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ABSTRACT

Doing research in China requires the awareness of the Chinese indigenous construct of guanxi. In measuring guanxi, researchers can take different approaches. In order to highlight the significance of adopting either the particularistic ties approach of Farh et al (1998) or the differential behaviours approach of Wong et al (2003), we used both measures in a correlation analysis in a mainland Chinese setting. The study demonstrates that these different approaches to measuring guanxi produce very different research outcomes, and highlights the need for researchers to be aware of how they measure guanxi.
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In 1978 the implementation of China’s so called “Open Door Policy” for foreign trade and investment (Boisot & Child 1996; Fairbank & Reischauer 1989) triggered a flurry of interest among scientists who were keen to become involved in a wealth of new research possibilities (Smith, Wang & Leung 1997; Wang & Takao 1994). But China has its own particular cultural characteristics that researchers need to take into account before proceeding with their studies. One of the most important concepts is that of guanxi, a system of interpersonal relationships involving mutual indebtedness and favour exchange (Alston 1989; Bond & Hwang 1986; Chen & Tjosvold 2007; Farh, Tsui, Xin & Cheng 1998). Guanxi has been operationalised in several ways (Farh et al 1998; Law, Wong, Wang & Wang 2000; Wong, Tinsley, Law & Mobley 2003), but when different measurement scales have been based on different approaches toward guanxi itself, divergent and conflicting research outcomes can result. This study attempts to shed light on the importance of choosing the most appropriate guanxi measure by applying and comparing two different guanxi measures against a Chinese backdrop.

The indigenous Chinese concept of guanxi does not have a direct Western equivalent, but can be loosely translated as relationships. However, “relationship” does not capture its essential element, and that is, the set of interpersonal connections that facilitate exchange of favours between two people (Hwang 1987; Smith et al 1997; Xin & Pearce 1996; Yeung & Tung 1996; Zhang & Zhang 2006). Guanxi arose in Chinese society as a result of the strong influence of Confucian ethics which formed the basis of the education system for officials during the Han Dynasty, and which developed into the official state philosophy (Fairbank & Reischauer 1989). The influence of the Confucian code of ethics has endured to the present day, with guanxi maintaining its important and pervasive role in all aspects of Chinese society (Alston 1989; King 1991; Tsui & Farh 1997; Walder 1983). Confucian philosophy
rests on the assumption that man exists, not as an individual, but through his relationships to others (Bond & Hwang 1986). These relationships are structured hierarchically, with people adopting multiple standards of behaviour for interactions with different people (Hwang 1987). Social order and the harmony of relationships come about through each party honouring his or her role requirements (Bond & Hwang 1986). Guanxi has arisen from this hierarchical structure because the prescribed roles of all relationships create obligations that the social norms dictate must be met (Chang & Holt 1991; Farh et al. 1998; Redding & Wong 1986). These standards of behaviour apply in all settings, but they are of particular significance in the business context, where guanxi plays a vital role (Luo 1997; Vanhonacker 2004; Wall 1990; Warren, Dunfee & Li 2004; Wood, Whiteley & Zhang 2002).

Guanxi has been examined as a system of relationships based on particularistic ties (Farh et al. 1998; Tsui & Farh 1997) whereby the existence of a guanxi base depends on whether or not two persons have a commonality of shared identification, either ascribed, such as family or hometown, or involving shared experience, such as place of work (Jacobs 1979; Tsui & Farh 1997). Farh et al. (1998) operationalised guanxi as the existence or not of eight particularistic ties, thus treating guanxi as a fixed attribute. However, the mere existence of a guanxi base does not in itself ensure that two persons will share a strong relationship. Having a shared base of, say, the same home town, does not necessarily mean that two persons have guanxi, rather it means that those two people have a shared base from which guanxi may develop (Bian & Ang 1997; Zhang & Zhang 2006). So a guanxi measure that indicates only the presence or absence of a particularistic tie does not capture the full extent or quality of a relationship. For guanxi to become “close”, two dynamic norms of behaviour must operate: (1) social interaction and (2) utilization and helping (Hwang 1987; Jacobs 1979; Wong CS et al 2003). Social interaction, such as greetings, visits, dinners, exchanging gifts, is essential to both the development and the maintenance of close guanxi, while helping behaviours are the expected actions that one will undertake when a guanxi partner is in need. These exchanges, which are regarded as ethical and meaningful in Chinese societies (Han & Altman 2009), create reciprocal obligations that have no time limit, and consequently, people become bonded over long periods of time (Alston 1989). It is the socially dictated behaviours of the people involved in a guanxi relationship that indicate the strength of that relationship.
Hwang (1987) has classified the strength of guanxi relationships in terms of the nature and purpose of interactions, this classification resulting in three categories. Socio-affective guanxi refers to family relationships where social interactions satisfy the need for belonging and emotional attachment (Chen & Chen 2004; Hwang 1987; Leung, Heung & Wong 2008). Instrumental guanxi refers to the relationship between strangers where there is no expectation of affection but rather an expectation of objective and fair exchanges similar to those occurring between buyers and sellers (Chen & Chen 2004; Hwang 1987; Leung et al 2008). Mixed guanxi, common among co-workers, involves both material exchanges and those of affection (Hwang 1987; Fu, Tsui & Dess 2006). For example, affective exchanges between co-workers may be playing sport together or having dinner parties, while instrumental exchanges may be helping a colleague solve a work problem or cooperating at work (Chang & Holt 1991). In order to take this process view of guanxi, researchers have developed measures of guanxi that take into account specific behaviours that demonstrate the degree of closeness of a guanxi relationship (Chen & Peng 2008; Law et al 2000; Wong CS et al 2003).

Several studies have investigated the relationship of guanxi with various organisational outcomes. Farh et al (1998) found positive connections between guanxi and the work outcomes of trust, communication frequency and favourable evaluations in Mainland China and Taiwan, while Xin et al (1996) found guanxi to be positively related to leader member exchange and organisational commitment by subordinates in Mainland China and Taiwan. Chou, Cheng, Huang and Chen (2006) found guanxi to be significantly related to Chinese work team effectiveness in Taiwan, while Cheung, Wu, Chan and Wong (2009) found guanxi between supervisors and subordinates to be positively associated with job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and negatively associated with job turnover. Loyalty and commitment to a supervisor have been found to be significant factors among those who have guanxi, and this is reflected in extra effort and favourable work evaluations (Chen, Tsui & Farh 2002; Tsui & Farh 1997). Additional studies have found that commitment to supervisors has a direct effect on organisational commitment (Wong 2001), and that loyalty to supervisors is more important than organisational commitment in explaining turnover intention and job satisfaction (Chen 2001; Chen et al 2002). Further empirical results of Wong, Ngo and Wong (2003) show a positive
relationship between guanxi and subordinates’ trust in their supervisor and their organisational citizenship behaviour.

However, despite several studies finding positive organisational outcomes associated with guanxi, other work shows inconclusive findings. For example, Farh et al (1998) did not find any significant relationship between guanxi and organisational commitment and turnover intention. In Farh et al’s (1998) study, guanxi was treated as a dichotomized variable of the existence or not of eight particularistic ties: former classmate, relative, same family name, same province, former colleague, former teacher/student, former supervisor/subordinate, and former neighbour. However, since guanxi involves the development of interpersonal relationships for the exchange of material and emotional benefits (Bian & Ang 1997; Wong YT et al 2003), a guanxi measure that only takes particularistic ties into account will not help our understanding of how guanxi develops. This development of connections is referred to as “la guanxi” or “pull guanxi” (Ambler 1995; Chang & Holt 1991; Chen & Chen 2004; Wong CS et al 2003), and it is the behaviours and actions involved in this process that determine the existence and strength of guanxi (Bian & Ang 1997; Chen & Peng 2008; Wong CS et al 2003).

In order to highlight the significance of adopting either the particularistic ties approach of Farh et al (1998) or the differential behaviours approach of Wong CS et al (2003), we applied a correlation analysis to a study that used both measures in a mainland Chinese setting. We selected four other variables for our study: affective commitment; job satisfaction; turnover intention; and leader member exchange. Affective commitment is the degree of employees’ emotional attachment to, and identification with the organisation (Meyer & Allen 1991), and is considered to be of significance in China due to the importance of relationships and the special role of ‘harmony and loyalty’ in that culture (Bond & Hwang 1986; Warner & Zhu 2002). Job satisfaction refers to a person’s pleasurable emotional state that arises from the appraisal of one’s job (Cheung et al 2009), and has been found to have a positive association with guanxi (Cheung et al 2009). Turnover intention is the conscious and deliberate plan to leave the organisation (Tett & Meyer 1993), and is the strongest and most consistent predictor of actual turnover (Chen, Hui & Sego 1998; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand & Meglino 1979). Cheung et al (2009) found that those who had good guanxi with their superiors were more likely to
stay with the organisation. Leader member exchange (LMX) is the quality of the relationship that a superior and subordinate develop (Dienesch & Liden 1986). Both LMX and guanxi refer to relationships, but the two are theoretically distinct (Law et al 2000). LMX refers to the quality of the working relationship, whereas guanxi refers to all types of interpersonal relationships and is concerned with both social and economic exchanges. Nevertheless, since both concepts are those of relationships, it is reasonable to expect that one will be associated with the other, and this was indeed the finding of Wong CS et al’s (2003) study which found that guanxi was a critical variable in predicting work relationships such as LMX. In view of these studies which have found relationships between guanxi and the variables of affective commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intention and leader member exchange, we set out to discover how those associations may vary according to which measure of guanxi is used.

METHODS

Sample and Procedure

We collected data from five private manufacturing enterprises located in the Jiangmen economic zone of the Pearl River Delta region of China in September 2007. All of the companies manufacture and assemble parts for motor cycles and cars, with one company also assembling complete motor cycles. Survey data was collected on site during working hours. Following Brislin’s (1986) recommendations, all questionnaire items were translated into Chinese, using the simplified Chinese characters that are used in mainland China, and then back-translated to ensure consistency of meaning.

We collected data from 380 subordinates and 38 of their supervisors. From organisation one, 40 subordinates and 4 supervisors answered the questionnaire. In each of organisations two, three and four, 50 subordinates and 5 supervisors completed the survey, and from organisation five, 190 subordinates and 19 supervisors completed the survey. All respondents were full time workers in their organisations. Because of missing data, the sample size was reduced to 374.

In terms of demographic characteristics, 2.6% of supervisors had completed primary school, 26.3% had completed middle school, 31.6% had completed high school, and 15.8% had completed 3 years of tertiary college, with the remaining 23.7% declining to report their level of education. The average age of supervisors was 31.17 years. The gender division of supervisors was 52.6% male and 23.7% female,
the remaining 23.7% declining to state their gender. Average supervisors’ organisational tenure was 4.63 years.

Among subordinates, 5.5% had completed primary school, 41.3% had completed middle school, 46.6% had completed high school, and 3.9% had completed 3 years of tertiary college, with the remaining 2.6% declining to report their level of education. The average age of subordinates was 25.37 years. The gender division of subordinates was 60.5% male and 39% female, with 0.8% not reporting their gender. Average subordinates’ organisational tenure was 2.09 years, while the subordinates’ average tenure with their current supervisors was 1.45 years.

Measures

Guanxi (particularistic ties approach)

In all organisations, both supervisors and subordinates completed questions on two measures of guanxi. The first measure was that developed by Farh et al (1998), whereby subordinates were asked to indicate the presence or absence, using a yes/no response format, of 8 particularistic ties (former classmate; relative; same family name; same province; former colleague; former teacher/student; former supervisor/subordinate; former neighbour) between themselves and their supervisors. Supervisors were asked parallel questions concerning themselves and their subordinates. Following the procedure of Farh et al (1998), when both supervisor and subordinate reported the presence of a tie between them, we recorded 1 for the presence of guanxi. When both supervisor and subordinate reported the absence of a tie between them, we recorded 0 for the absence of guanxi. When there was no agreement as to the presence or absence of a particularistic tie, we recorded 0 to indicate an absence of guanxi.

Guanxi (differential behaviours approach)

The second measure of guanxi was the 15-item scale measure of guanxi developed by Wong CS et al (2003), which is a multidimensional measure that takes into account differential behaviours that are appropriate for people with different degrees of guanxi closeness. Responses were made on a five point Likert scale (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely). The five behaviour categories are social activities, financial assistance, giving priority to a person, celebrating special events, and emotional support. Example items are: ‘I play tennis (or some other two person sport) with him/her,’ ‘I would
lend him/her money,’ ‘I would miss a work meeting in order to visit him/her in the hospital,’ ‘I celebrate special events (birthday, holidays) with him/her,’ and ‘I listen to his/her fears and worries.’ The internal consistency estimates (alpha coefficients) for the five guanxi dimensions from the supervisors’ perspectives were .78, .72, .70, .72, .72, and .85 for the global guanxi measure. For the subordinates’ perspectives, the alphas for the five dimensions were .80, .79, .56, .72, .78, and .88 for the global guanxi measure.

Turnover intention

Turnover Intention of subordinates was measured by the three item scale from Camman, Fichman, Jenkins and Klesh (1979) which was modified by Chen et al (1998). The three items are, ‘I often think about quitting’, ‘It is very possible that I will look for a new job next year’, and ‘If I may choose again, I will choose to work for the current organisation.’ A 5 point Likert scale was used (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with the first two items reverse coded. The coefficient alpha was .71.

Affective commitment

Affective organisational commitment of subordinates was measured by the six-item scale of Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993). Sample items are, ‘I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organisation’, and ‘This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me.’ A 7 point Likert scale was used (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), with three of the items reverse coded. The coefficient alpha was .73.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction of subordinates was measured by 4 items taken from Cole (1979) and adapted by Leung, Smith, Wang and Sun (1996). Sample items are ‘I am satisfied with my job,’ and ‘I would recommend this job to a friend.’ A 5 point Likert scale was used (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The coefficient alpha was .63.

Leader-member exchange (LMX-MDM)

In all organisations, both supervisors and subordinates completed two measures of leader member exchange. The first measure was that of the multi dimensional scale, LMX-MDM, developed by Liden and Maslyn (1998). The original scale had 12 items, but because one of the items was double barrelled,
that item was split into two, thus creating a 13 item scale. A 7 point Likert scale was used
(1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The coefficient alpha for the global measure of the
subordinates’ view, LMX-MDMS, was .83. The supervisors’ view of exchange quality was measured
with 13 items that parallel the subordinates’ view of exchange quality (Greguras & Ford 2006). The
resulting measure, LMX-MDML, also adopted a 7 point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 =
strongly agree). The coefficient alpha for the global measure of the supervisors’ perspective of LMX-
MDML was .82.

**Leader-member exchange (LMX-7)**

The second measure of leader member exchange was the 7 item unidimensional LMX7, which was
developed by Graen, Novak and Sommerkamp (1982) and revised by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). A
sample item from the subordinate survey is, ‘My supervisor understands my job problems and needs,’
with a 5 point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The coefficient alpha for the
subordinate perspective of exchange quality, LMX7S, was .77. The supervisors’ view of exchange
quality was measured with 7 items that parallel the subordinates’ view of exchange quality (Paglis &
Green 2002). The same 5 point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) was used, and
the coefficient alpha for the supervisors’ perspective of exchange quality, LMX7L, was .78.

**Results**

Table 1 below shows the occurrence of the eight particularistic *guanxi* ties as indicated by the
categorical *guanxi* measure.

**Insert Table 1 here**

There were no former classmate, former teacher/student or former neighbour ties, and only two
(0.53%) former supervisor/subordinate ties in the sample, so those four *guanxi* bases were excluded
from the analysis. Following Farh et al’s (1998) procedure, we obtained an accuracy index for each
*guanxi* base by dividing the percentage agreement reported by dyads by the total number of dyads.
The accuracy index for the four *guanxi* bases that were retained for analysis ranged from 89.8% to
99.5%, thus indicating reliability of the *guanxi* measures.

We then conducted correlation analyses, using the variables of affective commitment, turnover
intention, job satisfaction, two different measures of leader-member exchange, and two different
measures of *guanxi* (one based on particularistic ties and the other based on differential behaviours). These variables were measured from the subordinates’ perspective. We conducted further correlation analyses, using the same two measures of leader-member exchange and the same two measures of *guanxi*, but this time from the supervisors’ perspective. The means, standard deviations and non parametric correlations between variables, measured from the supervisors’ perspective, are reported in Table 2 below.

**Insert Table 2 here**

The only significant correlation between the particularistic *guanxi* variables and the two leader member exchange variables was that between *guanxi*-relative and leader member exchange (MDML) \((r = .12, p < .05)\). The means, standard deviations and non parametric correlations between variables, measured from the subordinates’ perspective, are reported in Table 3 below.

**Insert Table 3 here**

There were no significant correlations between any of the particularistic *guanxi* measures and the variables of affective commitment, turnover intention, job satisfaction, and two measures of leader member exchange.

The correlations of the second measure of *guanxi*, that using the differential behaviours approach, were then examined. The means, standard deviations and parametric correlations between variables, measured from the supervisors’ perspective, are reported in Table 4 below.

**Insert Table 4 here**

Table 4 shows that *guanxi*-social, *guanxi*-finance, *guanxi*-priority, *guanxi*-celebration, and *guanxi*-emotion were all significantly correlated with two measures of leader member exchange. The largest correlation was that between *guanxi*-celebration and leader-member exchange (MDML) \((r = .51, p < .01)\), while the smallest was that between *guanxi*-emotion and leader-member exchange (MDML) \((r = .30, p < .01)\).

The means, standard deviations and parametric correlations between variables, measured from the subordinates’ perspective, are reported in Table 5 below.

**Insert Table 5 here**
Table 5 shows that guanxi-social, guanxi-finance, guanxi-priority, guanxi-celebration, and guanxi-emotion were all significantly correlated with affective commitment, turnover intention, job satisfaction, and two LMX variables, with one exception, that of the correlation between guanxi-social and job satisfaction. The largest correlation was between guanxi-emotion and affective commitment ($r = .43, p < .01$), while the smallest significant correlation was between guanxi-social and turnover intention ($r = .18, p < .01$).

**DISCUSSION**

The two different measures of guanxi that we used in the study yielded very different results. When we used a measure based on particularistic ties (Farh et al 1998), we found only one small significant association out of the almost 30 associations that we examined. This sole significant association was that between one of the leader member exchange measures and guanxi-relative from the supervisors’ perspective. In view of the fact that family relationships are the strongest, closest and most binding of all guanxi, and that ongoing loyalty and obligation are taken for granted within families (Bond & Hwang 1986; Tsui & Farh 1997), this finding was not unexpected. Good relationships are expected from family members, and such expectations extend into all domains, including the work situation, whereas non-family relationships have to be developed, rather than taken for granted. Although the association between leader member exchange and guanxi-relative was significant from the supervisors’ perspective, there was no such significant association between leader member exchange and guanxi-relative from the subordinates’ perspective. We surmise that this can be explained by the culture of paternalism in Chinese societies, whereby those in positions of authority are expected to take responsibility for the overall well being of those further down the hierarchical order (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang & Farh 2004; Redding 1990). Supervisors, therefore, may be even more sensitive towards establishing good relationships with subordinates who have family connections with them.

But setting aside family connections, one of the most important findings of our study was that there were no significant associations between guanxi and five other measured variables when the measure of guanxi was that of particularistic ties. This was not surprising, since a measure based on particularistic ties tells only part of the guanxi story, i.e., that there is some commonality between two people. It does not tell us anything about how relationships are developed.
Guanxi is more completely described as interpersonal relationships in which certain behaviours are deemed appropriate and expected, according to the strength of those relationships. Our second measure of guanxi (Wong CS et al 2003) was based on this differential behaviours concept of guanxi, and our results showed that guanxi was significantly associated with two measures of leader member exchange from both the supervisors’ and subordinates’ perspectives, and significantly associated with affective commitment, turnover intention, and job satisfaction from the subordinates’ perspective.

All five dimensions of guanxi were significantly associated with affective commitment, with the largest association being between affective commitment and guanxi-emotion. We think that, even though commitment to the organisation was measured, this reflects more of an emotional attachment of the subordinate to the supervisor rather than to the organisation itself, due to the widespread incidence of “personalism” in Chinese societies (Redding 1990). This may account for guanxi-emotion having the greatest magnitude of association with affective commitment. With affective commitment being more a psychological attachment to the supervisor rather than to the organisation, this may explain why the magnitude of this variable’s association with guanxi is larger than the associations of guanxi with turnover intention and job satisfaction, since these two latter variables are not directly concerned with interpersonal relationships. But, apart from one non significant association between job satisfaction and guanxi-social, there were significant associations between all five dimensions of guanxi and the variables of turnover intention and job satisfaction. We believe that this can be explained by the importance of relationships, whereby subordinates first assess the quality of relationships with their supervisors, and this relationship quality then has an important impact on all other aspects of the subordinates’ working environment.

When we looked at how guanxi, using the differential behaviours approach, and leader member exchange were related, we found the strongest relationships among all the variables. From both supervisors’ and subordinates’ perspectives, all five dimensions of guanxi were significantly related to both measures of LMX. Although guanxi and LMX are distinct concepts (Law et al 2000), they are both concerned with interpersonal relationships, LMX with work relationships, guanxi with all types of relationships. Our results show that the social interaction and helping behaviours of guanxi have a significant impact on the quality of work relationships for both supervisors and subordinates. It is
interesting to note that, with one exception, the associations between all five guanxi dimensions and both LMX measures were larger from the supervisors’ perspective than from the subordinates’. We believe that this can be explained by the Chinese cultural phenomenon of those in positions of power and authority being expected to take responsibility for promoting and maintaining the well being of those in subordinate positions, and those in such superior positions accepting these ascribed roles and taking conscious action to meet these culturally determined expectations.

CONCLUSION

Guanxi is a Confucian based system of interpersonal relationships incorporating mutual indebtedness and favour exchange, socially dictated role requirements, and specific behaviours that demonstrate the degree of closeness of a guanxi relationship. Our study looked at how guanxi is associated with specific organisational outcomes and how those outcomes could be interpreted according to how guanxi is measured. We used two different measures of guanxi, one a particularistic ties approach, the other a differential behaviours approach, and found greatly differing results. Since guanxi in China is all pervasive and substantially affects interpersonal relationships across all sectors of society, researchers need to take into account the effect of its presence and to carefully consider how they will measure guanxi. We believe that a differential behaviours approach to measuring guanxi is the most appropriate method to use if researchers are going to capture the complexity of guanxi and its effects on organisational outcomes.
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Table 1: Guanxi (particularistic ties) in the Vertical Dyad (N = 374)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guanxi</th>
<th>Yes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>No&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former classmate</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>98.40</td>
<td>99.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same family name</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>97.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same province</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>79.14</td>
<td>89.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former colleague</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>89.04</td>
<td>90.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former teacher/student</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.47</td>
<td>99.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former supervisor/subordinate</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>90.11</td>
<td>90.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former neighbour</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.73</td>
<td>99.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> “Yes” means percentage agreement regarding presence of guanxi.

<sup>b</sup> “No” means percentage agreement regarding absence of guanxi.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations (non parametric) for Study Variables (supervisors’ perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Guanxi-relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guanxi-family name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guanxi-province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guanxi-colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leader member exchange, MDML</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leader member exchange, LMX7L</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>*</sup><i>p < .05</i>;  **<i>p < .01</i>
Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations (non parametric) for Study Variables (subordinates’ perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Guanxi-relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guanxi-family name</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guanxi-province</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guanxi-colleague</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leader member exchange, MDMS</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leader member exchange, LMX7S</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affective commitment</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Turnover intention</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations (parametric) for Study Variables (supervisors’ perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>1. Guanxi-social</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guanxi-finance</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guanxi-priority</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guanxi-celebration</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guanxi-emotion</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leader member exchange, MDML</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leader member exchange, LMX7L</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 5: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations (parametric) for Study Variables (subordinates’ perspective)

| Variable                                      | Mean | SD  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Guanxi-social                              | 3.16 | 0.84| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Guanxi-finance                             | 3.13 | 0.83| 0.49**| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Guanxi-priority                            | 3.07 | 0.69| 0.40**| 0.49**| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Guanxi-celebration                         | 3.26 | 0.74| 0.50**| 0.47**| 0.50**| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Guanxi-emotion                             | 3.62 | 0.74| 0.44**| 0.41**| 0.42**| 0.58**| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Leader member exchange, MDMS               | 4.89 | 0.83| 0.28**| 0.32**| 0.36**| 0.33**| 0.40**| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Leader member exchange, LMX7S              | 3.22 | 0.62| 0.38**| 0.33**| 0.29**| 0.30**| 0.30**| 0.56**| 1.00 |      |      |      |      |
| 8. Affective commitment                       | 4.80 | 1.06| 0.24**| 0.29**| 0.19**| 0.28**| 0.43**| 0.39**| 0.36**| 1.00 |      |      |      |
| 9. Turnover intention                         | 3.41 | 0.79| 0.18**| 0.16**| 0.15**| 0.20**| 0.29**| 0.27**| 0.35**| 0.52**| 1.00 |      |      |
| 10. Job satisfaction                          | 3.18 | 0.66| 0.06 | 0.20**| 0.24**| 0.20**| 0.25**| 0.29**| 0.28**| 0.30**| 0.42**| 1.00 |      |

*p < .05; **p < .01