科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告
期末報告

雙元焦點轉換型領導對部屬影響之跨層次研究

計 畫 類 別 ： 個別型計畫
計 畫 編 號 ： MOST 106-2410-H-032-069-SSS
執 行 期 間 ： 106年08月01日至107年07月31日
執 行 單 位 ： 淡江大學企業管理學系

計 畫 主 持 人 ： 汪美伶

計畫參與人員： 碩士班研究生-兼任助理：劉冠毅
碩士班研究生-兼任助理：張嘉謙
大專生-兼任助理：李姿瑩
大專生-兼任助理：彭俊閎

報 告 附 件 ： 出席國際學術會議心得報告

中 華 民 國 107 年 10 月 06 日

中 文 摘 要 ： 結合轉換型領導相關理論與社會學習理論，本研究驗證探討分店主管轉換型領導對團隊學習氣候的直接影響，以及團隊學習氣候是否在分店主管轉換型領導與團隊知識分享、團隊顧客導向間，扮演中介角色。因此，本研究以國內行動通訊連鎖零售商旗下的分店店長與員工為研究對象，以問卷方式蒐集125位店長與586位員工之資料，進行結構方程模式分析。結果發現，店長轉換型領導會影響分店的團隊學習氣候；團隊學習氣候也會中介轉換型領導對團隊知識分享、團隊顧客導向的正向影響效果。針對上述結果，本研究提出理論意涵與管理建議。

中 文 關 鍵 詞 ： 轉換型領導、團隊學習氣候、團隊知識分享、團隊顧客導向

英 文 摘 要 ： Integrating transformational leadership theory with the social learning theory, this study examined how TFL influences team knowledge sharing and team customer orientation through team learning climate. Data was collected from 125 store managers and their 586 service employees in mobile device stores and analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM). The results show that store managers' transformational leadership had positive influence on team learning climate. In addition, store managers' transformational leadership had influence on team knowledge sharing and team customer orientation through team learning climate. Both theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

英 文 關 鍵 詞 ： transformational leadership, team learning climate, team knowledge sharing, team customer orientation

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告

（□期中進度報告/■期末報告）

雙元焦點轉換型領導對部屬影響之跨層次研究

計畫類別：■個別型計畫　□整合型計畫
計畫編號：MOST 106－2410－H－032－069－SSS
執行期間：106 年 8 月 1 日至 107 年 7 月 31 日
執行機構及系所：淡江大學企業管理學系

計畫主持人：汪美伶
共同主持人：
計畫參與人員：劉冠毅、張嘉譙、李姿瑩、彭俊閎

本計畫除繳交成果報告外，另含下列出國報告，共 _1_ 份：
□執行國際合作與移地研究心得報告
■出席國際學術會議心得報告

期末報告處理方式：

1. 公開方式：
   □非列管計畫亦不具下列情形，立即公開查詢
   ■涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，□一年■二年後可公開查詢
2. 「本研究」是否已有嚴重損及公共利益之發現：■否 □是
3. 「本報告」是否建議提供政府單位施政參考 ■否 □是，____（請列舉提供之單位；本部不經審議，依勾選逕予轉送）

中　華　民　國　107　年　10　月 5　日

中文摘要

結合轉換型領導相關理論與社會學習理論，本研究驗證探討分店主管轉換型領導對團隊學習氣候的直接影響，以及團隊學習氣候是否在分店主管轉換型領導與團隊知識分享、團隊顧客導向間，扮演中介角色。因此，本研究以國內行動通訊連鎖零售商旗下的分店店長與員工為研究對象，以問卷方式蒐集 125 位店長與 586 位員工之資料，進行結構方程模式分析。結果發現，店長轉換型領導會影響分店的團隊學習氣候；團隊學習氣候也會中介轉換型領導對團隊知識分享、團隊顧客導向的正向影響效果。針對上述結果，本研究提出理論意涵與管理建議。

關鍵詞：轉換型領導、團隊學習氣候、團隊知識分享、團隊顧客導向

ABSTRACT

Integrating transformational leadership theory with the social learning theory, this study examined how TFL influences team knowledge sharing and team customer orientation through team learning climate. Data was collected from 125 store managers and their 586 service employees in mobile device stores and analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM). The results show that store managers' transformational leadership had positive influence on team learning climate. In addition, store managers' transformational leadership had influence on team knowledge sharing and team customer orientation through team learning climate. Both theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Keywords: transformational leadership, team learning climate, team knowledge sharing, team customer orientation

1. Introduction and Hypothesis Development

In leadership research, there has recently been a strong focus on how to inspire, motivate, support, and intellectually stimulate subordinates. Such leadership has been labeled transformational leadership (TFL thereafter) (Bass, 1985) and has been found important to shape followers' attitudes and behaviors and in achieving desirable organizational outcomes (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). While prior research has highlighted the importance of the leader's role in organizational processes, particularly in knowledge management (Bryant, 2003; Srivastava, Batrol, & Locke, 2006), mechanisms through which TFL influences performance remain understudied. Working from the notions that team learning leads to effective knowledge sharing through encouraging new ideas (Taylor & Wright, 2004) and that TFL provides a foundation for understanding how leaders impact the cultivation of knowledge (Bass & Avolio, 1995), we test whether a team's learning climate explains the link between TFL and knowledge–related outcomes.

TFL is defined as a process by which leaders inspire their followers to perform at a higher level than expected and to potentially exceed the followers' own self-interests for a high-level of shared vision (Bass & Avolio, 1999). Followers in the condition of TFL are able to maximize their subordinate's performance and increase the degree of their feelings of motivation, organizational commitment, satisfaction, trust and work engagement at the individual level (Bono & Judge, 2003). Previous research has also examined the kind of leadership behaviors that boost team effectiveness

(e.g., Burke et al., 2006), and most of these studies have focused primarily on the group level of analysis.

Organizational learning can help organizations develop strategic resources, such as knowledge, that have the potential to influence employees' behaviors. A supportive climate for learning can be viewed as a facilitator of organizational learning (Thuy Pham & Swierczek, 2006). Organizations that have developed a high learning climate effectively acquire knowledge as well as apply the knowledge to modify behaviors, thereby achieving organizational goals (Huber, 1991). Organizations stressing learning climate can enhance individuals' ability to acquire information, interpret it to fully understand its meaning, and transform it into work-related knowledge. Hence, the current study concentrates on team learning climate, which determines the extent to which a team promotes a learning environment and an atmosphere of continuous learning.

Drawing on Edmondson et al.'s (2001) suggestion that leaders need to help create a climate for team learning, TFL is also expected to foster team learning climate through strengthening the interconnectivity among individual members and cultivating effective knowledge exchanges within the team. TFL implies creating clear goals and visions, and instilling confidence in followers that they can accomplish what they aim to do by providing their influence to each other with the purpose of creating effective team outputs (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Hetland, Skogstad, Hetland, & Mikkelsen,, 2011). This mutual influence facilitates interactions and coordination among team members, encourages exchanges of information, knowledge, and expertise, and allows team members to learn from their interdependent teamwork, thereby promoting a shared learning climate within the team (Edmondson, 1999). Based on the discussion, we hypothesize the following:

H_1: TFL has a positive effect on team learning climate.

Knowledge sharing occurs when an individual is willing both to learn and assist others in developing new capabilities (Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, J, 2005). In particular, team knowledge sharing focuses on the process by which team members engage in distributing new knowledge and routines (Argote, Gruenfeld, & Naquin, 2001). It occurs when team members retrieve knowledge and information and share it with each other via discussion or documentation. Within organizations individuals can share their knowledge with one another, reach out to other parts of the firm, or even cross organizational boundaries for seeking and transferring information. More specifically, knowledge sharing implies a voluntary act by individuals who participate in the exchange of knowledge even though there are no compulsory pressures (Davenport, 1997), recent theorization of knowledge sharing work has begun to emphasize the "soft"' strategies relying on the leadership of the specific organizational unit to inspire and support knowledge sharing at individual or team level (Hülsheger, Anderson, & Salgado, 2009; Srivastava et al., 2006). Leadership activities encourage or discourage the development of the working environment for knowledge sharing among employees. In particular, TFL theory provides a foundation for understanding how leaders impact the cultivation of knowledge (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

Team learning climate is a team-level construct and captures a shared perception among individual members regarding the extent to which team members engage in behaviors such as

asking for feedback on performance, exchanging information and knowledge for each other, and discussing ways to improve performance (Edmondson, 1999). Such a team climate emphasizes the importance of collective knowledge development through trust and team members' cooperation (Zucker, Darby, & Armstrong, 2002). Surrounded by a high learning climate, team members are able to explore various features and potential applications of knowledge and willing to share knowledge to team colleagues without fear of reprisal from making errors. Individuals who perceive that the team recognizes their effort in taking the initiative for speaking up new ideas are more likely to engage in knowledge sharing (Edmondson, Bohmer, & Pisano, 2001). Team learning climate can thus enhance individuals' ability to acquire information, interpret it to fully understand its meaning, and transform it into work-related knowledge. Although team learning behavior was found to lead to effective knowledge sharing through encouraging new ideas (Taylor & Wright, 2004), we attempt to further examine whether team learning climate contributes to team members' knowledge sharing. Therefore, we propose the following:

Leaders may influence knowledge sharing indirectly through their influence on the climate of the team (Carmeli, Gelbard, & Reiter-Palmon, 2013). Troy, Szymanski and Rajan (2001) found that a climate emphasizing open communication led to greater knowledge sharing. Previous work suggests that leaders are instrumental in developing and cultivating work climates (Liao & Chuang, 2007; Schneider, Ehrhart, Mayer, Saltz, & Miles-Jolly, 2005). Leaders can signal behaviorally and verbally the appropriate and normative behaviors that are expected from team members. Researchers have found a more direct link between leader expectations, behaviors, and knowledge sharing, in particular that leader expectations and leader supportive behaviors cultivate a context of knowledge sharing (Carmeli & Waldman, 2010). Based on the discussion, we propose the following:

H_2: Team learning climate mediates the relationship between TFL and knowledge sharing.

We also suggest that team learning climate predicts team customer-orientation. The concept of customer-orientation asserts that sales can be achieved by determining customer needs and wants, and then delivering desired satisfaction better than competitors. Customer-orientation is therefore defined as the implementation of the marketing concept in interactions between individual salespeople and their customers (Saxe & Weitz, 1982).

According to social system and group development theories from organizational psychology, customer-orientation is influenced and determined by the organization's culture (Williams & Attaway, 1996). The higher the level of a firm's supportive organizational culture, the higher it will stimulate creativity in the salesperson and, in turn, enhance the salesperson's customer-oriented selling behaviors. Findings from Siguaw, Brown and Widing (1994) suggest that a firm's market orientation has a significant positive relationship with a salesperson's customer orientation. Perceived psychological climate, empowerment, and leadership behavior of the sales manager also have been suggested to be associated positively with customer-oriented selling behaviors of the salesperson (Martin & Bush, 2006). When employees perceive a higher learning climate, they are more likely to "learn to learn" about customers (Day, 1994). A higher learning climate makes

employees put more emphasis on learning issues during everyday interactions with customers as well as display more customer-oriented behaviors. Consistent with this view, Wang (2013) found that salespeople within a higher level of learning climate displayed more adaptive selling behaviors when responding to changing customer needs and sales situations. As such, when salespersons perceive a higher level of learning climate, they are more willing to display customer-oriented behaviors to serve and delight customers. Team learning climate, therefore, is expected to positively predict the team's customer-orientation. Hence, considering Hypothesis 1, we propose the following:

H_3: Team learning climate mediates the positive relationship between TFL and team customer-orientation.

2. Method

2.1 Participants and procedure

This study is based on the 125 stores of a large mobile device chain in northern Taiwan. Each mobile device store leads the whole employees in the store for achieving the operational goal. That is, store mangers act as the leader of the team (i.e., mobile device store). Mobile device stores are chosen because consumers are more likely to have many service interactions with different employees in the same store. It is both likely and important for employees to develop pseudorelationships with customers (Gutek, 1995). Additionally, mobile devices generate higher levels of customer attention and involvement (Mano & Oliver, 1993). Therefore, this sample provides a unique opportunity to study the impact of TFL on knowledge sharing through individual learning. Furthermore, the use of information obtained from multiple sources (store managers and employees) at multiple levels in a longitudinal design allows us to reduce common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

To solicit honest responses, we invited the senior manager in charge of the stores in northern Taiwan to provide us assistance during the data collection period. All store managers and employees of the stores were invited to participate in the study. The respondents were assured of confidentiality and that nobody from the mobile device company would have access to their individual responses. Specifically, at Time 1, store managers were invited to fill out a survey about their direct report of their own of TFL. At Time 2, individual employees in each store filled out a survey about their personal perceptions of team learning climate within the store. At Time 3, employees filled out another survey on the level of their own knowledge sharing and customer-oriented behavior. From Tim1 to Time 3, the time intervals ranged from 4 to 6 weeks. After deleting incomplete questionnaires, the final sample consisted of 586 employees and 125 store managers, which averaged about 4.69 employees for each store.

Figure 1 The Characteristics of Samples

Store manager sample (N=125)				Employee sample (N=586)			
		Number	%			Number	%
Gender	Male	62	49.6	Gender	Male	331	56.6
	Female	63	40.4		Female	254	43.4
Age	Under 30	34	27.2	Age	Under 23	66	11.3
	30~35	72	57.6		23~30	316	61.9
	Over 35	19	15.2		Over 30	204	26.8
Level of education	High school	21	16.8	Level of education	High school	37	6.3
	College or above	104	83.2		College or above	549	93.7
Store size(# of employee)	Under 5	24	19.2	Working with the store manager	Under 1 year	91	15.9
	5~8	86	68.8		1~3 years	232	40.7
	Over 8	15	12.0		Over 3 years	95	16.6
Tenure	Under 5 years	37	29.6				
	5~10 years	72	57.6				
	Over 10 years	16	12.8				

2.2 Measures

The measures used in this study are drawn from western studies on social psychology and organizational behavior. Overcoming language barriers is one of the first steps in accurate comparability so, for the current study, all measures previously developed in English were translated into Chinese using a standard translation-back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1980). Next, we describe the measures for the main study variables involved in the analyses.

TFL. We asked store managers to rate their own TFL behaviors using the seven-item Global Transformational Leadership (GTL) scale (Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000) along a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (frequently, if not always). One example item is "I encourage my staff to think about problems in new ways and questions assumptions." This scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .96.

Team learning climate. Team learning climate was measured by using the nine-item learning climate scale (Nikolova, Van Ruysseveldt, De Witte, & Van Dam, 2014). Example items are "My organization provides sufficient resources to develop my competences," and "In my organization, employees who continuously develop themselves professionally, are being rewarded." Respondents answer on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree." By definition, team learning reflects a shared pattern of learning behaviors within a team. We assessed the within-group agreement to examine consensus and justify aggregation. Then, we proceed with aggregating individual members' ratings of team learning climate to the team level of analysis. This scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .93.

*Team Knowledge sharing. Team k*nowledge sharing was measured by using Bock et al.'s (2005) five-item knowledge sharing scale. One example item is "I share my expertise from my education or training with other organizational members in a more effective way." Respondents answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree." We assessed the within-group agreement to examine consensus and justify aggregation. Then, we proceed with aggregating individual employees' self-reports of knowledge sharing to the team level of analysis. This scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .92.

Team Customer-Orientation. Team customer-orientation was measured using five positively worded items from the reduced-version sales orientation/customer orientation scale (Thomas et al., 2001). This scale was originally designed to measure salespeople's customer orientation; thus, it was expected to reflect the level of customer orientation in each store after data aggregation. As a result, this study asked each participating employee to evaluate his or her customer-oriented behaviors displayed during the service encounter using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .89.

2.3 Data Aggregation

Team learning climate, team knowledge sharing, team and team customer orientation are formed via a bottom-up emergence process. Therefore, this study aggregated the perceptions and evaluations of learning climate, knowledge sharing, and customer-oriented behavior at the employee level to form the store-level measures. Investigating within group agreement (rwg) with a uniform distribution reached acceptable levels of agreement (average rwg for learning climate = 0.93; knowledge sharing=0.94; customer-oriented behavior = 0.93). In addition, interclass correlations (ICCs) appeared as follows: ICC (1) of learning climate, knowledge sharing and customer-oriented behavior were 0.42, 0.39, and 0.39 respectively. Thus, there were acceptable levels of within-group

agreement (rwg) and ICC (1).

2.4 Reliability and Validity

As shown in Table 1, construct reliabilities of the scales used in this study were tested using Cronbach's α coefficients. All Cronbach's α coefficients of all measures varied between 0.89 and 0.96. Thus, we concluded that all the measures were unidimensional and reliable.

To confirm the four-factor structure (TFL, team learning climate, team knowledge sharing, and team customer-orientation) for the measurement model, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using latent variables was carried out in the first step. The results of CFA provided a reasonable fit to the data (χ^2= 587.86, $p < 0.01$; CFI= 0.92, TLI = 0.91, SRMR = 0.060, RMSEA = 0.082). The factor loadings were highly significant, and the composite reliabilities of each scale exceeded the recommended level of 0.70 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The results demonstrated an acceptable level of convergent validity for all constructs at the store level (Hair et al., 2006). The square root of the average variances extracted (AVE) was larger than the correlation coefficients for each pair of variables, which provided evidence of discriminant validity (Fornell & Larker, 1981).

The factor loadings were highly significant, and the composite reliabilities of each scale

exceeded the recommended level of 0.70 (Fornell and Larker, 1981). The results demonstrated an acceptable level of convergent validity for all constructs at the salesperson level (Hair *et al.*, 2006).

ABLE 1 Means, standard deviations, and correlations of variables.

		Means (*M*)	Standard Deviation *(SD)*	AVE	1	2	3	4
1.	TFL (T1)	4.05	*0.46*	0.75	(0.96)			
2.	Team Learning Climate (T2)	3.93	*0.45*	0.75	0.81**	(0.93)		
3.	Team Knowledge Sharing (T3)	3.96	*0.40*	0.78	0.77**	0.76**	(0.92)	
4.	Team Customer Orientation (T3)	3.98	*0.39*	0.80	0.65**	0.76**	0.78**	(0.89)

N=125, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, Coefficient composite reliabilities are reported in the diagonal.

T1=first-wave store manager survey; T2=second-wave employee survey; T3=third-wave employee survey

3.Results

3.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Table I presents the means, standard deviations, correlations, and internal consistencies of the scales. The correlation coefficients of the variables indicated that all the main study variables were highly associated.

3.2 Structural Model and Hypothesis Testing

To test our hypotheses we conducted structural equation modeling (SEM) in Mplus version 6.0 with maximum likelihood estimation. Mplus produces measures of overall model fit, generates estimates of the hypothesized relationships (unstandardized and standardized coefficients, standard errors, and *t*-tests), calculates total effects, and provides measures of the proportions of variance explained.

The theoretical model with structural paths was tested in the second step. To test the mediating role of team learning climate, the following conditions must be satisfied according to MacKinnon, Fairchild, and Fritz (2007): (1) the independent variable (TFL) has a significant effect on the mediating variable (team learning climate); and (2) the mediating variable (team learning climate) has a significant effect on the dependent variable in a regression of the independent and mediating variable on the dependent variable. Full mediation occurs if there is no effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable (in addition to the mediating variable). Partial mediation occurs if the independent variable does have a significant effect on the dependent variable in addition to the mediating variables.

First, TFL predicted team learning climate ($\gamma = 0.81$, $p < .01$), providing support for Hypothesis 1. Second, results indicated that team learning climate predicted team knowledge sharing ($\gamma = 0.76$, $p < .01$) and team customer orientation ($\gamma = 0.75$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, the estimations of confidence intervals revealed an indirect relation between TFL and team knowledge sharing, mediated by team learning climate ($\gamma = 0.62$, $p < .01$; 95% CI = 0.52-0.72), providing support for Hypothesis 2, and an indirect relation between TFL and team customer orientation, mediated by team learning climate ($\gamma = 0.61$, $p < .01$; 95% CI = 0.50-0.72), providing support for

Hypothesis 3.

4. Discussion and Implications

4.1 Discussion

The current research examined whether and why TFL may be related to team knowledge sharing and team customer orientation. To that end, we conducted a study in which we measured the variables at different time points and using different sources. As expected, we found that TFL predicted team-based knowledge-related outcomes indirectly, through employees' shared perceptions of learning climate.

A novel insight provided by this research is that team learning climate plays a role in the TFL process. Perhaps this is not surprising given that TFL is about to create opportunities and processes to stimulate and encourage knowledge amongst team members (Lee, Gillespie, Mann, & Wearing, 2010), all of which arguably promote an orientation to make use of knowledge. This view is also supported by TFL theory (Bass, 1985), where the assumption is that transformational leaders inspire and activate subordinates to perform and achieve goals beyond normal expectations.

Furthermore, TFL aims to communicate the importance of group goals, develop shared values and beliefs, and inspire unified effort to achieve group goals (Wang & Howell, 2010). The target of group-focused TFL is the whole group, meaning that the leader behaves similarly toward different members within the group and that members have a shared perception of the common goals and visions within the team. Relevant evidence suggests that TFL should promote team knowledge sharing in several ways. First, TFL implies creating clear goals and visions, and instilling confidence in followers that they can accomplish what they aim to do by providing their influence to each other with the purpose of creating effective team outputs (Carson et al., 2007; Hetland et al., 2011). In teams formed by people with differing perspectives and knowledge, TFL can convince to fuse their personal goals with the team mission, thereby facilitating the integration of diverse knowledge bases and viewpoints. Second, TFL may foster team knowledge sharing through strengthening the interconnectivity among individual members and cultivating effective knowledge exchanges within the team. This mutual influence facilitates interactions and coordination among team members, encourages exchanges of information, knowledge, and expertise, and allows team members to learn from their interdependent teamwork, thereby enhancing team knowledge sharing. Finally, by acting the knowledge builder role, leaders also actively role model knowledge sharing. They are setting the example and signaling that the open sharing of ideas and information is important and valuable for the team. As a result of this role modelling, team members are likely to reciprocate and share their expertise and knowledge with the team.

Our research is also particularly relevant in light of recent calls for studies examining the relationship between organization learning and KM. Our findings show the direct relationship between team learning climate and team customer orientation in service settings. The findings further validate the earlier studies on KM, such as those conducted by Ismail Al-Alawi et al. (2007) and Chou et al. (2005), who asserted that an organization must build up a supportive learning environment to encourage its employees to display customer-oriented behaviors by acquiring and

developing their customer knowledge. Our findings add to the extant literature by suggesting that learning climate helps service employees identify the characteristics of different customer types and develop appropriately specific sales interaction strategies when responding to varying service situations.

Using a time-lagged study with multiple subordinates of each supervisor and a multi-source data collection lends credence to the validity and reliability of the findings. The measurements were not conducted at the same time, because this would risk inflated relationships due to common source bias.

4.2 Practical Implications

Our research has several practical applications related to the management of employees in the retailing stores. First, our research demonstrates the relevance of store managers' TFL in ensuring that employees actively learn how to deal with varying customer needs and share work-related knowledge with team members. Store managers need to convey the importance of team learning climate and knowledge sharing so that salespersons can understand the importance of learning in the store and take necessary actions to learn and share knowledge of customers to serve customers' needs and interests.

Second, the results suggest the need to establish a high learning climate to encourage salespeople to share knowledge. Store managers should make extensive efforts to provide role-modeling behaviors and practices related to learning as well as provide opportunities and incentives to encourage salespersons to learn the necessary skills and increase their customer knowledge.

Finally, the current study reached similar conclusions in our review of the relevant literature focusing on the link between learning climate and customer-focussed behaviors (Wang, 2012). These findings are consistent with the resource-based view, which asserts that organizations can gain competitive advantages through the utilization of knowledge assets (Hult et al., 2002). Hence, service organizational expecting their employees to exhibit more customer-oriented behaviors must be certain that employees are encouraged by a high learning climate to acquire the strategic resource and use the strategic resource to improve customer-oriented behaviors.

4.3 Limitations and Directions for Further Research

Our sample included the chain stores of a single mobile device company with uniform pricing and advertising practices and similar store features. Despite that the occupational homogeneity and the compatibility across stores may rule out the extraneous and confounding effects, the single organizational context may affect the generalizability of the findings. In the further research, we will try hard to include teams from multiple organizations and examine additional types of values, such as uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980), to understand more fully how TFL affects knowledge sharing and customer orientation though the learning process.

References

Argote, L., Gruenfeld, D., & Naquin, C. (2001). Group learning in organizations. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and research* (pp. 369-411). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bock, G., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y., & Lee, J. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly, 29*(1), 87-111.

Bono, J., & Judge, T. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(5), 554-571.

Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H.C. Triandis, & J. W. Berry, (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (pp.389-444). Boston, MA: Allen & Bacon.

Bryant, S. E. (2003). The role of transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing and exploiting organizational knowledge. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(4), 32-44.

Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(3), 288-307.

Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J., & Mann, L. (2000). A shorter measure of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14*(3), 389-405.

Carmeli, A., & Waldman, D. A. (2010). Leadership, behavioral context, and the performance of work groups in a knowledge-intensive setting. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 35*(4), 384-400.

Carmeli, A., Gelbard, R., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2013). Leadership, creative problem-solving capacity, and creative performance: The importance of knowledge sharing. *Human Resource Management, 52*(1), 95-121.

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1217-1234.

Chou, T. C., Chang, P. L., Tsai, C. T., & Cheng, Y. P. (2005). Internal learning climate, knowledge management process and perceived knowledge management satisfaction. *Journal of Information Science, 31*(4), 283-296.

Davenport, T.H. (1997). *Information ecology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Day, G. S. (1994). Continuous learning about markets. *California Management Review, 36*(4), 9-31.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*(2), 350-383.

Edmondson, A. C., Bohmer, R. M., & Pisano, G. P. (2001). Disrupted routines: Team learning and new technology implementation in hospitals. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(4), 685-716.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39-50.

Gutek, B. A. (1995). *The dynamics of service: Reflections on the changing nature of customer/provider interactions.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hetland, H., Skogstad, A., Hetland, J., & Mikkelsen, A. (2011). Leadership and learning climate in a work setting. *European Psychologist, 16*(3), 163-173.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Huber, G.P. (1991), "Organizational learning: the contributing process and literature", in Cohen, M.D.

Hülsheger, U. R., Anderson, N., & Salgado, J. F. (2009). Team-level predictors of innovation at work: A comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1128-1145.

Ismail Al-Alawi, A., Yousif Al-Marzooqi, N., & Fraidoon Mohammed, Y. (2007). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: critical success factors. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 11*(2), 22-42.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of*

Lee, P., Gillespie, N., Mann, L., & Wearing, A. (2010). Leadership and trust: Their effect on knowledge sharing and team performance. *Management learning*, *41*(4), 473-491.

Liao, H., & Chuang, A. (2007). Transforming service employees and climate: A multilevel, multisource examination of transformational leadership in building long-term service relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1006-1119.

MacKinnon, D. P., Fritz, M. S., Williams, J., & Lockwood, C. M. (2007). Distribution of the product confidence limits for the indirect effect: Program PRODCLIN. *Behavior research methods*, *39*(3), 384-389.

Mano, H., & Oliver, R. L. (1993). Assessing the dimensionality and structure of the consumption experience: Evaluation, feeling, and satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*, 451-466.

Martin, C.A., & Bush, A.J. (2006). Psychological climate, empowerment, leadership style, and customer-oriented selling: An analysis of the sales manager-salesperson dyad. J*ournal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *34*(3), 419-438.

Nikolova, I., Van Ruysseveldt, J., De Witte, H., & Van Dam, K. (2014). Learning climate scale: Construction, reliability and initial validity evidence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *85*(3), 258-265.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903.

Saxe, R., &Weitz. B.A. (1982). The SOCO scale: A measure of the customer orientation of sales people. *Journal of Marketing Research, 14*(August), 343-351.

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., Mayer, D. M., Saltz, J. L., & Niles-Jolly, K. (2005). Understanding organization-customer links in service settings. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(6), 1017-1032.

Siguaw, J., Brown, G., & Widing, R. (1994). The influence of the market orientation of the firm on sales force behavior and attitudes. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*(1), 106-116.

Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1239-1251.

Taylor, W. A., & Wright, G. H. (2004). Organizational readiness for successful knowledge sharing: Challenges for public sector managers. *Information Resources Management Journal, 17*(2), 22-37.

Thuy Pham, N., & Swierczek, F. W. (2006). Facilitators of organizational learning in design. *The Learning Organization, 13*(2), 186-201.

Tomas M. Hult, G., Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Slater, S. F. (2002). A longitudinal study of the learning climate and cycle time in supply chains. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 17*(4), 302-323.

Troy, L. C., Szymanski, D. M., & Varadarajan, P. R. (2001). Generating new product ideas: An initial investigation of the role of market information and organizational characteristics. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 29*(1), 89-101.

Wang, M. (2013). Adaptive to customers: The roles of learning climate and customer knowledge. *Human Systems Management, 32*(3), 171-180.

Wang, M. L. (2012). How does the learning climate affect customer satisfaction?. *The Service Industries Journal, 32*(8), 1283-1303.

Wang, X. H. F., & Howell, J. M. (2012). A multilevel study of transformational leadership, identification, and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(5), 775-790.

Williams, M.R., & Attaway, J.S. (1996). Exploring salespersons' customer orientation as a mediator of organizational culture's influence on buyer-seller relationships. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 16*(4), 33-52.

Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., & Armstrong, J. S. (2002). Commercializing knowledge: University science, knowledge capture, and firm performance in biotechnology. *Management Science, 48*(1), 138-153.

科技部補助專題研究計畫出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期： 107 年 7 月 29 日

計畫編號	MOST 106-2410-H-032 -069 -SSS		
計畫名稱	雙元焦點轉換型領導對部屬影響之跨層次研究		
出國人員 姓名	汪美伶	服務機構 及職稱	淡江大學企業管理學系教授
會議時間	107 年 7 月 23 日 至 107 年 7 月 27 日	會議地點	Seoul, Korea
會議名稱	（中文）2018 第 18 屆國際勞雇關係學會世界年會 （英文）18th International Labour and Employment Relations Association (ILERA) 2018 World Congress		
發表題目	（中文）國家文化對職家互動與生活-工作滿意之影響 （英文）Impacts of National Cultures on Work-Family Conflicts and Work/Life Satisfaction are Different across Countries.		

一、 參加會議經過

此行主要目的是發表有關於國家文化對於職家衝突、個人福祉影響的研究成果，近年來，工作家庭平衡的觀念日益普及，相較於前幾世代的工作者，新世代工作者追求兼顧自身在工作與家庭等場域的角色績效，回應此趨勢，企業方必須了解員工產生職家衝突或是家職衝突的前因與後果，提出減少此衝突感受的解決方案，改善或提升勞雇雙方關係，繼而維持國家社會的整體就業狀況。此外，在全球化的浪潮下，不可避免的，大多數企業雇用多國籍員工，亦面臨國家文化價值觀影響員工態度、行為的管理挑戰。基於此主題涉及勞資關係穩定性以及國際化背景因素，主持人於去年九月將研究主題的一部份改寫，投稿至此研討會。舉辦此研討會的機構為創辦於 1966 年國際工業關係學會(International Industrial Relations Association , IIRA)，其成立宗旨是因應工業關係管理的需求，促進各國學者在此領域的知識交流，並且透過討論與研究論壇平台的設置，提供學者與業界人士交流的管道。協會的創始成員是英國大學工業關係學會(British Universities Industrial Relations Association)、美國的工業關係研究學會(Industrial Relations Research Association)、瑞士的國際勞工研究中心(International Institute for Labour Studies)以及日本勞工研究中心。在 2010 年，學會改名為國際國際勞雇關係學會。

該項會議是國際著名的勞資關係研討會，每三年舉行一次，今年是第 18 屆，主題是「Employment for a sustainable society: What is to be done?」，期望在迎接工業 4.0 時代來臨的前夕，能夠集思廣益，提供更多勞資關係創新作法，追求一個具有穩定持久勞雇關係的社會，長

達五天的會議期間，有許多相關主題的論文發表。由於本研究議題呼應研討會主題，故選擇投稿至此研討會，並獲得接受、發表。

計畫主持人近年來重心在探索職學衝突，但其概念多半來自職家衝突，亦與共同作者探討職家相關議題。在性別平權新思維下，工作者需同時兼顧工作與家庭生活，但個人時間與精力有限，往往容易產生角色間的衝突，加上資訊科技越來越便利，工作者亦很難清楚劃分上下班的界線。根據 Hobfoll 的資源保存理論，個人若因無足夠的資源同時應付工作與家庭領域的要求，便會產生職家間衝突互動，此些家間衝突有可能影響個人對於工作與生活的滿意度。另一方面，不同國家的文化會影響到個人的職家互動感受，但跨國家之資料蒐集不易，目前針對國家文化與職家互動的研究多是以單一國家或少數國家進行分析比較；關於國家文化構面與職家互動的研究更是少數，且大多僅以個人主義與集體主義進行探討，故此研究欲同時比較多個國家，國家文化各構面對職家衝突與工作滿意度、生活滿意度間關係的影響。本研究是採用國際社會調查計畫（ISSP）於 2012 年的家庭與性別角色變遷調查資料，共涵蓋 41 個國家工作者的職家互動、福祉以及 Hofstede 國家文五構面的調查資料，進行分析。研究結果發現，國家文化對於家對職衝突的影響都較職對家衝突影響顯著，此結果與 Allen 等人（2015）的結果相同。過去的研究多著墨於個體層次， 普遍發現與工作相關的因素會對職對家衝突有顯著影響，本研究從宏觀的國家層次著手，認為在國家層次中，家庭方面因素可能是影響工作者職家衝突感受的重要因素。

在同場報告中，有一篇論文探取 meta 方式，探討工時對職家衝突、增益的關係，並分別以活力、耗竭做為中介變數，代表時間這項資源，可能是決定工作者面對職家介面衝突時，是否會獲益或退縮的重要個人資源。

二、 與會心得

除了會議主持人外，大會亦安排有評論人，故除了回應與會者的提問外，亦能夠獲得評論人的寶貴意見。此場次的評論人是英國肯特大學的 Dr. Heejung Chung，她認為這個研究的結果是很有趣，各變數間也有顯著關係，但是否可說明為什麼可針對各國勞工政策，來解釋原因，建議作者未來可朝向這個方向，分別針對各國文化、社會政策，解釋在不同國文化脈絡下，職家衝突對滿意度等福祉的影響。此意見亦證實，由於文化價值觀或是人資政策不同，在研究職家、職學介面等議題時，西方文獻的結果或理論，並不全然與台灣樣本結果相同。以職學衝突而言，歐美研究多以半工半讀大學生為對象，但台灣大多數大學生並非全職工作者，反而是攻讀碩士學位的學生，較高比例是全職工作者，利用平日晚間、假日時間來進修，但台灣企業並沒有刻意鼓勵員工在職進修，也沒有提供額外的支持作法，導致在職進修者的中輟率提高。從評論人意見、同場次報告者內容以及研討會發表人資領域文章的大方向來看，可以考慮將產業因素、企業人資作法等變數納入職學介面議題的研究架構中，這是此行很大的收穫

在此會議中，亦巧遇多位組織行為、人力資源與工業關係領域的著名台灣學者，並觀摩其

研究成果，了解當前的研究趨勢，獲益良多。

三、　考察參觀活動(無是項活動者省略)

大會無安排考察參觀活動，但主持人有前往會場附近的 LG 數位中心參觀，體驗許多新科技在日常生活中的應用，同時，在首爾停留期間，主持人發現這個城市兼具現代與傳統的風貌，從速食店的自助點餐、遊樂園的消費模式，乃至於退稅機制的設計，或是硬體設備顯現於外的創意，但也可看到四處都有外國人士穿韓服體驗韓國傳統文化的情景，令人不得不驚歎這個國家已經從 20 年前的亞洲金融風暴脫身，在企業、金融、公共部門以及勞動關係等方面，做了很大的改革，躋身世界第 11 大經濟體，有很多地方值得我們國家學習。

四、　建議

此次是以口頭報告型式發表成果，雖然僅有 15 分鐘的發表空間，但是本人發現，有興趣的與會者，不吝給予各種批評與讚美，亦提出許多問題，為了避免臨場緊張，還是有事前準備完整講稿的必要性。亦可先行搜尋發表者的發表著作，了解其研究主軸，有助於結識國際學者，並提高進行跨國合作的機會。

五、　攜回資料名稱及內容

大會發給每位註冊與會者一本包括研討會行程安排、研究成果發表之地點、時間以及與會者索引名錄的會議手冊。

六、　其他

此行遇到許多來自亞洲國家不同地區的學者，藉由此機會，了解彼此的研究領域以及研究現況，增加未來合作或建立研究社群的可能性，以本次發表為例，同場發表的中國學者，就有論文探取 meta 方式，探討工時對職家衝突、增益的關係，並分別以活力、耗竭做為中介變數，同時利用後設分析的方式，驗證其研究架構，是近年來組織行為與人力資源領域日益普及的分析方法，提醒本人可檢視先前收集的資料，是否亦可套用此分析方式，獲得有趣的研究發現。

106年度專題研究計畫成果彙整表

計畫主持人：汪美伶	**計畫編號：**106-2410-H-032-069-SSS
計畫名稱：雙元焦點轉換型領導對部屬影響之跨層次研究	

成果項目					量化	單位	質化 （說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等）
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文			0	篇	
		研討會論文			0		
		專書			0	本	
		專書論文			0	章	
		技術報告			0	篇	
		其他			0	篇	
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權			0		
		營業秘密			0		
		積體電路電路布局權			0		
		著作權			0		
		品種權			0		
		其他			0		
	技術移轉	件數			0	件	
		收入			0	千元	
國外	學術性論文	期刊論文			0	篇	
		研討會論文			0		
		專書			0	本	
		專書論文			0	章	
		技術報告			0	篇	
		其他			0	篇	
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權			0		
		營業秘密			0		
		積體電路電路布局權			0		
		著作權			0		
		品種權			0		
		其他			0		

	技術移轉	件數	0	件	
		收入	0	千元	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	大專生	2	人次	有兩位分別就讀大二、大三的學生參與資料收集工作。
		碩士生	2		有兩位就讀研二的學生參與文獻整理、資料收集工作。
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
	非本國籍	大專生	0		
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士後研究員	0		
		專任助理	0		
其他成果 （無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。）					

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估
   ■達成目標
   □未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）
   　□實驗失敗
   　□因故實驗中斷
   　□其他原因
   說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）
   論文：□已發表　■未發表之文稿　□撰寫中　□無
   專利：□已獲得　□申請中　■無
   技轉：□已技轉　□洽談中　■無
   其他：（以200字為限）

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性，以500字為限）
   考量知識與學習是企業獲取競爭優勢的重要資源，本研究推論團隊基礎的轉換型領導行為，有助於形成團隊學習氣候，可增進團隊知識分享與團顧客導向行為。建議領導者可展現點轉換型領導行為，協助個別員工主動學習，展現顧客導向行為；強化團隊成員對團隊的認同，願意分享知識，並將其轉化為具體的團隊績效、顧客滿意度與財務績效。預期本研究成果能夠增進現代企業對轉換型領導的相關知識，並用以設計管理者領導技能的訓練發展方案，並將應用在例行的領導實務，進一步達成兼顧組織效能與員工福祉的雙贏成果。研究成果可協助企業訓練管理者領導技能，有效改善組織效能與員工福祉。

4. 主要發現

本研究具有政策應用參考價值：■否　□是，建議提供機關

（勾選「是」者，請列舉建議可提供施政參考之業務主管機關）

本研究具影響公共利益之重大發現：□否　□是

說明：（以150字為限）

預期本研究成果能夠增進現代企業對轉換型領導的相關知識，並用以設計管理者領導技能的訓練發展方案，並將應用在例行的領導實務，進一步達成兼顧組織效能與員工福祉的雙贏成果。研究成果可協助企業訓練管理者領導技能，有效改善組織效能與員工福祉，故主要是對企業經營有實務參考價值，而非政府政策。