Narcissism as a Moderator of the Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Dr. Müge Leyla Yildiz
Marmara University
Department of Business Administration
Ressam Namık İsmail Sokak No:1
Bahçelievler Istanbul, Turkey

Dr. Ayla Zehra Öncer
Marmara University
Department of Business Administration
Ressam Namık İsmail Sokak No:1
Bahçelievler Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

Organizational citizenship behaviour is a positive concept in terms of both intent and outcome, so it is important to generate this behaviour for organizations. There are various antedencents of organizational citizenship behaviour and one of them is organizational trust. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour, and how narcissism effects this relation. The survey of this study is conducted on 190 employees of various companies in Turkey. The obtained data from the questionnaires are analysed through the SPSS statistical packaged software. Analyses results showed that organizational trust has significant positive effect on organizational citizenship behaviour, and this relation is moderated by narcissism in a negative way. The most striking result of the study is that narcissism generates unhealthy outcomes because of its negative effects as a moderator.

Key Words: Narcissism, organizational trust, organizational citizenship behaviour

1. Introductıon

Organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) is an important outcome for companies with its positive effects on employee's performance. Empirical studies generally support positive relationships between OCB and individual-level performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Werner, 1994), aggregated individual performance (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994), group-level measures of performance (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997), and organizational-level measures of performance (Walz & Niehoff, 2000).

The literature displays that improving organizational trust (OT) will have positive effects on organizational citizenship behaviour (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; Wong, Ngo, & Wong, 2006; Zeinabadia & Salehi, 2011). It was displayed that trust in organization (Robinson, 1996) and trust in co-workers (McAllister, 1995) have significant effects on OCB.

Although there were various studies examining several moderators on the relationship between OT and OCB, narcissism in organization has never been considered. Therefore, we choose narcissism as a moderating variable on this relationship.

In this context, the paper begins with a brief overview of OCB, OT and narcissism, then goes on to the development of hypothesis. We test the hypothesis if perceived OT affects OCB. Furthermore, we hypothesize that narcissism moderates the impact of OT on OCB. Research methodology, analyses results and research model is discussed and recommendation is provided for managers and academicians.

2. Theoretical Background and Hypotheses

2.1. Organizational Trust

Trust has been discussed in many areas such as communication (Giffin, 1967), social psychology (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Blau, 1964), sociology (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), international business (Inkpen &Currall, 1997), economy (Williamson, 1993), strategic management (Barney &Hansen, 1994), management by objectives (Scott, 1980), leadership (Atwater, 1988), negotiation (Bazerman, 1994), game theory (Milgrom & Roberts, 1992), labour-management relations (Taylor, 1989), organizational behaviour (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) and marketing (Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

The empirical study of trust began with Deutsch's (1958), and he defined trust in behavioural terms as "an individual may be said to have trust in the occurrence of an event if he expects its occurrence and his expectation leads to behaviour which he perceives to have greater negative motivational consequences if the expectation is not confirmed than positive motivational consequences if it is confirmed". Bhattacharya, Devinney, & Pillutla (1998) conceptualized trust as an expectancy of positive outcomes that one can receive, based on the expected action of another party in an interaction characterized by uncertainty. Subsequently, Barber (1983) characterized trust as "a set of socially learned and socially confirmed expectations that people have of each other, of the organizations and institutions in which they live, and of the natural and moral social orders that set the fundamental understandings of their lives". Scott (1980) mentioned that "trust is a positive force from which cooperation is derived".

As trust does not have a common definition in literature, there isn't a unity on the antecedents of trust as well. According to the several studies in literature, the antecedents of trust can be gathered as; competence, benevolence, vulnerability, honesty, trustworthiness, integrity, caring, openness, reliability, identity, integrity, perfection, consistency, loyalty, justice, respect, availability, fairness, receptivity and ability. Just like the antecedents, dimensions of trust also differentiate in literature. There are mainly three dimensions as; interpersonal trust (Scott, 1980; Cook & Wall, 1980; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995), supervisory trust (Deluga, 1995; Mishra & Morissey, 1990; Tan & Tan, 2000; Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001) and trust in organization (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis, & Winograd, 2000; Tan & Tan, 2000; Ellis et al., 2001). Although there are different forms of trust our focus in this study is on OT.

As Cook and Wall (1980) declared, OT is the major factor that shapes the organization's internal environment; they defined the term as "the extent to which one is willing to ascribe good intentions to and have confidence in the words actions of other people". Mayer et al. (1995) characterized the concept as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party". According to Gilbert & Tang (1998), "OT is the feeling of confidence and support in an employer; it refers to employee faith in corporate goal attachment and organizational leaders and to the belief that ultimately, organizational action will prove beneficial for employees". Tan & Tan (2000) defined OT as "the willingness of a subordinate to be vulnerable to the actions of his or her supervisor whose behaviour or actions he or she can't control". Hoy & Tschannen-Moran (2003) conceptualized OT as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open".

There are several theoretical and applied studies on trust. In these studies it has been seen that OT has significant relationships with many variables such as, communication, cooperation (Mishra & Morissey, 1990; Costigan, Ilter, & Berman, 1998), organizational justice (Hoy & Tarter, 2004), conflict (Zaheer, McEvily, & Perrone, 1997; De Reu, Giebels, & Van de Vliert 1998), organizational commitment (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996), leadership (Arnold, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001), organizational culture (Doney & Cannon, 1997), performance (Dirks, 1999; Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000), satisfaction (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Ward, 1997) and organizational climate (Tarter, Hoy, & Hoy, 1995). Previous studies showed that increased levels of OT have been seen to be in a relation with desired organizational outcomes such as increased organizational learning (Barker & Camarata, 1998), cooperation (Hardy, Phillips, & Lawrence, 1998), desire to change (Reinke, 2003) and taking responsibility (Nyhan, 2000), productivity, job satisfaction, as well as decreased absenteeism, turnover (Kath, Magley, & Marmet, 2010), and transaction costs (Curral & Judge, 1995).

2.2. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Organ and his colleagues first coined the term "organizational citizenship behaviour". Drawing on Chester Barnard's concept (Barnard, 1938) of the "willingness to cooperate", and using an open systems model, Katz & Kahn (1966) distinguished between dependable role performance and extra-role behaviour or innovative and spontaneous behaviours (Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Smith, Organ & Near (1983) and Katz (1964) proposed that to achieve effective organizational operation, employee willingness to remain with the organization, employee actions that surpass their job description, and employee proactive behaviour beyond job responsibilities (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012). Drawing upon these ideas, Organ (1988) described OCBs as self-initiated by employees. OCB are voluntary, going beyond the influence of the formal incentive mechanism (Organ, 1988, 1990; Smith et al. 1983). OCB are some behaviour of employees such as staying late, helping co-workers, performing at high level standards and being actively involved in company affairs (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In other words, employees surpass organizational requirements, not only performing their tasks or obligations but also doing voluntary actions beyond their work rules, helping others, making sacrifices (Organ, 1990). OCB cannot be spurred by formal rewards which mean the formal organizational reward system does not recognize the behaviour although it is certainly possible that OCB is noticed and rewarded (McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Spector & Fox, 2002). According to Graham (1991) OCB encompasses three components: organizational obedience, organizational loyalty, and organizational participation (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

OCB has suffered from a lack of consensus is the dimensionality of the construct. Among the various factor structures used to describe OCB, the most common are a two-factor (OCBI and OCBO by Williams & Anderson, 1991) a three-factor (OCBI, OCBO, and job/task conscientiousness by Coleman & Borman, 2000), and a five factor solution. The five-factor structure is composed of conscientiousness, courtesy, civic virtue, altruism, and sportsmanship (Organ, 1988; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991). The five-factor dimension is utilized in this study.

Although OCB, are in-or extra-role behaviours, classified by various researchers, the most common classification is into the following five dimensions by Organ (1988):

1. Altruism: opposed to egoism or selfishness, helping co-workers or personnel who have work related problems (Podsakoff et al., 2000),
2. Conscientiousness: going beyond job requirement through hard works, besides to complying with organizational rules,
3. Sportsmanship: obeying organizational regulations, tolerating imperfect situations without complaint (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012),
4. Courtesy: to respect for co-workers,
5. Civic virtue: displaying a sense of responsibility and commitment to the organization (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997).

Williams & Anderson (1991) created a two dimensional conceptualization of OCB consisting of OCB Individual (OCBI) and OCB Organization (OCBO), which categorizes OCB in terms of the target of the behaviour rather than the type of behaviour, as in previous conceptualizations of the construct (Gilbert, Laschinger, & Leiter, 2010). These two factor structure is composed of individually-directed (OCBI) and organizationally-directed (OCBO) citizenship behaviour. The OCBI (e.g., helping others) dimension has been suggested to benefit the supervisor; on the other hand the OCBO (e.g., voice behaviours) dimension can benefit the organization as a whole (both organization and supervisor). In addition, the OCBI dimension might include altruism (Williams & Anderson, 1991) whereas the OCBO dimension might entail civic virtue and sportsmanship (Coleman & Borman, 2000; Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007).

There are several theoretical and applied studies on OCB. In these studies it has been seen that OCB has significant relationships with many variables such as, personality (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Ryan, 1995), behaviour of the leader, manager or supervisor (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), employee attitudes towards the job and organization (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995), perceived justice and fairness (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993).

2.3. Narcissism in Workplace

The term narcissism comes from a story of a young man Narcissus, the son of the river god Cephissus and the nymph Liriope in Greek mythology. He falls in love with his own reflection in the water and as a result, his self-love causes his death. The term narcissism was first used as an expression "narcissus-like" by a psychologist Havelock Ellis in 1898. Then in 1899 Nacke summarized Ellis's article and used the term "narcissismus". Later in 1910 Freud studied the personality and behavioural traits of narcissists.

Nowadays, we use the term narcissism to describe a persuasive pattern of overt grandiosity, self-focus, and self-importance behaviour displayed by an individual or groups of individuals (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Narcissism is a term that a person who possesses an extreme self-love, a grandiose sense of self importance, and powerful sense of entitlement (Duchon & Drake, 2009). According to The Diagnostics and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders- DSM-IV (4th edition) by American Psychiatric Association, there are nine traits associated with narcissism. If any five of these traits are met, the person can be diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder. However, we don't analyse NPD which causes functional defect in his or her life.

The nature of managers is important because healthy and unhealthy manager behaviours become "contagious" and spread throughout the organization accordingly (Godkin & Alcorn, 2009a). Narcissism in workplace exists along a range from healthy to unhealthy. Healthy narcissism includes empathy to help master the interpersonal world, self-conscious emotions including shame and envy, and the sense of control and power. Positive self-esteem and self-regard involve the experience of inner autonomy and sense of control of thoughts, feelings, experiences and impulses [that occur within social norms]. According to Ronningstam (2005), healthy narcissism includes the ability to tolerate guilt and loneliness while also balancing feelings of separateness, superiority, and pride with feelings of belongingness, gratitude, and concern realistic self-appraisal abilities and limitations, an ability to tolerate criticism and rejection as well as approval and praise, grandiose fantasies that motivate achievement, an ability to internally control one's sense of power and constructive aggression, a balanced sense of entitlement relative to others, possession of empathy and compassion, an appreciation of commitment and mutuality, an ability to tolerate feelings of self-conscious emotions (envy, shame, pride) and inferiority and humiliation.

Healthy narcissism can improve organizational performance. (Godkin & Alcorn, 2009b) Talented narcissistic people possessing intellectual giftedness combined with grandiose fantasies and strong self-investment can experience sustained period of successful academic, professional or creative accomplishment. They can also periodically interpret tasks and events as opportunities to demonstrate their superiority (Godkin & Alcorn, 2009a). Narcissists are often highly successful in business; such situations reward those who can manipulate others.

According to King (2007), narcissists can also have a significant effect on the decision making process of an organization planning or faced with a crisis. During a crisis, an organization needs a leader who can promptly and effectively return a company to estate of normal operation. In essence, the crisis leader must be able to clearly and accurately assess the crisis, strategically plan a course of action and successfully implement that plan of action. In short, it's the crisis leader's goal to transform the organization from a stage of uncertainty to one of normalcy. Narcissists believe that they have a right to alter their positions and commitments as the circumstances or situations change thus, in a crisis situation narcissist will portray sings of sincerity and trustworthiness.

Organizations that employ healthy narcissistic employees with a healthy, authentic sense of self-value knowledge and awareness rather than denial, seeks justice and fair play rather than entitlement, and encourages self-confidence rather than self-aggrandizement. These organizations enhance and build the value of others in the organization and seek to maximize benefits for the largest number of people without exploitation. They are subject to uncertainties and anxieties, they make mistakes but are better able to cope with and adapt to these pressures. The healthy narcissistic managers are aware and proud of their strengths and, at the same time, they are aware of trying to overcome their weaknesses (Duchon & Burns, 2008). As we mentioned above, the contrast of healthy narcissism in workplace is unhealthy narcissism. Unhealthy narcissistic managers may have problems interacting with colleagues as well as communicating with lower-level staff and line workers. The result of such behaviour may cause the organization to fail to achieve a desired goal. Also, due to their arrogance, unrealistic vision, sense of entitlement, lack of concern for others' feelings and abilities, along with a constant desire to be in the limelight, narcissistic managers will find it difficult to work effectively in teams.

Not only due to their poor job at developing people, but their alienating subordinates as a result of their devaluation of others, insistence on having their own way, lack of empathy, and willingness to exploit others' (Lubit, 2002). Ronningstam's (2005) descriptors of unhealthy narcissism are summarized as inflated, vulnerable self-esteem, grandiosity, strong reactions to criticism, strong feeling of anger, shame, and envy, mood variations (depression, irritability, elation), arrogant and haughty attitude, compensatory fantasies of being special and perfect, extreme self-preoccupation, intense shame reactions and fear of failure, hyperactive and willing to expend limitless time and energy to succeed.

According to Maccoby (2004), narcissistic behaviours are bound to leave damaged systems and relationships in their wake because they damage organizational climate. Thus, it could be said that, in the long term narcissistic behaviours fail to create the climate necessary for achieving sustainable performance (Higgs, 2009).

Organizations that employ unhealthy narcissistic workers are entirely self-absorbed, out of touch and not reality based (Gregory, 1999). According to Stein (2003), narcissist employees will believe their organization to be extraordinarily special and unique. This belief does not reflect normal feelings of pride and accomplishment, but is instead highly exaggerated to the point of delusion. Second, a powerful sense of self-aggrandizement and entitlement leads to a kind of unconscious imperialism or an unconscious omnipotence. Third, the employees believe the organization to be omniscient; that is, it has access to all information, both internal and external which is relevant to the organization. As a result these attributes are so pervasive that they become permanently embedded in organizational functioning (Stein, 2003).

2.4. Development of Hypothesis

In several studies trust has been demonstrated as an important predictor of OCB (Deluga 1995; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Wong et al., 2006; Zeinabadia & Salehi, 2011; Aryee et al., 2002; Van Dyne, Vandawalle, Kostova, Latham, & Cummings, 2000; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Rubin et al., 2010).

Konovsky & Pugh (1994) declared that employees who trust their supervisor are more likely to engage in OCB. Podsakoff et al. (1990) argued trustworthy managers are likely to encourage subordinates to demonstrate OCB. Likewise, Pillai et al. (1999) displayed trust in leader mediates the relationship between leader behaviour and OCB. In addition, Van Dyne et al. (2000) demonstrated that propensity to trust has a positive relationship with subsequent organizational citizenship. In various studies it was manifested that trust building by leader (Deluga, 1995), trust in co-workers (McAllister, 1995) and trust in organization (Robinson, 1996) have positive effects on OCB.

Hence, we expect OT to be positively associated with the demonstration of OCB. Stated formally:

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Despite the rich history of theoretical and empirical support on trust and citizenship behaviour, narcissism has never been examined as a moderator in this relationship. However, the perception of trust and citizenship behaviour of the employees can be effected by the individuals' narcissist personality. Based on this paradigm, we can assume that narcissism in organization moderates the relationship between the OT and OCB. We therefore propose:

Hypothesis 2: The effect of organizational trust on organizational citizenship behaviour is moderated by narcissism.

3. Method

3.1. Purpose of the Paper

The primary aim of this study is to identify the impact of organizational trust on organizational citizenship behaviour, and to display the moderating effect of narcissism on the relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. In order to analyse the hypotheses, a survey using questionnaires was conducted.

3.2. Sample and Data Collection

The survey of this study was conducted on employees of different industries in Turkey by using coincidental sampling.

Data related to the narcissism, OT, and OCBs were obtained directly from the employees through the questionnaires, which mean primary source data were used in the research. 300 employees were contacted via email and asked to participate in the survey. A total of 260 questionnaires were returned, so the return rate of the research was %87. However, 70 of them were not usable, so 190 questionnaires were used in analysis (n=190). We analysed the data obtained from questionnaires through the SPSS statistical packet software (v.18), and proposed relations were tested through hierarchical regression analyses.

3.3. Measures and Reliabilities

In this study we used three different surveys mentioned below to measure our three variables determined as narcissism, OT and OCB.

The recent researches on narcissism rely on either a 40-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory (the NPI-40, Ruskin & Terry, 1988) or a 37-item measure (Emmons, 1987). In this paper we used NPI-16, a shorter measure, which was developed by Ames, Rose, and Anderson in 2006.

Tan & Tan (2000) define OT as relations with a variety of constituent groups in the organization whereas trust in the supervisor involves the day-to-day interaction between the supervisor and employee. Outcomes such as OCB, job satisfaction and performance are associated with the direct supervisor (DeConinck, 2010). Therefore we used Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI) developed by Cummings & Bromiley (1996) which measures an individual's level of trust in his or her supervisor and in his or her work organization as a whole. The original scale included 62 items; however their condensed version of the scale (Short Form) is more common. The short form that we used is a 12-item 5-point rating scale.

We adopted The OCB scale from Podsakoff et al. (1990) with 24 items (e.g. "Help others who have been absent"). The questionnaire was accompanied by a 7-point rating scales.

We used 1 Sample K-S test for testing normality in distribution; thus, parametric tests of significance were used in the study. For the reliability of these surveys, the Cronbach's alpha scores obtained are α= 0,933 for Organizational Trust Inventory after 5 items deleted, because of its negative effect on reliability, α= 0,902 for OCB scale after 3 items deleted, and α= 0,855 for Narcissism scale, which indicates that the scales are reliable. Validity of scales were analysed by their developers and used and tested in various studies by other researchers as well. Therefore these instruments are adequate and stable.

4. Results

The demographic questions related to the participants' sex, age, educational level, length of working time, and length of time working in their companies. Of the study participants, 56,8 % were male and 43,2 % were female. The participants had a mean of 32,55 years old, the median was 32, and the mode was 35. 52,6 % had a bachelor's degree, 28,4 % a master's degree, and 19 % the others. The participants had a mean of 10,08 years of experience in business. The median was 10 years and the mode was 12 years. They also had a mean of 4,76 years of experience in their own firm. The median was 4 and the mode was 3.

For testing hypothesis we analysed the impact of OT on OCB and added the moderator effect of narcissism. As a result of correlation analysis in Table 1 there is a positive relationship between OT and OCB (0,423, p=0,000), so H1 is supported. In addition there is a negative relationship between narcissism and OCB (-0,221, p=0,036).

Table 1: Correlations Between Variables

		OCB	OT	Narcissism
OCB	Pearson Correlation	1	,423[**]	-,221[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,036
	N	190	190	190
OT	Pearson Correlation	,423[**]	1	-,184
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,082
	N	190	190	190
Narcissism	Pearson Correlation	-,221[*]	-,184	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,036	,082	
	N	190	190	190

Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with its results presented in Table 2. It can be seen that OT has a significant effect on OCB (B=0,341, Sig=0,000), the regression equation is,

   OCB = 4,635 + 0,341 OT

   and OT explained 0,18 % of the variance in OCB. The regression coefficient is reasonable because there are many other variables which affect OCB.

In model 2, it is seen that narcissism has a negative role (B= -0,244, Sig=0,033) on the impacts of OT on OCB, total variation increased to 0,20 % and the regression equation is,

OCB = 5,311 + 0,319 OT - 0,244 Narcissism

Table 2: Coefficients[a]

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Rsquare	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
Model 1	(Constant)	4,635	,270		,179	,000		
	Trust	,341	,078	,423		,000	1,000	1,000
Model 2	(Constant)	5,311	,520		,200	,000		
	Trust	,319	,079	,396		,000	,966	1,035
	Narcissism	-,244	,161	-,148		,033	,966	1,035

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

As seen in Table 2, when narcissism included in the regression analysis, the significant effect of OT on OCB has decreased to 0,319. Thus, narcissism has moderating role on the impacts of OT on OCB. As a result it can be displayed that H2 is supported. According to the tolerance and VIF values, there is no collinearity between independent variables.

5. Conclusion

Our paper indicates the relationship among organizational trust, narcissism and organizational citizenship behaviour. It was the first time in literature that narcissism discussed as a moderator in the relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. The results show that narcissism has a significant impact on the effect of organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. In other words, it can be asserted that narcissism has a significant moderating role on the relationship between organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour. The correlation analysis results for testing hypothesis 1 showed that, there is a significant relationship between OT and OCB which was supported in related litareture as well (McAllister, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Dyne et al., 2000; Aryee et al., 2002; Wong et al., 2006; Zeinabadia & Salehi, 2011; Rubin et al., 2010).

Thus H1 hypothesis is supported. Besides, there is a statistically significant weak negative correlation between narcissism and OCB. Accordingly, increasing level of narcissism behaviour of employee decreases OCB. This result is reasonable because it is supported in literaure that narcissism also generates negative consequences in organizational outcomes.

According to the hierarchical regression results for testing hypothesis 2; OT affects OCB moderately which is seen in model 1. The reason for such a moderate regression coefficient is that there are too many variables that affect OCB such as personality, behaviour of the leader, manager or supervisor, employee attitudes towards the job and organization, perceived justice and fairness etc.

In order to determine the moderating effect of narcissism, we add the variable to the relationship between OT and OCB in model 2. It is seen that, narcissism has an effect of reducing the impacts of OT on OCB. In addition, because of explanatory power of model 2 is significantly more than model 1 (from 18% to 20%), the moderating effect of narcissism is observed. However, this effect is negative. So, high level of employee narcissism adds explanatory power to the relationship between OT an OCB, but reduces OCB. In other words, even if employees have trust in their organization, high level of employee narcissism reduces OCB.

According to this study employee narcissism emerges as an unhealthy concept as a result of its negative impact. Despite the positive organizational outcomes in literature (Ronningstam, 2005; King, 2007; Duchon & Burns, 2008; Godkin & Alcorn, 2009a, 2009b), it is put forth for the first time that employee narcissism has negative impacts on the relationship between organizational trust and citizenship behaviour. This was the most striking result of the study as a contribution to the litareture.

Overall, this study expands the understanding of narcissism and its relationship with organizational trust and organizational citizenship behaviour by pointing out that narcissism may cause negative outcomes for companies. However, the study was limited in scope with the sample. Future studies could expand the sample size or analyze different variables to generalize the findings.

Based on the results of this study, we recommend that it would be beneficial to add narcissism dimension to the personality and ability tests for the candidates during the recruitment process. There are negative and positive outcomes of healthy and unhealhty narcissism as we classified and negative outcomes should not be ignored by the companies.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (4th Ed) 2000. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders DSM-IV-TR. USA.

Arnold, K.A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E.K. 2001. Transformational Leadership or the Iron Cage: Which Predicts Trust, Commitment and Team Efficiency. Leadership Organizational Development Journal, 22: 315-320.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P.S., & Chen, Z.X. 2002. Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23: 267-285.

Atwater, L.E. 1988. The relative importance of situational and individual variables in pre-dicting leader behavior. Group and Organization Studies, 13: 290-310.

Barber, B. 1983. The logic and limits of trust. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Barker, R., & Camarata, M. 1998. The Role Of Communication in Creating and Maintaining a Learning Organization: Preconditions, Indicators and Disciplines. Journal of Business Communication, 35: 443-467.

Barnard, C.I. 1938. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Barney, J. B., & Hansen, M.H. 1994. Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage. Strategic Management Journal, 15: 175-190.

Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. 1983. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". Academy of Management Journal, 26(4):587-595.

Bazerman, M.H. 1994. Judgment in managerial decision making. New York: Wiley.

Bhattacharya, R., Devinney, M.T., & Pillutla, M.M. 1998. A formal model of trust based on outcomes. Academy of Management Review, 23(3): 459-472.

Blau, P.M. 1964. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Borman, W.C., Penner, L.A., Allen, T.D., & Motowidlo, S J. 2001. Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9: 52-69.

Chiang, C.F., & Hsieh, T.S. 2012. The Impacts of Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Empowerment on Job Performance: The Mediating effects of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31: 180-190.

Coleman, V.I., & Borman, W.C. 2000. Investigating The Underlying Structure of The Citizenship Performance Domain. Human Resource Management Review, 10: 25-44.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. 1980. New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53: 39-52.

Costigan, R., Ilter, S., & Berman, J. 1998. A multidimensional study of trust in organizations. Journal of Managerial Issues, 10(3): 303-317.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M.S. 2005. Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. Journal of Management, 31(6): 1-27.

Curral, S.C., & Judge T.A. 1995. Measuring Trust Between Organizational Boundary Role Persons. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 64: 151-170.

Davis, J., Schoorman, F.D., Mayer, R., & Tan, H. 2000. Trusted unit manager and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage. Strategic Management Journal, 21: 563-576.

De Dreu, C., Giebels, E., & Van de Vliert, E. 1998. Social motives and trust in integrative negotiation: The disruptive effects of punitive capability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83: 408-423.

DeConinck, J.B. 2010. The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. Journal of Business Research, 63: 1349-1355.

Deluga, R.J. 1995. The relation between trust in the supervisor and subordinate organizational citizenship behavior. Military Psychology, 7(1): 1-16.

Deutsch, M. 1958. Trust and suspicion. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2(4): 265-279.

Dirks, K.T. 1999. The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84: 445-455.

Doney, P.M., & Cannon, J.P. 1997. An Examination of the Nature of Trust n Buyer-Seller Relationships. Journal of Marketing, 61: 35-51.

Duchon, D., & Burns, M. 2008. Organizational Narcissism. Organizational Dynamics, 37(4): 354-364.

Duchon, D., & Drake B. 2009. Organizational Narcissism and virtuous behavior. Journal of Business Ethics, 85: 301-308.

Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. 2001. Trust in top management and immediate supervisor: The relationship to satisfaction, perceived organizational effectiveness, and information receiving. Communication Quarterly, 49(4): 382-398.

Giffin, K. 1967. The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication department. Psychological Bulletin, 68: 104-120.

Gilbert, S., Laschinger, H.K.S., & Leiter M. 2010. The Mediating Effect of Burnout on The Relationship between Structural Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. Journal of Nursing Management, 18: 339–348.

Godkin, L., & Allcorn, S. 2009a. Dependent Narcissism, Organizational Learning, and Human Resource Development. Human Resource Development Review, 8(4): 484-505.

Godkin, L., & Allcorn, S. 2009b. Institutional narcissism, arrogant organization disorder and interruptions in organizational learning. The Learning Organization, 16(1): 40-57.

Gregory, B. 1999. The Impact of Narcissism on Leadership and Sustainability. In A. Johill & J. Kruth (Ed.), Pathways to Sustainability: The Age of Transformation. Thoe Center for Sustainable Future.

Hardy, C., Phillips, N., & Lawrence, T. 1998. Distinguishing Trust and Power in Interorganizational Relitions: Forms and Façades of Trust. In (Ed.) R. Bachman & C. Lane, Trust Whitin and Between Organization. Oxford University Press.

Higgs, M. 2009. The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: Leadership and Narcissism. Journal of Change Management, 9(2): 165-178.

Hoffman, B.J., Blair, C.A., Meriac, J.P, & Woehr, D.J. 2007. Expanding the criterion domain? A Qualitative Review of the OCB Literature. Journal of Applied psychology, 92(2): 555-566.

Hopkins, K. M. 2002. Organizational Citizenship in Social Service Agencies. Administration in Social Work, 26(2): 1–15.

Hoy, W., & Tschannen-Moran, M. 2003. The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The Omnibus T-Scale. [Cited 06 April 2012.] Available from URL: http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/whoy/Omnibus%20T-Scale%20Paper.pdf.

Hoy, W.K., & Tarter, C.J. 2004. Organizational Justice in Schools: No Justice without Trust. International Journal of Educational Management, 18(4): 250-259.

Inkpen, A.C., & Currall, S.C. 1997. International joint venture trust: An empirical examination. In P.W. Beamish & J.P. Killing (Ed.), Cooperative strategies: North American perspective: 197-226. San Francisco: New Lexington Press.

Kath, L.M., Magley, V.J., & Marmet, M. 2010. The role of organizational trust in safety climate's influence on organizational outcomes. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 42: 1488-1497.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. 1966. The Social Psychology or Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

King, G. 2007. Narcissism and Effective Crisis Management: A Review of Potential Problems and Pitfalls. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 15(4): 183-193.

Konovsky, M.A., & Pugh, S.D. 1994. Citizenship behavior and social exchange. Academy of Management Journal, 37: 656-669.

Konovsky, M.A., & Organ, D.W. 1996. Dispositional and Contextual Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16: 215–224.

Lewicki, R.J., & Bunker, B.B. 1996. Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Ed.), Trust in organization: frontiers of theory and research: 114-139. California: Sage Publications.

Lewis, J., & Weigert, A. 1985. Trust as a social reality. Social Forces, 83: 967-968.

Lubit, R. 2002. The Long-Term Organizational Impact of Destructively Narcissistic Managers'. Academy of Management Executive, 16 (1): 127-138.

Maccoby, M. 2004. The Productive Narcissist: The Promise and Peril of Visionary Leadership. New York: Broadway Books.

MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., & Fetter, R. 1991. Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Objective Productivity As Determinants of Managerial Evaluations of Salespersons' Performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50: 123-150.

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. 1995. An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. Academy of Management Review, 20: 709-734.

McAllister, D. 1995. Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38: 24-59.

McNeely B.L. & Meglino, B.M. 1994. The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: an examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79: 836-844.

Milgrom, P., & Roberts, J. 1992. Economics, organization and management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mishra, J., & Morrissey, M.A. 1990. Trust in employee / employer relationships: A survey of West Michigan managers. Public Personnel Management, 19: 443-485.

Moorman, R H. 1991. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship?. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76: 845-55.

Morgan, R.M., & Hunt, S.D. 1994. The commitment–trust theory of relationship marketing. Journal of Marketing, 58(3): 20-38.

Niehoff, B.P., & Moorman, R.H. 1993. Justice as mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 369(3): 527-556.

Nyhan, R.C. 2000. Changing The Paradigm Trust and Its Role in Puplic Sector Organization. American Review of Public Administration, 30(1): 87-109.

Nyhan, R.C., & Marlowe, H.A. 1997. Development and Psychometric Properties of the Organizational Trust Inventory. Evaluation Review, 21(5): 614-635.

Organ, D. W. 1990. The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds), Research in organizational behavior: 43–72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. 1995. A Meta-analytic Review of Attitudinal and Dispositional Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48: 775-802.

Organ, D.W. 1988. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lextington Books.

Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. 2006. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences. Thousand OA: Sage Publications.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C., & Williams, E. 1999. Fairness Perceptions and Trust as Mediators for Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Two-Sample Study, Journal of Management, 25(6): 897-933.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. 2000. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. Journal of Management, 26 (3): 513-563.

Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S.B. 1997. Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82: 262-270.

Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. 1994. Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. Journal of Marketing Research, 3(1): 351–363.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Bommer, W.H. 1996. Transformational Leaders Behaviors and Substitutes for Leadership as Determinants of Employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Journal of Management, 22: 259-298.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. 1990. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The Leadership Quarterly, 1(2): 107-142.

Reinke, S.J. 2003. Does The Form Really Matter? Leadership, Trust, and Acceptance of the Performance Appraisal Process. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 23(1): 23-37.

Robinson, S. 1996. Trust and the breach of the psychological contract. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41: 574-599.

Ronnigstam, E. 2005. Identifying and understanding the narcissistic personality. Oxford University Press.

Rubin, R.S., Bommer, W.H., & Bachrach, D.G. 2010. Operant leadership and employee citizenship: A question of trust?. The Leadership Quarterly, 21: 400-408.

Scott, K.D. 1980. The causual relationship between trust and the assessed value of management by objective. Journal of Management, 6(2): 157-175.

Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K., & Winograd, G. 2000. Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters?. Organizational Development Journal, 18(4): 35-48.

Smith, C.A., Organ D.W, & Near J.P. 1983. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68: 653-663.

Spector, P.E., & Fox S. 2002. An Emotion-Centered Model of Voluntary Work Behavior Some Parallels between Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Human Resources Review, 12: 269-292.

Stein, M. 2003. Unbounded Irrationality: Risk and Organizational Narcissism at Long Term Capital Management. Human Relations, 56: 523-538.

Tan, H.H., & Tan, C.S.F. 2000. Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 126(2): 241-260.

Tarter, J.D., Hoy, S., & Hoy W.K. 1995. Middle School Climate, Faculty, Trust and Effectiveness. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 29: 41-49.

Taylor, R.G. 1989. The role of trust in labor-management relations. Organization Development Journal, 7: 85-89.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, LL, & McLean Parks, J. 1995. Extra-role behaviors: In Pursuit of Construct and Definitional Clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). Research in Organizational Behavior, 17: 215-285.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W, & Dienesch, R.M. 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. Academy Of Management Journal Briarcliff Manor, 37(4): 765-802.

Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M.E., & Cummings, L.L. 2000. Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a nonwork setting. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21: 3-23.

Walz, S.M., & Niehoff, B.P. 2000. Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their Relationship to Organizational Effectiveness. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 24: 108-126.

Ward, E.A. 1997. Autonomous work groups: A field study of correlates of satisfaction. Psychological Reports, 80: 60-62.

Werner, J.M. 1994. Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviors on supervisory ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79: 98-107.

Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. 1991. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Performance. Journal of Management, 17(3): 601-617.

Williamson, O.E. 1993. Calculativeness, trust and economic organization. Journal of Law and Economics, 34: 453-502.

Wong, Y., Ngo, H., & Wong, C. 2006. Perceived organizational justice, trust, and OCB: A study of Chinese workers in joint ventures and state-owned enterprises. Journal of World Business, 41: 344-355.

Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. 1997. Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. Organizational Science, 9(2): 141-159.

Zeinabadia, H., & Salehi, K. 2011. Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model. Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29: 1472-1481.