Organizational citizenship behavior: a case study of culture, leadership and trust

Steven Appelbaum

John Molson School of Business, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada

Nicolas Bartolomucci

Bombardier Aerospace, Montreal, Canada

Erika Beaumier

Axa Canada, Montreal, Canada

Jonathan Boulanger

Roland Boulanger & Co. Ltd, Montreal, Canada

Rodney Corrigan

Quebec Stevedoring Company Limited, Quebec City, Canada

Isabelle Doré

Bell Canada, Montreal, Canada

Chrystine Girard

Copie Zero Television and Media, Inc., Montreal, Canada, and

Carlo Serroni

Vifan Canada, Montreal, Canada

Abstract *The case will test two hypotheses regarding three variables influencing the level of employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship at GAMMA, a manufacturer of plastics. Two hypotheses were developed from a review of the literature and initial results from exploratory research (H1: low employee satisfaction at GAMMA is a direct result of an autocratic leadership style, low trust environment and weak corporate culture; H2: low employee citizenship is a direct result of low employee satisfaction). Results suggest that although the perception was that employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship were low (from the exploratory research); both quantitative and descriptive data indicated these were not. Moreover, the hypotheses were not conclusively supported quantitatively. High trust was not obtained. Also a specific high leadership style and a specific culture resulting in high employee satisfaction were also questionable. Moreover, it was not observed that a strong correlation existed statistically. H1 is therefore not conclusive quantitatively. H2 does not demonstrate a high level of employee citizenship and employee satisfaction correlation. Despite these results, it is recommended management employ the following action plan: do not change current leadership style; develop an action plan to increase trust starting with increasing accessibility of management to employees; develop an action plan to move from current culture to preferred expressed culture starting by rewarding team activity rather than individual activities; improve employee satisfaction even if the observed level is medium to high.*

Background to the case

The objective of this case study is to analyze the level of employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship in Gamma Company (GAMMA), a plastic manufacturer operating in North America. The case will test two hypotheses regarding three variables influencing the level of employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship, and examine how these three variables should or should not be changed to enhance employee satisfaction and employee citizenship.

GAMMA was founded in 1991 and is wholly owned by GAMMA GROUP (Italy). Its subsidiaries are one of the world's leading privately owned company's specializing in the development and manufacturing of diversified plastic materials with annual sales of $130 million. GAMMA GROUP has two core divisions: plastic and film and employs 230. This study focuses on the North American group (GAMMA) located in Canada.

In 2001, GAMMA was experiencing serious financial difficulties. The company had recently gone through a strike at the Canadian plant at the close of 2000. Initially, GAMMA GROUP thought of closing GAMMA but before doing so, they decided to carefully assess the situation in order to identify the problems in the situation and to determine how it could be resolved. The approach that was implemented was the following:

- Nominate a new management team.
- Improve GAMMA financial situation from losses to a satisfactory level of profitability.
- Create better relations with the unions and the employees. A major strike had resulted in tense management relations with the union influencing job satisfaction and level of involvement from employees. Preliminary assessment of job satisfaction was low as well as the employee's level of involvement.

More specifically, GAMMA GROUP nominated a new executive vice-president (EVP) to manage the GAMMA operations with a clear mandate to rapidly generate profits within a one-year timeframe.

The EVP assessed the situation with the management team (upper management) and decided to review all relevant decisions previously made in the company and to challenge the current way of operating. The EVP was concerned with the negative consequences of implementing a more tightly controlled leadership style that challenged every previous decision resulting in a lowered level of trust. Despite this potential negative consequence, top management came to the conclusion that they had no choice but to implement the tight control approach to achieve the financial turnaround objectives that would hopefully result in a successful venture at the close of the year. Actions needed to execute the turnaround were implemented immediately with little strategic thought.

Actions taken following the turnaround

Following an initial and rapid successful short-term turnaround, upper management then adopted a more open management style attempting to empower its workforce to counter the reaction of behavioral problems caused by the recently imposed autocratic leadership style.

At the beginning of 2003, a consulting firm was retained by upper management to analyze and assess the damage done by the autocratic leadership style, the new corporate culture and to develop an action plan to assist upper management in implementing employee empowerment. This data will be the foundation of this case study and article.

The initial step taken by the consulting firm was to perform a corporate culture assessment survey. The results of the survey characterized a work environment as one having a high level of avoidance. In essence, the workforce adopted a defensive strategy, hence avoiding change, risks and decision-making. The short-term gains were obliterated and the secondary problems resulting from initial actions led to the current problem to be solved. A preliminary diagnosis by the consultants revealed the following.

Description of the problem

An initial diagnosis by the consultants included the following:

- exploratory research to assess the perception of what the variables to be studied were;
- the development of hypotheses to examine the variables: employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship.

The hypotheses were then tested by performing and analyzing survey results, interviewing key executives and performing a literature review of the variables.

Exploratory research: the diagnosis

The exploratory research was conducted through an interview with the EVP of GAMMA that highlighted the following perceptions of the problem:

- The major variables perceived to be low were employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship. Low employee satisfaction was characterized as the level of employees enjoying their daily job activities. Low employee citizenship was characterized as the level to which employees engage in activities above and beyond their task descriptions.
- The trust level was also perceived to be low. Low trust level was characterized as the level to which employees believe in management messages and capacity to deliver.
- The corporate culture of GAMMA was perceived to be strongly influenced by the founder of GAMMA GROUP who is directive, with little employee consultations on decisions.

Development of hypotheses

Two hypotheses were developed from a review of the literature and initial results from the exploratory research.

H1. *H1* is related to the role of leadership, trust and corporate culture in direct relation with employee satisfaction. Both the literature, as we see below, and the findings resulting from the exploratory research, suggest that the leadership style, the level of trust and the type of culture within the organization are directly linked with the level of employee satisfaction. Research methodology will follow:

> *H1.* The low employee satisfaction at GAMMA is a direct result of an autocratic leadership style, low trust environment and weak corporate culture.

H2. *H2* is related to the direct link between employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship:

> *H2.* The low employee citizenship is a direct result of low employee satisfaction.

Research methodology

In order to validate the two hypotheses, the following approach was undertaken:

(1) Analyze whether the literature review supports the hypotheses.

(2) Data collection and contrasting correlations between the variables suggested in two hypotheses. This data gathering was performed in several ways:

- quantitative: a combination of surveys with sampled population in the company; and

- descriptive: interviews with key organizational members.

Review of the literature and hypotheses

Overall the literature suggests that the two hypotheses are moderately valid.

H1: *literature review.* In summary, there is no consensus within the literature indicating that management should work on improving job satisfaction as a variable. Research seems to suggest that addressing low job dissatisfaction is more effective.

As to whether job satisfaction is directly influenced by trust, leadership style and culture, the literature does not clearly suggest a direct correlation for all three variables. On the one hand, the literature suggests a positive correlation between trust level and employee satisfaction. Research also suggests increasing cognition-based trust is more effective on job satisfaction then affect based trust. On the other hand, research does not agree uniformly that focusing on culture and leadership style has a direct effect on improving job

satisfaction. Although some authors suggest that the "right culture" might encourage job satisfaction and that with the right situation, the appropriate leadership style can also encourage job satisfaction, the literature seems to agree that focusing on other variables, such as motivation, is most relevant to improve directly job satisfaction.

H2: *literature review*. In the study of the direct effect of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship, the literature does not suggest any consensus. Although some literature indicates that there might be a correlation between employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship, research suggests there is also a correlation between job dissatisfaction and organizational citizenship if dissatisfaction is expressed in an active matter. Finally, some literature suggests that if a lack of fairness is perceived, there is no correlation between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) since trust must be present to influence organizational citizenship. The analysis of the problem under study is presented in the next section of this article.

Review of the literature: the variables

Corporate culture

An organization's culture is made up of those aspects of the organization that give it a particular climate or feel. Culture is to an organization what personality is to an individual. It is that distinctive constellation of beliefs, values, work styles, and relationships that distinguish one organization from another (Harrison and Stokes, 1992).

But is corporate culture linked with job satisfaction? According to research by Woolliams and Moseley (1999), we can conclude that attempting to understand the nature of job satisfaction is not easy. It is a complex concept that can mean a variety of things for different people. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational culture is an issue of continuing debate and difficult to measure objectively as both concepts consist of a number of separate dimensions without a theoretical framework (Woolliams and Moseley, 1999). Employees form an overall subjective perception of the organization based on such factors as degree of risk tolerance, team emphasis, and support for people. This overall perception becomes, in effect, the organization's culture or personality. These favorable or unfavorable perceptions then affect employee performance and satisfaction, with the impact being greater for stronger cultures.

According to Pool (1997), job satisfaction is an attitude that individuals maintain about their jobs, and, is a complex concept. Consequently, many employee satisfaction initiatives do not work because they are based on myth rather than proven research (Atchison, 1999). For instance, many people believe senior management is responsible for employee satisfaction. However, most organization mission statements do not say anything about employee satisfaction. Therefore, management should not work to develop employee

satisfaction, but rather to create an environment that encourages employee motivation (Atchison, 1999).

The literature, although not explicit, seems to suggest that with the proper culture fit, employee satisfaction could be enhanced (see Appelbaum *et al.*, 1999a). Leadership style is presented next.

Leadership style

Leadership is defined as " ability to influence a group toward the achievement of goals" and in today's dynamic world, we need leaders to challenge the status quo, to create visions of the future, and to inspire organizational members to want to achieve the visions (Robbins, 2001).

No one can deny the importance of leadership to the success of a corporation, and the CEO bears the responsibility of establishing effective leadership. Consequently, given present organizational realities, leadership skills have never been more important (Hagen and Morsheda, 1998).

The relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction has received a great deal of attention in past research, and, the findings, however, have been mixed. Research by Savery (1994) reported a positive relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction. Similarly, Pool (1997) found that consideration leadership behavior has a positive relationship with job satisfaction, while initiating structure leadership behavior has a negative relationship with job satisfaction; while others found no relationship between the two variables (Yousef, 1996).

Further research indicates, that employers should not solely focus on improving job satisfaction in an effort to improve organizational effectiveness, because an employee's level of job satisfaction is a result of a multiplicity of factors, most of which cannot be influenced by the employer (Crow and Hartman, 1995). As a result, all management can do is remove road-blocks to effective performance, provide a workplace setting that is as free as possible of internally generated job dissatisfaction. With the proper focus on performance and supervision, job satisfaction should take care of itself (Crow and Hartman, 1995).

Research therefore does not directly link employee satisfaction to a specific leadership style. Instead, many theories suggest that leadership style needs to adapt to the situation as it attempts to reduce employee dissatisfaction (see Appelbaum *et al.*, 1999b). Trust is the next topic.

Trust

Trust is the belief or confidence in a person or organization's integrity, fairness and reliability (Lypnack and Stamps, 1997). Trust is a positive expectation that another will not – through words, actions, or decisions-act opportunistically. The key dimensions underlining trust are integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty and openness. Trust seems to be the primary attribute associated with leadership since honesty and integrity are among the six traits found to be consistently associated with leadership (Robbins, 2001).

In a study of remote workers and their differences from non-remote workers, evidence shows (Staples, 2001) that interpersonal trust of the employee in their manager was found to be strongly associated with higher self-perceptions of performance, higher job satisfaction and low job stress. These findings were similar for both remote and non-remote employees. Interesting studies regarding trust were conducted in downsizings of organizations that illuminate this critical issue (see Appelbaum and Donia, 2001a, b)

According to Lypnack and Stamps (1997), trust is the belief or confidence in a person or organization's integrity, fairness and reliability. Their study that identifies two dimensions of trust: Cognition-based trust and affect-based trust. According to the data, individuals with high levels of trust had significantly higher job satisfaction. In all cases, job satisfaction scores were higher for the high trust respondents versus low trust groups. In addition, respondents with high trust levels felt they worked under less tension and felt less fidgety and nervous than did the respondents with lower trust levels. More specifically, evidence shows that cognition-based trust has a stronger impact on job satisfaction than affect-based trust on remote workers.

The literature suggests a positive correlation between trust level and employee satisfaction. Moreover, research suggests increasing cognition-based trust is more effective on job satisfaction than affect-based trust. The effect of employee satisfaction upon OCB is the next topic:

Employee satisfaction and OCB

High employee satisfaction is important to managers who believe that "an organization has a responsibility to provide employees with jobs that are challenging and intrinsically rewarding" (Robbins, 2001). The management in the case study is concerned with having satisfied employees to try to influence reduced effort associated with dealing with dissatisfaction (motivation and boosting moral activities). Although job satisfaction represents an attitude rather then a behavior, and therefore is difficult to influence directly to change, management is concerned about its employee level of satisfaction.

OCB is defined as a "discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee's formal job requirement but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (Robbins, 2001).

Organ (1990) described five categories of OCB:

(1) conscientiousness means that employees carry out in role behaviors (i.e., individual task performance) well beyond the minimum required levels;

(2) altruism implies that they give help to others;

(3) civic virtue suggests that employees responsibly participate in the political life of the organization;

(4) sportsmanship indicates that people do not complain, but have positive attitudes;

(5) courtesy means that they treat others with respect.

According to an article by Zhou and George (2001), prior theory and research suggest that employees respond to job dissatisfaction in one of four ways: exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect (Farrel, 1983; Hirschman, 1970; Rusbult *et al.*, 1988). First, and consistent with the turnover literature, dissatisfied employees may quit an organization all together in response to their job dissatisfaction (exit). Second, dissatisfied employees may choose to remain in their organization and actively try to improve conditions, actively searching for and coming up with new ways of doing things and advocating changes to make things better (voice). Third, employees may remain in the organization but respond passively to their job dissatisfaction by accepting the status quo without raison any objections or making any suggestion for improvements (loyalty). Lastly, employees may remain with the organization and exhibit passive withdrawal behaviors such as putting forth less effort (neglect). The literature refers more to continuance commitment rather than employee citizenship. There appears to be little correlation between job dissatisfaction and employee citizenship.

Zhou and George (2001), suggest that within the context of job dissatisfaction, leaving a job is a real option for dissatisfied employees, and when employees respond to dissatisfaction with exit, their potential to be creative in the focal organization and make improvements is negated. However, exit will not be a viable option for employees when high costs are associated with leaving and they are aware of theses. These costs can include inability to find alternative employment opportunities, being tied to a limited geographical area, inability to replicate job benefits elsewhere, and loss of job security. When the costs of quitting are perceived to be too high, dissatisfied employees often feel that staying in the organization if the better choice. Under these conditions, the employees are committed to their organization, not on the basis of affective attachment or identification with organizational values and goals, but rather because of necessity. This type of commitment has been referred to as "continuance commitment" (Allen and Meyer, 1996).

Continuance commitment ensures that employees do not resort to exit in response to their dissatisfaction and ensure that organization members remain their organizations despite being dissatisfied or discontented. Dissatisfied employees who stay in an organization because of continuance commitment have two alternative responses to their job dissatisfaction in addition to voice or creativity: loyalty and neglect.

Voice and creativity are active responses and loyalty and neglect are passive responses to job dissatisfaction (Farrel, 1983).

The fundamental difference between the two types of active response, exit and voice is that exit can be destructive to an organization, whereas voice is constructive (LePine and Van Dyne, 1998). An employee's quitting (exit) does not help an organization to correct the existing problems and may be a loss of valuable human resources for it.

Discontentment or dissatisfaction can lead employees to seek out improvements, but only if they respond to their dissatisfaction in an active, rather than a passive manner. Therefore "voice" not only enables organizations to channel employee job dissatisfaction into a positive desire for change, but also helps them correct existing problems and make improvements (Hirschman, 1970).

Some literature does show that there is a correlation between employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship. A meta-analysis showed that citizenship behaviors correlated with job satisfaction, perceived fairness, organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness (Organ and Ryan, 1995).

Finally, according to Robbins (2001), there is a modest overall relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. But when fairness is controlled for, satisfaction is unrelated to OCB. Basically, job satisfaction is interpreted by conceptions of fair outcomes, treatment, and procedures. If you don't feel that your supervisor, the organization's procedures, or pay policies are fair, your job satisfaction is likely to suffer significantly. However, when you perceive organizational processes and outcomes to be fair, trust is developed. When you trust your employer, you're more willing to voluntarily engage in behaviors that go beyond your formal job requirement.

To summarize, although some literature suggests there may be a correlation between employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship, while some suggest there is also a correlation between job dissatisfaction and organizational citizenship if dissatisfaction is expressed in an active matter. Finally, some literature suggests that if no fairness is perceived, there is no correlation between job satisfaction and OCB since trust must be present to influence organizational citizenship. An analysis of the problem will be presented next.

Problem analysis
The data analyzes to test the hypotheses were performed in two phases presented:

(1) *Phase 1 – quantitative and descriptive data results.* Each survey was reviewed to obtain an overall assessment level of each variable independently. Both quantitative as well as descriptive data were analyzed and considered. Each of the variables measured was assessed. In the following sections the measurement used for each variable will be presented with the quantitative results and the descriptive results in the hypothesis. Each variable average was measured utilizing the following scale:

  · below 40 percent – low;
  · between 40 and 70 percent – medium;
  · above 70 percent – high.

(2) *Phase 2 – correlations amongst the variables of hypotheses were performed.* For each hypothesis, a positive correlation was apparent if both situations were present:

- if the quantitative data showed a correlation, for each hypothesis, of positive 70 percent; or if the calculated correlation coefficient was close to 1; and
- if the descriptive results supported the quantitative results in the same direction.

Analysis of variables – phase 1

Each measurement used to define each variable is described in this section as well as the result of data gathering for each variable independently of the others.

Employee satisfaction

A person with high job satisfaction holds positive attitude towards the job while the person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job (Robbins, 2001). The two most widely used approaches to measuring job satisfaction are single global rating and summarization scores of job facets. The analysis focused on the latter measurement. The following qualifications were employed to measure job satisfaction (Robbins, 2001):

- nature of the work;
- supervision;
- present pay;
- promotion opportunities;
- relation with co worker.

Each qualification was measured and averaged as a percentage. All qualifications were given the same weight of importance and an overall average of employee satisfaction was obtained as an average percentage. Moreover, descriptive data was observed to analyze the current employee satisfaction perception (see Table I).

Moreover, a visit to the North American headquarters resulted in some descriptive analysis of employee satisfaction. The observations shown in Table II were made via interviews.

OCB

OCB is discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee's formal job requirement but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Employees who engage in "good citizenship" engage in the following behavior (Robbins, 2001):

- make constructive statement about their workgroup and the organization;

- avoid unnecessary conflicts;
- help others in their team;
- volunteer for extra job activity;
- respect spirit and letter of rules and regulations;
- gracefully tolerate occasional work related impositions and nuisances.

Each behavior was measured and averaged to a percentage. All were given the same weight of importance and an overall average of employee satisfaction was obtained as an average percentage. Moreover, descriptive data was observed to analyze the current employee level of engagement in organizational behavior according to these qualifications (see Table III).

	Satisfaction	Dissatisfaction
# measure	20	20
Average (%)	58	18
Overall	Medium	Low
Quantitative conclusion: Employee satisfaction is medium but employee dissatisfaction is low		

Table I.
Measure of satisfaction – quantitative summary

Variable	Observation
Nature of work	The employees seem to enjoy performing their work. e.g. smiling, welcoming
Supervision	The visit permitted the team to observe relations between employees and their manager. When the manager was explaining a task function, the employee helped him explain with respect and enjoyment
Present pay	Not observed
Promotion opportunities	The manager performing the visit was promoted from prior position
Relation with co worker	The work seems group focused and cooperation was observed

Table II.
Measure of satisfaction – descriptive

	Agree (strong OCB)	Disagree (weak OCB)
# measure	7	7
Average (%)	68	12
Overall	Medium but closer to high	Low
Quantitative conclusion: OCB is medium but closer to high end		

Table III.
Measure of OCB – quantitative summary

Moreover, a visit to the North American office resulted in this descriptive analysis of OCB. The observations shown in Table IV were made via interviews.

Leadership style

The three dimensions of leadership styles were evaluated. The first two dimensions were as defined by the managerial grid of Blake and Moulton (1983). Although this theory is dated and traditional, the usefulness of the two dimensions for data collection was used in this case where the following dimensions were adopted from the University of Michigan studies:

- *Concern for people*. One who emphasizes interpersonal relations: "They take personal interest in the needs of their employee and accept individual differences among members" (Robbins, 2001).

- *Concern for production*. One who emphasizes technical or tasks aspects of the job. Main concern is in accomplishing their group's task and group members are a mean to and end (Robbins, 2001).

- *Development-oriented dimension*. The third dimension was defined as development-oriented. The leader values experimentation, seeking new ideas and generating and implementing change (Robbins, 2001).

Each dimension was measured and averaged to a percentage. All dimensions were given the same weight of importance. The first two dimensions were plotted on a managerial grid to obtain a leadership style and a focus on the third dimension was added. Moreover, descriptive data was observed to analyze the current leadership style according to these dimensions.

Finally, research suggests there is needed consideration for situational factors that influence success or failure of leadership style (see Table V). This

Variable	Observation
Make constructive statement about their workgroup and the organization	The visit demonstrated that when people were explaining their job function, they were proud of working for the firm
Avoid unnecessary conflicts	Not observed
Help others in their team	Yes. The function in the plant required cooperation and cooperation was observed
Volunteer for extra job activity	There is no formal volunteering program in the plant. NA
Respect spirit and letter of rules and regulations	Yes, the plant is very clean according to standards. Observation was that people were very polite and respectful
Gracefully tolerate occasional work related impositions and nuisances	This was observed by the fact that the visit to the plant was received as positive; not a nuisance by the ones performing the visit

Table IV.
Measure of OCB –
descriptive

led to measurement of the situation under which the management style is operating using the Fiedler model (Fiedler, 1965). This theory suggests that effective groups depend upon proper match between a leader's style of interacting with subordinates and the degree to which the situation gives control and influence to the leader (Robbins, 2001). Fiedler defined three contingency dimensions that, defines key situational factors that determine leadership effectiveness. These are:

- *leader member relations*: degree of confidence trust and respect members have in their leaders;
- *tasks structure* – degree to which job assignments are procedures (structured);
- *position power* – degree influence a leader has over power variables.

Moreover, a visit to the North American plant presented some descriptive analysis of leadership style. The observations in Tables VI and VII were made via interviews.

Corporate culture
Culture is a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguishes the organization from other organizations. How do we read an organization's culture? According to Robbins (2001), there are seven primary characteristics that, in aggregate, capture the essence of an organization's culture:

(1) *innovation and risk taking:* the degree to which employees are encouraged to be innovative and take risk;

(2) *attention to details:* the degree to which employee are expected to exhibit precision, analysis, and attention to detail;

(3) *outcome orientation:* the degree to which management focuses on results or outcomes rather than the techniques and processes used to achieve these outcomes;

	Concern for people		Concern for production		Concern for development	
	Agree	Do not agree	Agree	Do not agree	Agree	Do not agree
# measure	7		5		2	
Averag (%)	43	32	50	24	54	21
Overall	Medium but close to low	Low	Medium but close to low	Low	Medium	Low

Quantitative conclusion: Leadership style is not a strong concern for the employee in general. It is for those working in production

Variable	Measure
Concern for people	This was perceived high at the visit. When people arrived for the visit, without knowing why they were there, people were opening doors and welcoming their arrival. But asking questions about company rituals suggested the company does not encourage humanistic approaches. Birthdays and service anniversary's are not celebrated as a norm
Concern for production	This was observed to be high as style. For example, the plant visit was made by the plant manager. His speech focused on production levels and how proud he was of how he handled production problems and quantities met. None of his team members were brought to the visit not mentioned. The company is also certified in various process certification (ISO 9002) and when audited has high scores
Development oriented	When asked about training, it was observed that no formal training plan is in place although there is a budget for training at the discretion of manager. There appears to be some intention from upper management to employ a more development oriented style since consulting firms are engaged to assess culture and help recommend changes to improve

Table VI.
Measure of leadership – observation

(4) *people orientation:* the degree to which management decisions take into consideration the effect of outcomes on people within the organization;

(5) *team orientation:* the degree to which work activities are organized around teams rather than individual;

(6) *aggressive:* the degree to which people are aggressive and competitive rather than easygoing;

(7) *stability:* the degree to which organization activities emphasize maintaining the status quo in contrast to growth.

From these primary characteristics, Harrison's (1992) culture definitions were utilized to identify the current and preferred culture. According to Harrison, the four alternative cultures are: power, role, achievement, and the support orientation.

The power-oriented organization is based on inequality of access to resources. The people in power use resources to satisfy or frustrate the needs of other and, thus, to control others behavior. Leadership resides in the person of the leader(s) and rest on the leader's ability and willingness to administer rewards and punishments. People in power-oriented organizations are motivated by rewards and punishments and to be associated with a strong leader. In the power organization at its best, leadership is based on strength, justice, and paternalistic benevolence on the part of the leader. At

Variable	Description	Observation	Quantitative results	Overall
Leader-member relation	The degree of confidence, trust and respect members have in their leader	None	Low trust is observed	Poor
Task structure	The degree to which the job assignments are procedures	Job process are structure	None	High
Position power	The degree of influence leader has over power variable such as hiring, firing, disciplines, promotions, salary increase	When asked how jobs are structured, the VP described the level of management as low. Many approvals are required to perform these power variables	None	Weak

Quantitative conclusion: The situation reveals the organization has poor leader member relations, a high task structure and weak in terms of power. According to the Fiedler model, the appropriate leadership style for such a situation is a medium task oriented leadership style (i.e. medium concern for production) and a medium relation oriented leadership style (i.e. medium concern for people). This is close to the current leadership style observed in the organization under study

Table VII.
Measure of situation
proportional to
leadership

its worst, the power-oriented organization tends toward a rule by fear, with abuse of power for personal advantage on the leaders, their friends, and their protégés.

The values of the role orientation culture are order, dependability, rationality, and consistency. A well-designed system of roles (a bureaucracy) in which performance is organized by structures and procedures, rather than personally controlled by the leader, permits work to be reliably directed at a distance, so that large, complex organizations can be created and managed. At its best, the role-oriented organization provides stability, justice, and efficient performance. The weakness of role organizations is in the very impersonality that is their strength.

The achievement-oriented organization culture has been called the aligned organization because it "lines people up" behind a common vision or purpose. This type of organization is frequently under-organized: it relies on high motivation to overcome its deficiencies in structures, systems, and planning. People's needs are subordinate to the organization's mission and its needs. Under stress, organization members may withdraw into an idealistic fantasy world, losing touch with the realities of competition, customer needs, and the business environment.

The support culture may be defined as an organizational climate that is based on mutual trust between the individual and the organization. In such an organization, people believe that they are valued as human beings, not just as cogs in a machine or contributors to a task. Like achievement organizations, support-oriented organizations assume that people want to contribute. Rather than evoking their contribution through a common purpose or ideal (a doing culture), the support-oriented organization offers its members satisfactions that are derived from relationships: mutuality, belonging, and connection (a being culture). The weakness of the support culture is the negative component of its humanistic strengths. Organizations in which the support culture is both strong and unbalanced tend toward conflict avoidance: in the interests of harmony, difficult issue is swept under the rug.

Tables VIII and IX summarize the actual and preferred culture as a result of the survey.

Existing culture

Power is by far the dominant culture in the company and this is confirmed by the highest score on this characteristic (43.9 on average).

Another important aspect of the survey is the dominance of "role" (42 on average).

Achievement is the third preference as a culture orientation factor but is still quite high and is relatively close to the two previous characteristic (38 on average).

A role that is clearly inferior of the entire previous ones is "support' (26 on average) that yields a clearer picture of the company style.

The culture-index (E-index) scores are a useful way to summarize the four scales. By adding achievement and support and subtracting those on the power and role scales, a measure that reflects the general level of empowerment, trust, and cooperation within the organization can be ascertained. Considering that this index is highly negative (-21.8 on average) it appears that empowerment, trust and cooperation are quite poor in the existing culture.

Preferred culture
Regarding the preferred culture it appears that people respond negatively toward power and would like to see a drastic reduction in this variable (average 23.5) which is about 20 point below the actual culture. People are consistent with the role culture but they want to experience an increase regarding achievement. This is the most critical goal in the preferred culture (average 50.7 on average). The survey suggests a need for a relevant change versus a support culture (average 39.4) which is 14 points higher than the actual.

Considering in this case the culture index, it appears there is a positive index (+30. P-index) and this supports a significant need of the people for more trust, cooperation and empowerment.

The organization needs to reduce some of its power and role orientation in favor of achievement and support. The company and its management need to develop the ability to empower people, create cooperation, team spirit and trust.

Trust
Trust is the perception of confidence and fairness by employees towards their superiors and is a positive expectation that another will not act

Variable	Measure (actual)	Measure (preferred)
Power	High	Much lower
Support	Low	Higher
Role	High	A little lower
Achievement	Medium	Higher

Table VIII.
Measure of culture – quantitative summary

	Existing culture					Preferred culture				
	E-power	E-role	E-achiev.	E-support	E-index	P-power	P-role	P-achiev.	P-support	P-index
Member average	43.9	42	38.1	26	-21.8	23.5	36.4	50.7	39.4	30.2

Table IX.
Measure of culture – quantitative summary

opportunistically (Robbins, 2001). The five trust dimensions as described in (Robbins, 2001) include:

- integrity refers to honesty and truthfulness;
- competence encompasses an individual's technical and interpersonal knowledge and skills;
- consistency relates to an individual's reliability, predictability and good judgment in handling situations;
- loyalty is the willingness to protect and save face for another person;
- openness is defined as whether you can rely on that person to give you the truth.

Interviews and observations illuminated descriptive findings to measure the current trust level according to these dimensions and conclusions are shown in Tables X and XI.

Analysis of correlation – phase 2

Each independent variable was correlated with the dependent variable. A positive correlation was concluded if both criteria were met:

- if the quantitative data showed a positive correlation for each hypothesis of positive 70 percent; or if the calculated correlation coefficient was close to 1; and

	Agree (strong trust)	Disagree (weak trust)
# measure	14	14
Average (%)	54	25
Overall	Medium	Low
Quantitative conclusion: Trust level is medium but closer to being low		

Table X.
Measure of trust – quantitative summary

Variable	Observation
Integrity	The level of trust seems low when it is perceived that the only way to obtain a promotion is to be linked to home office
Competence	The trust level was not observed do to lack of communication from upper management. For example, the plant manager felt the VP did not utilize face to face or direct communication with plant employees to inform them of company direction more frequently
Consistency	Not observed
Loyalty	Not observed
Openness	Not observed

Table XI.
Measure of trust – descriptive

- if the descriptive results supported the quantitative results in the same
  direction.

Conclusion H1a
All variables above at the medium range did not meet the requirement to
conclude there is a positive correlation between these (see Table XII). There is
not enough evidence to observe a direct link between leadership style and job
satisfaction with the quantitative data.

The Fiedler model suggests that the current leadership style in GAMMA is
appropriate for the situation of poor leader member relations, high task
structure and weak in terms of power. The situation calls for a medium task
oriented and medium people oriented leadership style which is in place today in
ALFA.

Conclusion H1b
Power and role culture variables are high but employee satisfaction is medium
(see Table XIII). There is not enough evidence to observe a direct link between
culture and job satisfaction with the quantitative data according to the criteria.

It can be observed that there is a discrepancy between the current culture
and preferred culture. This suggests people prefer a different culture then the
one in place.

An initial conclusion is that if the organization moves towards the preferred
culture, satisfaction should increase. Although, the possibility exists that
another preferred culture would be identified when the culture is changed, it
appears improved satisfaction would never be reached.

Variable	Measure	People oriented	Task oriented	Development oriented	Situation
Job satisfaction	Medium (58 percent satisfied)	Medium (43 percent agree, 32 percent disagree)	Medium (50 percent agree, 24 percent disagree)	Medium (54 percent agree, 25 percent disagree)	Poor High Weak
Job dissatisfaction	Low (18 percent dissatisfied)				

Table XII.
H1a: impact of
leadership on job
satisfaction and
dissatisfaction

Variable	Measure	Power	Role	Achievement	Support
Job satisfaction (actual)	Medium (58 percent satisfied)	High	High	Medium	Low
Job satisfaction (preferred)	Medium (58 percent satisfied)	Lower	A little lower	Higher	Higher

Table XIII.
H1b: impact of culture
on job satisfaction

Conclusion H1c

Trust and employee satisfaction variables above are medium and therefore do not meet the requirement to conclude there is a positive correlation between these (see Table XIV). Moreover, the correlation coefficient calculated amongst the employee satisfaction question results and the trust question results show a near 0 correlation factor. There is not enough evidence to link trust with employee satisfaction with the quantitative data according to the criteria.

Conclusion H2

Employee satisfaction and OCB variables above are not as high (over 70 percent) as the criteria required (see Table XV). *H2* therefore does not meet the requirement to conclude there is a positive correlation between these. Moreover, the correlation coefficient calculated amongst the employee satisfaction question results and the OCB question results show a near 0 correlation factor. There is not enough evidence to observe a direct link between job satisfaction and OCB with the quantitative data according to the criteria.

Results

A summary of the quantitative, descriptive results as well as literature results in GAMMA study and relevant discussion of the differences between the various conclusions observed is presented.

Data (quantitative and descriptive) summary – individual variables

Although the quantitative data analysis shows medium employee satisfaction and medium organizational behavior levels, the descriptive field visit observed higher levels of employee satisfaction and organizational behavior via the

Variable	Measure	Trust (agree)	Lack of trust (disagree)
Job satisfaction	Medium (58 percent satisfied)	Medium (54 percent)	Lower (25 percent)
Job dissatisfaction	Low (18 percent dissatisfied)		

Note: Correlation between job satisfaction and trust on agreement = −0.002911614 (no correlation)

Table XIV.
H1c: impact of trust on job satisfaction

Variable	Low	OCB high	OCB low
Job satisfaction – low	Medium (58 percent satisfied)	High (68 percent)	Low (12 percent)
Job satisfaction – high	Low (18 percent dissatisfied)		

Note: Correlation between job satisfaction and organization citizenship on agreement = −0.006791116 (no correlation)

Table XV.
H2: impact of job satisfaction on OCB

interviews (see Table XVI). Moreover, although the quantitative data analysis showed medium concern for people leadership style, the descriptive filed visit observed higher concern for a people leadership style present in ALFA. Finally, although the quantitative data showed a medium level of trust, the observed field visit to GAMMA revealed a perception of lower trust levels.

In summary, there is a noticeable difference between observed variable levels and the quantified data results from the survey.

Data and literature summary – hypothesis correlations
Although the quantitative data correlation measures do not indicate correlation support for the hypotheses, the literature is congruent with some correlations identified in the hypotheses (see Table XVII). There appears to be a link between trust and employee satisfaction and employee satisfaction and OCB.

Alternatives and recommendations
In order to fulfill the objective to determine how trust, leadership style and culture should or should not be changed to enhance employee satisfaction of OCB in light of the results, the following recommendations to management include:

· do not change current leadership style;

· develop action plan to increase trust;

Variable	Number of measures	Average agree	Average disagree	Preferred	Descriptive observation
Job satisfaction	20	58 medium	18 low		High
OCB	7	68 medium	12 low		Medium to high
Leadership style	14				
Concern people		43 medium	32 medium		High
Concern production		50 medium	24 low		High
Concern development		54 medium	21 low		Medium to low
Leadership situation					Not observed
Leader-member		Poor		Medium concern for production and medium concern for task	
Task structure		High			
Position power		Weak			
Trust	14	54 medium	25 Low		Low
Org. culture					Not observed
Power	10	High		Much Lower	
Support		Low		Higher	
Role		High		A little lower	
Achievement		Medium		Higher	

Table XVI. Result summary – quantitative and descriptive variables

Hypothesis	Direct impact of variable	Conclusions re: correlation – quantitative	Conclusions re: correlation – literature review
H1a: impact of leadership style on job satisfaction	Job satisfaction	No	No consensus. Leadership style needs to be appropriate for the right situation
H1b: impact of trust on job satisfaction	Job satisfaction	No	Yes. Positive correlation. Best with cognition based trust
H1c: impact of organizational culture on job satisfaction	Job satisfaction	Weak link	No consensus. Weak link if right culture encourages employee satisfaction
H2: impact of job satisfaction on OCB	OCB	No	Yes. Some suggest positive or negative correlation depending on means to express dissatisfaction and level of trust present

Table XVII.
Result summary –
quantitative
correlations and
literature review
correlations

- develop action plan to move from current culture to preferred expressed culture;
- still aim to improve employee satisfaction even if the observed level is medium to high.

When alternatives are proposed, a set of criteria for decision making is used and one alternative is recommended as a first step to the other alternatives utilizing the variables under study.

Leadership style
Neither the literature review nor the quantitative data suggest a strong direct correlation between leadership style and employee satisfaction. Considering that the level of employee satisfaction was measured at the medium level in the quantitative analysis, it is recommended to management to maintain the current leadership style. Moreover, in accordance with the Fiedler model, the current leadership style is optimal for the observed level of leader member relations, task structure and position of power. This recommendation assumes that the level of leader member relations, task structure and position of power remains unchanged in the organization and that the now classical Fiedler model is appropriately predicting the leadership style as appropriate.

Level of trust
The quantitative data results indicated no correlation between trust and employee satisfaction. However, it was observed to be medium to high. This suggests management should continue to focus upon increasing employee

satisfaction by increasing trust. This recommendation is supported by the fact that the literature suggests a positive relationship between the two variables. The corporate management should proactively ensure employee satisfaction to prepare for eventual reduction of satisfaction. Moreover, increasing trust level might enhance other dependent variables.

The following alternatives are considered to increase the level of trust:

- *Alternative 1*. Use a coach approach. According to Tracy *et al.* (2001), managers need to assume a "coach approach" in their management style in order to develop and maintain trust among their employees.

- *Alternative 2*. Increase communication. Guilbert and Tang (1998) found a strong positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational communication. They suggest that formal, but even more important informal, access to organizational communication channels enhances organizational trust.

- *Alternative 3*. Training on increasing trust. Informal between manager and subordinates.

- *Alternative 4*. Increase empowerment. The significant effects of access to empowerment enhance perceptions of trust in management. These are consistent with expectations discussed 25 years ago by Kanter's (1977) theory and the recent findings of other research linking trust to open communication and information sharing, increased employee decisional involvement, and supportive leadership practices.

- *Alternative 5*. Increase accessibility of management. When management is available to their staff, relationships are personalized. Strong and stable organizations have leadership that is approachable and caring. This message is reinforced through the manager's actions as and words. An employee, who feels respected and treated fairly, will not only trust management, but the organization as well.

Corporate culture change
Neither the quantitative data results nor literature showed a strong positive correlation between culture and employee satisfaction. Despite the fact that observations found medium to high current employee satisfaction, it is felt management should change the culture from the existing one to the preferred culture increasing employee satisfaction.

This recommendation is based on the fact that moving to the expressed culture will increase employee satisfaction and possibly trust level since management will have taken those actions expressed by employees.

The following alternatives are recommended to change the culture intended to lower power and enhance achievement and support levels:

- *Alternative 1: rewards team activity rather than individual activity.*

- *Alternative 2: communicate the finding of the cultures survey and explain the action plan.* This develops trust since people feel empowered as actors of change. They actually see that what they expressed in the survey became the action plan.
- *Alternative 3: communicate over and over again the vision and the mission of the company.* People need to see and share the goal. Value embedded in the mission has to be larger than mere profit and growth. In pursuing the mission, organization members need to believe they are making a contribution to society as well as gaining something for the company.
- *Alternative 4: celebrate events together (promotion, retirements, birthday, etc.).* Develop a sense of camaraderie through external activities where people interact spontaneously.
- *Alternative 5: view failure as something to learn from, rather than a sign of personal inadequacy.* Reward risk taking independently from the result.

Selection of alternatives

The following five criteria were employed to select the appropriate recommendation. Each criterion was weighed with the same level of importance. Each alternative is valued on a scale of 1 to 5 as being congruent with the criteria (Level 5) to not fitting well with the criteria (Level 1). The higher the overall cumulative score of an alternative, the more effective the recommended alternative is.

The criteria are:

- easy to implement (within one year);
- cost low (low = below $50 and 100K$);
- effect sustainable (not one shot deal);
- effect: does change impacts many people, groups;
- radical change, its progressive.

As can be seen form Table XVIII, alternative 5, increase accessibility of management, is recommended to be implemented first but all alternatives should be implemented successively per required needs.

As can be seen from Table XIX, alternative 1, reward team activity rather than individual activity, is recommended to be implemented first but all alternatives should be implemented successively to fulfill the case study objectives.

Conclusion of case study

Results suggested that although the perception was that employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship were low (from the exploratory research), both quantitative and descriptive data indicated these were not, and scored between medium to high. Although employees do not seem very satisfied (average is not above 70 percent), they are not dissatisfied (average below 20 percent).

Observation (via interviews) also found this to be valid. This suggests that these might not be the variables that management should concentrate on improving.

Although some literature suggests that there might be a correlation between employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship, research suggests there is also a correlation between job dissatisfaction and organizational citizenship if dissatisfaction is expressed in an active matter. Finally, some literature suggests that if a lack of fairness is perceived, there is no correlation between job satisfaction and OCB since trust must be present to influence organizational citizenship.

Moreover, the hypotheses were not conclusively supported quantitatively. High trust was not obtained. Also a specific high leadership style and a specific culture resulting in high employee satisfaction were also questionable. Moreover, it was not observed that a strong correlation existed statistically. *H1* is therefore not conclusive quantitatively. *H2* does not demonstrate a high level of employee citizenship and employee satisfaction correlation.

Despite these results, it is recommended corporate management employ the following action plan:

· do not change current leadership style;

· develop an action plan to increase trust starting with increasing accessibility of management to employees;

· develop an action plan to move from current culture to preferred expressed culture starting by rewarding team activity rather than individual activities;

· improve employee satisfaction even if the observed level is medium to high.

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Alternative 1	3	3	3	3	3	15
Alternative 2	4	4	4	5	2	19
Alternative 3	3	2	2	2	3	12
Alternative 4	3	3	2	4	2	14
Alternative 5	5	4	3	5	3	20

Table XVIII.
Trust level – rating

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Alternative 1	5	5	3	4	5	22
Alternative 2	5	5	3	4	3	20
Alternative 3	4	5	3	3	4	19
Alternative 4	5	5	2	4	5	21
Alternative 5	4	4	4	5	3	20

Table XIX.
Corporate culture
change – rating

Further actions
There is an important lack of trust and communications found through quantitative measures and observation. It is further recommended to focus on improving communication in the North American operation. Further investigation is recommended to support the following hypothesis: improved trust and communication are needed to increase employee satisfaction and organizational citizenship.

The ability to communicate effectively is perhaps one of the most valuable attributes a manager can possess (Smith, 1998). Research indicates a common theme between communication and employee satisfaction: the less the uncertainty, the greater the satisfaction. Distortions, ambiguities and incongruities all increase uncertainty and hence a negative impact on satisfaction (Slatter, 1984). The less distortion that occurs in communication, the clearer the goals will be. In essence, feedback and other management messages to employees will be received as they were intended.

Evidence also demonstrates a positive relationship between effective communication and worker productivity. Additionally, communication plays a significant role in determining the level of employee motivation (Robbins, 2001).

Consequently, there is a strong case for leaders and managers to convey honest and accurate information to employees in order to ensure the company's success.

Alternatives available to management to enhance communications with employees are:

· *alternative 1:* implement a newsletter from all management to disseminate information;

· *alternative 2:* perform a regular event company picnic for all managers, non-manager and mix plant. informal activity;

· *alternative 3:* communicate survey result at least once a year to all employees with plan to address results;

· *alternative 4:* perform a face to face meeting to all managers to report on business plan each year;

· *alternative 5:* ensure more personal one-on-one meetings occur between upper management and employees.

As can be seen from Table XX, alternative 5, intended to ensure more personal one on one meeting to occur between upper management and employees, is

Alternatives	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Alternative 1	5	5	4	4	4	22
Alternative 2	5	5	2	4	5	21
Alternative 3	5	4	3	3	3	18
Alternative 4	5	5	4	4	5	23
Alternative 5	5	5	5	5	5	25

Table XX.
Alternatives available to management to enhance communications with employees – rating

recommended to be implemented initially. However, all alternatives should be implemented in lock step fashion as they were prioritized via the criteria and description of the problem in need of resolution at the start of this case study.

References

Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1996), "Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: an examination of construct validity", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 49, pp. 252-76.

Appelbaum, S.H. and Donia, M. (2001a), "The realistic downsizing preview: a multiple case study: methodology and results of data collection (part I)", *Career Development International*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 128-48.

Appelbaum, S.H. and Donia, M. (2001b), "The realistic downsizing preview: a multiple case study: analysis of RDP model: results of data collected and proposed new model (part II)", *Career Development International*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 193-211.

Appelbaum, S.H., Abdallah, C. and Shapiro, B. (1999a), "The self-directed team: a conflict resolution analysis", *Team Performance Management Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 60-77.

Appelbaum, S.H., Hebert, D. and Leroux, S. (1999b), "Empowerment: power, culture and leadership – a strategy or fad for the millennium?", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 11 No. 7, pp. 233-54.

Atchison, T.A. (1999), "The myths of employee satisfaction", *Healthcare Executive*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 18-23.

Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1983), *Consultation: A Handbook for Industrial and Organizational Development*, Addison-Wesley Publishers, Reading, MA, pp. 564-5.

Crow, S.M. and Hartman, S.J. (1995), "Can't get no satisfaction", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 34-41.

Farrel, D. (1983), "Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: a multidimensional scaling study", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp. 596-607.

Fiedler, F.E. (1965), "Engineering the job to fit the manager", *Harvard Businesss Review*, Vol. 43, pp. 115-22.

Guilbert, J.-A. and Tang, L.P.T. (1998), "An examination of organizational trust antecedents", *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 27, pp. 321-5.

Hagen, A.F. and Morsheda, T.H. (1998), "Critical strategic leadership components: an empirical investigation", *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, Vol. 63 No. 3, pp. 39-44.

Harrison, R. and Stokes, H. (1992), *Diagnosing Organizational Culture*, Pfeiffer, San Francisco, CA.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kanter, R.L.M. (1977), *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Basic Books, New York, NY.

LePine, J.A. and Van Dyne, L. (1998), "Predicting voice behaviors in work groups", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 853-68.

Lypnack, J. and Stamps, J. (1997), *Virtual Teams: Reaching Across Space, Time, and Organizations With Technology*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY.

Organ, D.W. (1990), "The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 12, pp. 43-72.

Organ, D. and Ryan, K. (1995), "A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, Winter, pp. 775-803.

Pool, S.W. (1997), "The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation", *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 271-83.

Robbins, S.P. (2001), *Organizational Behavior*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Rusbult, C.E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G. and Mainous, A.G. (1988), "Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: an integrative model", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 31, pp. 599-627.

Savery, L.K. (1994), "Attitudes to work: the influence of perceived style of leadership on a group of workers", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 12-18.

Slatter, S. (1984), *Corporate Recovery*, Penguin Books, Harmandsworth.

Smith, W.J. (1998), "Turning toward growth: part I", *Empowerment in Organizations*, Vol. 6 No. 4, p. 110.

Staples, D.S. (2001), "A study of remote workers and their differences from non-remote workers", *Journal of End User Computing*, Vol. 13 No. 2, p. 3.

Tracy, D., Morin, W. and Whitney, J.O. (2001), *Truth, Trust and the Bottom Line*, Dearborn Trade, Chicago, IL.

Woolliams, P. and Moseley, T. (1999), "Organizational culture and job satisfaction", *Ciber Discussion Paper Series*, September, p. 26.

Yousef, D.A. (1996), "Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationship of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 6-24.

Zhou, J. and George, J.M. (2001), "When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: encouraging the expression of voice", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 1, p. 31.

Further reading

Brownell, E.O. (2000), "How to create organizational trust", *Manage*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 10-11.

Gambetta, D. (1988), "Can we trust?", in, *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*, Basil Blackwell, New York, NY, pp. 213-38.

Koys, D.J. (2001), "The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 54 No. 1, p. 14.

Laschinger, H.K.S. and Havens, D.S. (1996), "Staff nurse empowerment and perceived control over nursing practice", *Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 26 No. 9, pp. 27-35.

Laschinger, H.K.S., Finegan, J. and Shamian, J. (2001), "The impact of workplace empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment", *Health Care Management Review*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 7-23.

Lewis, J.D. and Weigert, A. (1985), "Trust as a social reality", *Social Forces*, Vol. 63, pp. 967-85.

Rothenberger, C. (2000), "Consulting culture: two companies uncovered", Fast Company Magazine.Com, Boston, MA.

Sabiston, J.A. and Laschinger, H.K.S. (1995), "Staff nurse work empowerment and perceived autonomy", *Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 25 No. 9, pp. 42-50.

USA Today (2001), "Developing manager-employee trust", *USA Today*, Vol. 130 No. 2675, pp. 7-8.