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. Most people hope to be repaid after they help others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disbelieve</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly believe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Individualism / Collectivism Scale

Please read the following statements and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Somewhat Disagree  
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree (undecided)  
5 = Somewhat Agree  
6 = Agree  
7 = Strongly Agree

1. I often do "my own thing."

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The well being of my coworkers is important to me.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. One should live one's life independently of others.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Competition is the law of nature.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. If a co-worker gets a prize, I would feel proud.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

8. I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

9. I like my privacy.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

10. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

11. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

12. Before making a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

13. I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with people.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

14. Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]

15. It is important to maintain harmony within my group.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\text{strongly disagree} & \text{not sure} & \text{sure} & \text{agree} \\
\end{array}
\]
16. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I am a unique individual.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Winning is everything.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I like sharing little things with my neighbours.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. What happens to me is my own doing.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. It is important that I do my job better than others.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I feel good when I cooperate with others.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I hate to disagree with others in my group.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

26. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

27. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

28. We should keep our aging parents with us at home.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

29. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

30. Some people emphasize winning; I’m not one of them.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

31. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree

32. Children should feel honoured if their parents receive a distinguished award.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
strongly disagree not sure strongly agree
Appendix C

Human Resource Practices Questionnaire (HRPQ)

For the following questions, please circle the correct answer or write the correct answer in the allotted space. In order to keep your answers confidential, do not write your name on the questionnaire.

1) Compressed work weeks are work schedules in which 40 hours are worked in less than the traditional 5-day work week.

How important would compressed work weeks be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides compressed work weeks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Greatly obligated</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If an organization offers compressed work weeks, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the compressed work weeks.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers compressed work weeks, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) Flextime Work Schedule is a work schedule that allows employees to choose their own work hours.

How important would flextime be to you if you were looking for a job?
To what extent should *an employee* be obligated to remain with an organization that provides flextime?

Not at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Greatly obligated

If an organization offers flextime, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of flextime.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers flextime, should it affect how much effort *an employee* puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

More Effort

3) Health related benefits include prescription drugs, dental coverage, vision plan, paramedical services, out of province/country health care

How important would health related benefits be to *you* if you were looking for a job?

Not at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very important

To what extent should *an employee* be obligated to remain with an organization that provides health related benefits?

Not at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Greatly obligated

If an organization offers health related benefits, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the health related benefits.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers health related benefits, should it affect how much effort *an employee* puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort

More Effort

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4) During Family and Medical Leave, an employee may take a period of leave for personal health reasons, for medical care of a family member, or for birth, adoption or foster care placement.

How important would family and medical leave be *to you* if you were looking for a job?

Not at all

Very important

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

To what extent should *an employee* be obligated to remain with an organization that provides family and medical leave?

Not at all

Greatly obligated

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If an organization offers family and medical leave, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the family and medical leave.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers family and medical leave, should it affect how much effort *an employee* puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort

More Effort

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5) Voluntary Shared Leave allows one employee to assist another employee in case of a prolonged medical condition that exhausts the employee's available leave and forces the employee to be placed in leave without pay status. This employee will be able to donate vacation or bonus leave.
How important would voluntary shared leave be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very important | 7

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides voluntary shared leave?

Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Greatly obligated | 7

If an organization offers voluntary shared leave, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the voluntary shared leave.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers voluntary shared leave, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | More Effort | 7

6) Community Service Leave allows an employee to receive paid leave for participation in community service activities for non-profit organizations, for attendance at school-related programs for the employee's dependents (excluding athletics), or for participation in a weekly mentoring program with a school. Activities often take place during the employee's regular work schedule to qualify.

How important would community service leave be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very important | 7

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides community service leave?

Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Greatly obligated | 7
If an organization offers community service leave, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the community service leave.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers community service leave, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Group RRSPs are a collection of individual registered retirement savings plans established and maintained by an employer in order to help employees save for retirement. Each RRSP within the group is owned entirely by the employee.

How important would Group RRSPs be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides Group RRSPs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly obligated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an organization offers Group RRSPs, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the Group RRSPs.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years
If an organization offers Group RRSPs, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) How important would Employer Sponsored Pension Plans be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides employer sponsored pension plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Greatly obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an organization offers employer sponsored pension plans, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the employer sponsored pension plans.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers employer sponsored pension plans, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) How important would Life and Disability Insurance plans be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides life and disability insurance plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Greatly obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an organization offers life and disability insurance plans, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of life and disability insurance plans.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers life and disability insurance plans, should it affect how much effort *an employee* puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Profit sharing programs provide employees with a percentage of the profits above a certain amount the organization earns in addition to their base salary.

How important would profit sharing programs be *to you* if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should *an employee* be obligated to remain with an organization that provides profit sharing programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly obligated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an organization offers profit sharing programs, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the profit sharing programs.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years
If an organization offers profit sharing programs, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) How important would stock purchase plans be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides stock purchase plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Greatly obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an organization offers stock purchase plans, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the stock purchase plans.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers stock purchase plans, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) How important would individual incentives such as bonuses, merit pay, etc. be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides individual incentives such as bonuses, merit pay, etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Greatly obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an organization offers individual incentives such as bonuses, merit pay, etc., how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the individual incentives.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers individual incentives, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

More Effort

13) Relocation Allowances assist new employees to move to within a reasonable traveling distance when taking up a new job with an organization

How important would relocation allowances be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Very important

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides relocation allowances?

Not at all

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Greatly obligated

If an organization offers relocation allowances, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the relocation allowance.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers relocation allowances, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

More Effort
14) How important would retention bonuses of up to $10,000 be to you if you were looking for a job?

| Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very important | 7 |

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides retention bonuses of up to $10,000?

| Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Greatly obligated | 7 |

If an organization offers retention bonuses of up to $10,000, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the retention bonuses.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers retention bonuses of up to $10,000, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

| Less Effort | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | More Effort | 7 |

15) How important would tuition reimbursement of up to $2000 per year be to you if you were looking for a job?

| Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very important | 7 |

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides tuition reimbursement of up to $2000 per year?

| Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Greatly obligated | 7 |

If an organization offers tuition reimbursement of up to $2000 per year, how long should an employee stay with the organization?
1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the tuition reimbursement.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers tuition reimbursement of up to $2000 per year, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) In-house training programs are programs that involve: “job shadowing” where one person shows another all the aspects of a particular job, “coaching” which involves regular reviews of an employee's progress and is typically carried out by line managers who advise employees on how to improve their performance, mentoring, “passing on training” which involves one employee going on external training and returning to pass on their knowledge to other employees, and E-learning programs.

How important would in-house training be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all Very important

| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides in-house training?

Not at all Greatly obligated

| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

If an organization offers in-house training, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the in-house training.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers in-house training, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort More Effort
17) External Training Programs include training activities such as: seminars, workshops and conferences, technical and non-technical training, review courses in preparation for a professional exam.

How important would external training programs be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all Very important
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides external training programs?

Not at all Greatly obligated
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

If an organization offers external training programs, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the external training programs.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers external training programs, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort More Effort
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

18) How important would continuing education activities that maintain certifications or licenses be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all Very important
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides continuing education activities that maintain certifications or licenses?
If an organization offers continuing education activities that maintain certifications or licenses, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the continuing education activities
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers continuing education activities, should it affect how much effort *an employee* puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort  More Effort

How important would empowering jobs be *to you* if you were looking for a job?

Not at all Very important

To what extent should *an employee* be obligated to remain with an organization that provides empowering jobs?

Not at all Greatly obligated

If an organization offers empowering jobs, how long should *an employee* stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the empowering job.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers empowering jobs, should it affect how much effort *an employee* puts towards his/her job?
20) Non-monetary recognition includes benefits such as extended vacation, tickets to various sports games and shows, organizational ceremonies, etc.

How important would non-monetary recognition be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides non-monetary recognition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly obligated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an organization offers non-monetary recognition, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of the non-monetary recognition.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers non-monetary recognition, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21) Job Rotation is a system in which employees are given the opportunity to perform several different jobs in an organization.

How important would job rotation be to you if you were looking for a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides job rotation?
If an organization offers job rotation, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of job rotation.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers job rotation, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?

Less Effort

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

More Effort

22) Job Enrichment is a system in which employees are given more responsibility over the tasks and decisions related to their job.

How important would job enrichment be to you if you were looking for a job?

Not at all

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Very important

To what extent should an employee be obligated to remain with an organization that provides job enrichment?

Not at all

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Greatly obligated

If an organization offers job enrichment, how long should an employee stay with the organization?

1. As long as the employee is able to take advantage of job enrichment.
2. 0 - 3 months
3. 4 - 6 months
4. 7 months - 1 year
5. 1 - 3 years
6. 4 - 7 years
7. more than 7 years

If an organization offers job enrichment, should it affect how much effort an employee puts towards his/her job?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Effort</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>More Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Appendix D

Demographic Questionnaire

Instructions: For the purpose of demographic information for this study, please answer the following questions about yourself. In order to keep your answers confidential, do not write your name on the questionnaire.

1. Your age: _____

2. Gender: a. Male ___ b. Female ___

3. Year in University: _____

4. Your Current Accumulative Grade Point Average: _____

5. Your Place of Birth:
   ___ a. born in Canada
   ___ b. born outside of Canada; if so please answer the following:
   Name of the country in which you were born
   ____________________________.
   How old were you when you came to Canada? _____

6. Your Immigration Status:
   ___ a. Canadian Citizen
   ___ b. Landed Immigrant
   ___ c. Student Visa
   ___ d. Visitor’s Visa

7. What countries have you lived in? ____________________________
   And for how long? ____________________________
   ____________________________

8. Are you fluent in at least one other language besides English? Yes ___ No ___
   If yes, what other language(s), other than English, do you speak? ____________________________

9. What language do you speak at home with your family?
   ____________________________

10. What is your generation status in Canada?
    ___ a. 1st generation (born outside of Canada and immigrated to Canada before the age of 12)
    ___ b. 1.5 generation (born outside of Canada and immigrated to Canada after the age
c. 2nd generation (born in Canada and have at least one parent who was born outside of Canada)

d. 3rd generation (born in Canada and have at least one parent who was born in Canada)

e. beyond 3rd or later generation

f. I am an international student who was born outside of Canada

11. What is the highest level of your father’s education?

a. Elementary School Education

b. High School Diploma

c. Bachelor’s Degree or College Diploma

d. Master’s Degree

e. Doctoral Degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., J.D.)

12. What is the highest level of your mother’s education?

a. Elementary School Education

b. High School Diploma

c. Bachelor’s Degree or College Diploma

d. Master’s Degree

e. Doctoral Degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., J.D.)

13. What type of work does your father do (occupation)?

14. What type of work does your mother do (occupation)?

15. How would you describe approximately your family’s income level? For dual income families the incomes are combined.

a. (14,999 and below)

b. (15,000 – 44,999)

c. (45,000–74,999)

d. (75,000–104,999)

e. (105,000–134,999)

f. (135,000 and above)

16. Do you currently work? Yes No

17. Current employment status:

Full-time

Part-time

Casual

N/A
18. Current employment type:
   ___ Clerical
   ___ Labourer
   ___ Professional
   ___ Owner / Manager
   ___ Self-employment
   ___ Unemployed

19. Length of employment from on-start to present: _______________________

20. Did you previously have a job (if currently employed then answer in regards to
    the job you had before the current one)? Yes        No

21. Previous employment status:
   ___ Full-time
   ___ Part-time
   ___ Casual
   ___ N/A

22. Previous employment type:
   ___ Clerical
   ___ Labourer
   ___ Professional
   ___ Owner / Manager
   ___ Self-employment
   ___ Unemployed

23. Length of previous employment: _________________________
Title of Study: The Effects of the Reciprocity Norm and Culture on Normative Commitment for Generation Y

Thank you for taking interest in our study. You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Neli Remo and Dr. Catherine Kwantes, from the Department of Psychology at the University of Windsor. This study is Neli Remo’s Master’s Thesis Project, fulfilling a part of the requirements for the Master’s Program in Applied Social Psychology.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Neli Remo (student investigator) at (519) 253-3000 ext. 2212, remo@uwindsor.ca, or Dr. Catherine Kwantes (faculty supervisor), (519) 253-3000 ext. 2242, ckwantes@uwindsor.ca.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

We are interested in examining generation Yers’ (people born after 1981) commitment in the workplace. The purpose of this study is to explore the factors that influence the working relationship between organizations and employees. We hope to accomplish this by surveying you about your cultural beliefs and values, and how you feel about the time commitment you dedicate to an organization.

PROCEDURES

If you choose to participate in this study, I would ask you to complete three questionnaires pertaining to your cultural affiliation and perceptions regarding commitment in the workplace. Completing the questionnaires will take about 45 minutes. After completing the questionnaires, you will be provided with a short description of the study, and a form explaining the study.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There will be no risks, discomforts or inconveniences when you participate in this project.
POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

This study will provide you the opportunity to participate in a psychology experiment and to learn how these studies are conducted. This study may also benefit you by increasing awareness of the impact of your generation on the workplace.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You will receive two marks to be added to your final mark in a psychology course of your choice.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. All surveys will remain confidential and no identifying information will be released except with your permission. Your responses on the questionnaires will not be associated with your name. Surveys will be stored in a secure location accessible only to the researchers directly involved in the study. As well, any forms containing personal information, such as this consent form, will be stored in a place that is secured and apart from the questionnaires. If a report of this study is sent to a scientific journal, all information will be presented in a way that protects your confidentiality. For example, information included will reflect group information, and any identifying information will be modified or removed. Following the guidelines of the Canadian and American Psychological Associations, data will be retained for a period of 5 years after which time it will be disposed of in a secure manner.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to participate in this project or not. If you chose to participate in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. You also have the option to remove your data from the study should you decide to do so. The investigators may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Upon completion of the research, a brief report explaining the findings from this study will be made available to those interested as of October 2006. These reports will be available by sending an e-mail request to the researcher or by viewing the posted
summary of the results of the study on the REB Study Results website: www.uwindsor.ca/reb. The information available in this report will include only group results.

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data may be used in subsequent studies comparing other generations or cultures on perceptions of organizational commitment.

Do you give consent for the subsequent use of the data from this study?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916; e-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study “The Effects of the Reciprocity Norm and Culture on Normative Commitment for Generation Y” as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

__________________________________________
Name of Subject

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Subject  Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature of Investigator  Date
Appendix F

Explanation of the Study

You have just completed participating in a study examining the effects of the reciprocity norm and culture on normative commitment. When examining diversity, most researchers look at cultural or gender aspects of diversity. However, generational expectations are yet another type of diversity that is rarely examined, although it should be researched more often. The results of this study have the potential of improving the benefits the next generation of employees receive from the organization they work in. You have been presented with a series of HR practices and your answers will help the researcher examine your perceptions of a fair exchange between employees and the organization. Specifically, this study examines which cultural factors and the HR practices best predict length of stay in an organization for generation Y.

The information you provided is greatly appreciated by the researchers. Upon completion of the research, a brief report explaining the findings from this study will be made available to those interested. These reports will be available by sending an e-mail request to the researcher to this e-mail address: remo@uwindsor.ca. The information available in this report will include only group results. In addition, the results can be found in the Psychology Office.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study.

Neli Remo
Student Investigator
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
Phone: (519) 253-3000 Ex. 2212

Dr. Catherine Kwantes,
Faculty Investigator
Department of Psychology
University of Windsor
Phone: (519) 253-3000 Ex. 2242
VITA ACTORIS

Neli Remo was born on April 1, 1977 in Bucharest, Romania. She graduated from the University of Regina with an Honours Bachelor of Arts in Psychology in 2003. She is currently enrolled in the Doctoral Program in Applied Social Psychology at the University of Windsor.