

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TRUST AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS: REFLECTIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR PUBLIC MANAGERS FROM A MUNICIPALITY IN MINAS GERAIS

CORRELAÇÕES ENTRE CONFIANÇA E COMPORTAMENTOS DE CIDADANIA ORGANIZACIONAL: APONTAMENTOS E REFLEXÕES PARA GESTORES PÚBLICOS DE UM MUNICÍPIO DE MINAS GERAIS

Submission: 12/06/2015

Accept: 24/04/2017

Wagner Ferraz Coelho da Silva¹
Wanderléia da Consolação Paiva²
Helder Antônio da Silva³

ABSTRACT

This quantitative approach study aimed to investigate the influence of dimensions of trust over expressions of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in the total sample of civil servants from two public management units in a city in Minas Gerais. Data collection was held by applying a sociodemographic survey, the Behavioral Trust Inventory (BTI), the Public Relations Relationship Measurement Scale (PR-RMS) and the Behavioral Intentions of Organizational Citizenship Scale (EICCOrg) in a sample of 81 civil servants. Data was treated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences – SPSS version 22. Results confirmed the existence of a positive relation between the dimensions of trust and OCB both for the total sample and for the subsamples. The existence of peculiarities conditioning both the correlations and the explanatory power of trust variables was found in the total sample and subsamples of Health and Education sectors. This work expects to contribute to public managers so that they can develop actions that enhance the levels of trust and promote more cooperative environments with OCBs manifestations, favoring, therefore, the organizational climate and guaranteeing the services' users are satisfied.

Keywords: Trust. Organizational Citizenship. Public Management.

1 Specialized in Strategic Management for Human Resources in Universidade Estácio de Sá. Holds a degree in Administration from the Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology Sudeste de Minas - Campus Barbacena. Barbacena/Brazil.

E-mail: admwagnerferraz@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0117-5729>

2 PhD candidate in Language Studies in Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF). Holds a degree and a masters in Psychology from Universidade Federal São João del-Rei (UFSJ). Currently teaches Psychology at the Administration course in the Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology Sudeste de Minas - Campus Barbacena. Barbacena/Brazil. E-mail: wanderleia.paiva@ifsudestemg.edu.br.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0227-2427>

3 PhD in Administration by IAG PUC-Rio de Janeiro. Holds a degree in Mechanic Industrial Engineering from Universidade Federal de São João del-Rei (UFSJ) and a masters in Engineering from Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho (UNESP), Guaratinguetá-SP, in the research line of management and optimization. Currently teaches at the Administration course in the Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology Sudeste de Minas - Campus Barbacena. Barbacena/Brazil.

E-mail: helder.silva@ifsudestemg.edu.br. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7192-7052>

RESUMO

Este estudo de abordagem quantitativa teve como objetivo investigar a influência das dimensões da confiança sobre as expressões de comportamentos de cidadania organizacional (OCBs) na amostra total dos servidores de duas secretarias de gestão pública de um município de Minas Gerais. A coleta de dados deu-se com a aplicação de um questionário sócio demográfico, do Behavioral Trust Inventory (BTI), da Public Relations Relationship Measurement Scale (PR-RMS) e da Escala de Intenções Comportamentais de Cidadania Organizacional (EICCOrg) para uma amostra de 81 servidores públicos. Para o tratamento dos dados utilizou-se o Statistical Package for Social Sciences - SPSS versão 22. Os resultados confirmaram que existe uma relação positiva entre as dimensões da confiança e da CCO para a amostra total e para as subamostras. Constatou-se a existência de peculiaridades que condicionam tanto as correlações quanto o poder explicativo das variáveis da confiança em cada para amostra total e as subamostras dos setores de Saúde e Educação. Espera-se contribuir para que os gestores públicos possam desenvolver ações para melhorar os níveis de confiança e promover ambientes mais cooperativos com manifestações de OCBs favorecendo o clima organizacional e garantindo a satisfação dos usuários dos serviços.

Palavras-chave: Confiança. Cidadania Organizacional. Gestão Pública.

1 INTRODUCTION

By the late 1940's, studies with a new approach on how the individual behaves in the organizational environment began to emerge. Some theories and explanations guiding the individual-organization relationship and each one's role for the company's success, in a broad organizational context, were brought to discussion (MENEGON, 2012).

In this perspective, with the evolution of studies on organizational behavior, the 1980 decade brought up the Organizational Citizenship (OC) construct or Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs). In OC, both intended formal in-role relations and unintended voluntary behaviors coexist.

These behaviors bring significant benefits for all involved and they are characterized as altruistic acts insofar as they occur in a solidary manner – as a disposition of the individual to dedicate him/herself freely and on their own accord to help other people in their work environment (ORGAN, 1988) and they are able to overcome the prescribed activities of their position shaping the psychological and social context of the organization (GOMES, 2011).

Besides, these behaviors are important insofar as they act as generators of competitiveness for the company and contribute mainly for the organizational efficacy (ORGAN, 1988). OCBs make teams more solidary, united and bring great benefits for the whole organization. They reduce conflicts and, with that, avoid that managers spend time to solve them, opening room for important functions such as planning. They are also efficient as they make the work environment more cooperative, prone to behaviors of initiative, support, help, commitment and defense of the organization.

The importance of OC is evident when faced with the possibility of understanding how some everyday behaviors play a role in building an environment that is productivity- and effectiveness-oriented, with motivated personnel committed to their work and to the future of the organization. Trust is the basis to establish other relations, not only in the environment but also in the most different human relations. When employees trust their managers, their coworkers and the organization as a whole, an environment prone to cooperation and to the expression of OCBs is created.

In this sense, the guiding question of this study is: what is the relation between dimensions of trust (trust in one's superior, in coworkers, in the team and in the organization) and the expression of OCBs (individual initiative, additional commitment, help and organizational defense) by public servants in their work environments?

In light of this, a field research was conducted aiming to investigate the influence of dimensions of trust (dependent variable) over the expressions of OCBs (independent variable) in the total sample of servants located at two public management secretaries for Health and Education in a city in Minas Gerais. The specific objectives delineated were: (i) to compare the relation of trust interfering in the expression of OCBs between Health and Education subsamples; and (ii) to compare the relations between the dimensions of trust and the expression of OCBs between the total sample and subsamples.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP

'Organizational Citizenship' is a relatively new term. According to Mehboob and Bhutto (2012), this term was first used by Bateman and Organ (1983) when analyzing voluntary behaviors non formalized in their positions, "but its link could be found in Bernard's (1938) concept of 'Willingness to Cooperate'. That was further refined and explained by Katz (1966)" (MEHBOOB; BHUTTO, 2012, p. 553).

According to Organ (1988), OC refers to an environment with the coexistence of individual behaviors non recognized directly or explicitly by the formal rewards system and the in-role tasks; both of them make the organization function efficiently. They are behaviors of spontaneous collaboration, actions that go beyond the limits of duty that are present in the most diverse types of organization or work (KATZ; KAHN, 1973).

OC consists of voluntary efforts such as helping and cooperating with peers, performing extra duties without complaint, conserving company's resources, using time efficiently, sharing information, knowledge and ideas, in sum, all that may represent the organization favorably (TURNIPSEED; RASSUALI, 2005).

Studying OC responds to what Barnard (1938) has affirmed: organizations by their own nature are cooperative systems and cannot stop being so, for cooperation is their essence. Contracts are necessary if the organization is to create a cooperative environment – actually, so that the organization exists, a set of contracts in which each member commits to a common goal and to collaborating to reach this goal becomes necessary (BARNARD, 1938). As Dejours highlights (2000, p.143), "work, in the extent that it implies agents' voluntary cooperation, also calls for the workers to invest in establishing rules that play a role not only in their work but in their lives".

A company that stimulates OCBs searches to create a better life and work quality environment, one in which more democratic and fair relations can be established; prejudice, discrimination and inequalities may be mitigated, and it can contribute "to develop people in the physical, emotional, intellectual and spiritual aspects" (VERGARA; BRANCO, 2001, p. 22).

Menegon (2012) highlights OC as one of four types of behavior studied in the area of organizational behavior. The author mentions that OC may influence the worker's performance and, in spite of being a newer concept, its meaning is present in the organization's day-by-day, being translated into actions and attitudes (MENEGON, 2012).

In this perspective, it can be said that the company with higher levels of expressions of OCBs has competitive advantage in market. OC favors the company's management because it stimulates entrepreneurship making people take on a proactive attitude when searching for solutions. They begin to suggest improvements, they spontaneously search their self-development, and tend to find solutions for problems before presenting them to their superiors which, by their turn, are willing to hear and implement their ideas (YAN, 2008).

To understand how OCBs arise it is important to verify their relation to other factors that precede or influence them, such as individual initiative by the employees, their abilities and individual differences, tasks and organizational features, and behaviors of leadership (PODSAKOFF; MACKENZIE; BOMMER, 2000).

Many dimensions can be found in literature for the OC construct. Gomes (2011) groups these around four macro dimensions: behaviors for help, individual initiative, additional commitment, and organizational defense. Behaviors for help include “voluntary gestures of help to coworkers when they present work-related problems”. Individual initiative is linked to “behaviors of communication to others in the work environment, searching to improve group and individual performances”. Additional commitment is related to the “workers’ dedication and commitment to the organization, including overtime work-hours”. Organizational defense is connected to the voluntary promotion of “the organization’s image beyond the work environment” (GOMES, 2011, p. 100-101).

In this study, OC construct is measured using the Behavioral Intentions of Organizational Citizenship Scale (EICCOrg – following the Portuguese acronym) (GOMES, 2011), considering its measures unidimensionally (in order to measure OC relating to four dimensions of trust) and multidimensionally (in order to measure OC’s four dimensions: help, individual initiative, additional commitment, and organizational defense; plus the four dimensions of trust).

2.2 TRUST AS THE BASIS FOR OTHER RELATIONS

Among the several values existent in organizations, trust deserves an important distinction, for it is present in every relationship among people and between people and the organization (GAMBETTA, 1988).

There is not a universally accepted definition on the concept of trust, but there seems to be one regarding its role and importance. Gambetta (1988) says that trust allows for cooperative behavior; after all, trust is the basis for other relations to exist and, in its absence, there is no cooperation. It influences almost all human relations, “it permeates friendship relations, family relations, and economic relations” (FEHR, 2009, p. 235). Gambetta (1988) identifies trust saying that, implicitly, when one is trusted or when one is worthy of being trusted there is a high probability that such a person may perform a beneficial action or at least one that is not harmful; with that, the group decides whether or not to cooperate with such a person. Similarly, when we identify someone who is not trustworthy, the probability this person does something beneficial is very low and this leads us not to cooperate.

Trust is established, then, as a prerequisite for cooperation since it is a “fundamental factor for the purpose of obtaining collaboration in organizations because it favors the establishment of solid networks for productive relationships” (DRUMMOND, 2007, p. 5). It also concerns future actions that condition present decisions by the individuals (GAMBETTA, 2000). Trusting someone means believing that, when the opportunity comes, probably such a person will not behave in an opportunistic or harmful manner.

Besides conditioning the existence of cooperative behaviors (GAMBETTA, 1988), trust is directly linked to organizational environment and it is an important factor to reach efficient results. Trust generates confidence and creates an environment based on safety. Because it consists in an affective and psychological relation, “it can only be structured under a certain transparency, a shared experience, and the certainty that one can believe in the words of their coworkers” (DEJOURS; ABDOUCHELI; JAYET, 1994, p. 107).

In this sense, organizational relations go much beyond that which is the task for the job. Recognizing OCBs' existence and the function of trust is fundamental, since the formality is not sufficient to "secure tranquility on the parties involved in a relationship, especially when it concerns the link between the employee and their work organization" (SIQUEIRA, 2008, p. 101). To understand the performance of an antecedent such as trust may help the manager take actions that result in a greater expression of OCBs and it will make people, in addition to performing in-role tasks, go beyond the minimal requirements, acting reciprocally through expressing behaviors of help, support, initiative, commitment, and defense of the organization and of all parties involved in it (DOLAN; TZAFRIR; BARUCH, 2005; PODSAKOFF; MACKENZIE; BOMMER, 2000).

In environments where the organization-employee relationship is characterized by a high level of trust, employees are expected to express a higher level of OCBs (DOLAN; TZAFRIR; BARUCH, 2005). Simple actions tend to commonly gain more room in the work environment in the absence of a system that directly or formally rewards the individual for this act of spontaneous collaboration (ORGAN, 1988). The essence of such behaviors is voluntary and the reward consists in the collaborative environment itself.

There are several dimensions of trust in academic literature. We highlight, in particular, the studies by Zanini (2007) who proposes a practical approach and identifies three dimensions for organizational trust: trust in one's superior, trust in a coworker, and trust in the work team.

Trust in one's superior is important because it is the boss who is authorized to take decisions which, by their turn, may affect all others. Subordinates, when they trust their superior, tend to manifest more proactive attitudes and be less fearful in taking risks. Trust in the coworker concerns a relationship that involves horizontal interactions, based on rational or emotional criteria, in which the individual evaluates attitudes by their coworker in other relationships and in their own. In its turn, trust in the work team is necessary because each member must cultivate trust through their actions and must also be open to trust other members (ZANINI; LUSK; WOLFF, 2009).

The three dimensions of trust described above will be assessed in this research through the *Behavioral Trust Inventory* (BTI) (ZANINI; LUSK; WOLFF, 2009; GILLESPIE, 2003), complemented by the *Public Relations Relationship Measurement Scale* (PR-RMS) (SIMÕES, 2010; GRUNIG; HON, 1999) that, by its turn, measures the level of trust in the organization and evaluates factors such as justice, integrity, capacity, promise fulfilment and credibility. These factors are useful to verify the dimensions of trust in the organizational environment.

2.3 TRUST AS AN ANTECEDENT FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS

This study considers trust as a necessary predecessor for OCs to arise but also a successor for these behaviors to enjoy longevity in the organization. This relation has been studied by other researchers as is treated in the following.

Robinson and Morrison (1995), by investigating OCBs and psychological contracts, found a significant relation between trust and one of the OC's dimensions, civic virtue.

Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Bommer (1996), in their study based on Kerr and Jermier's (1978) work on "substitutes for leadership", emphasized a weak correlation between trust in leaders and some OCBs dimensions. This study involved 1539 employees of a large variety of industries, organizational contexts and levels of work. One possible explanation for such a weak correlation found by the researchers lies in the fact that their inquiry was not focused mainly on OC.

Menguc (2000), when studying the behavior of salespeople in Turkish context, found results that show how trust works as an antecedent for OCBs. The author concluded that the

perception of trust creates an environment in which salespeople tend to retribute with OCBs. His research shows that trust in managers was an antecedent for these behaviors by the Turkish salespeople and also mentions the relational contract as an important aspect for social exchanges based on trust and common interest.

According to Menguc (2000, p. 206), "Trust like other macromotives is a key component in the emergence and maintenance of social exchange relationships (Konovsky and Pugh 1994), and renders the basis for relational contracts".

Korsgaard, Brodt e Whitener (2002) report a positive correlation between trust in managers or superior and OCBs. Wech (2002 *apud* DOLAN; TZAFRIR; BARUCH, 2005) also suggested that trust may trigger the rise of OCBs.

A study developed in the Portuguese context by Henriques (2003), involving 414 employees of industry, retail and service sectors, presented very positive results. Focusing on trust in the superior and searching to establish its relation to OCBs, the author found statistically significant coefficients in the correlation matrix. A positive relation between dimensions of trust and OC was observed. OCs' variable most highlighted was identification with the organization, presenting higher correlation coefficients when compared to trust. Among the seven behaviors identified for the study of trust, three of them – general trust, reliability and integrity – directly influenced OCBs.

Dolan, Tzafirir and Baruch (2005) found a significant and positive correlation between organizational trust and OCBs in a research involving 450 Israeli workers aged from 18 to 70. The authors examined OC variables, procedural justice and organizational trust.

As it can be observed, studies investigating the relation between trust and OCBs found a strong relation among the variables, except for Podsakoff, MacKenzie and Bommer (1996) who found a weak correlation in a study that did not present OC as the main focus. This fact calls for inquiring the relation among the variables for the sample of this study.

3 METHODOLOGY

This study is of a quantitative nature as the information and opinions found were translated into numbers in order to be classified and, later, analyzed (FARIAS FILHO; ARRUDA FILHO, 2013). The quantitative research reduces chances of possible interpretation and analyses distortions because it uses the quantification for data collection and treatment, offering a greater safety margin (DIEHL, 2004).

In order to classify this research, the taxonomy presented by Vergara (2013) was used. It qualifies the research in terms of two aspects: as for the ends and as for the means.

As for the ends, this research is descriptive-explanatory. Descriptive because

[...] it exposes features of a particular population or phenomenon. It may also establish correlations between variables and define its nature. It is compromised in explaining the phenomena it describes even though it serves as a basis for this explanation (VERGARA, 2007, p. 47).

It is explanatory because it "clarifies which factors contribute, somehow, to the occurrence of a particular phenomenon" (VERGARA, 2007, p. 47) and is "centrally preoccupied in identifying factors determining or contributing to the occurrence of phenomena" (GIL, 2002, p. 42).

As for the means, it is a field research (primary data) and a bibliographical one (secondary data). Bibliographical because its grounds are based on investigation about organizational

citizenship and trust via books, academic journals and dissertations in databanks such as *Scielo (Scientific Electronic Library Online)*, EBSCO – Estácio Journals Portal, the Brazilian Digital Library for Theses and Dissertations (BDTD) e DynaMed Journals.

It consists in a field research because it was undertaken empirically through the collection of primary data via instruments with closed questions, organized in a manner that displays elements to explain the occurrence of a specific phenomenon (VERGARA, 2007).

For the methods of data collection, the same researcher applied *in loco*, individually or in groups of up to ten people, during the months of September and October 2014, the following tools: a sociodemographic survey drafted by the authors; the *Behavioral Trust Inventory* (BTI) created by Gillespie (2003), translated and validated in Portuguese by Zanini, Lusk and Wolff (2009), in order to measure the levels of trust in the superior, in a coworker and in the team in general. This was complemented by the *Public Relations Relationship Measurement Scale* (PR-RMS), created by Grunig and Hon (1999), in the 11-item version measuring the dependent variable 'trust in the organization', indicated by Simões (2010) for presenting strong indexes of reliability and for having been validated by other studies. At last, the *Behavioral Intentions of Organizational Citizenship Scale* (EICCOrg), proposed by Gomes (2011), was also applied in order to measure expressions of OCs. All data collection was undertaken after the favorable opinion by the Research and Ethics Committee from Instituto Sudeste MG, answering the Resolution n. 466, from December 12th 2012 by the National Health Council.

Before applying the tools in the whole sample, a pilot study was undertaken with 20 respondents. This aimed at testing the formulation of questions and modifying them, if necessary.

In face of the results in this study, a decision to replace the term "manager" by "superior" in BTI was taken. This has been done in order to secure a better comprehension of questions by the respondent. The term 'superior' is more widely employed by the respondents in this study.

When applying PR-RMS the question A. 40 (I think it is important to be in this organization to verify whether my interests are taken into account) was excluded. Even with an explanation note on the meaning of 'being taken into account', the expression was not well comprehended by the respondents of the pilot study.

Another sign that led to the exclusion of this question lies in the fact that A.40 does not present a mean that is similar to other questions. While question A.40 obtained a mean of 2,16¹ (43,2%), the mean amplitude among the other 10 questions ranged from 3,28 (65,6%) to 4,01 (80,2%). This is a strong sign because the questions presented relative values from 65,6% to 80,2% for trust in the organization and, only in that specific question, they presented a relative value around 43%.

For these reasons, the question A.40 was chosen to be eliminated from data analysis. Besides, after it was eliminated, *Cronbach's Alpha* went from 0,908 to 0,929, showing that this procedure increased inter-relations among the items.

Questions 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 21 were not used in EICCOrg once they did not reach significant values in Gomes's (2011) validation tests. The elimination is oriented by the author herself and, according to the results of the tests undertaken in her study, the reasons are diverse².

The universe of this study was composed of 101 civil servants in health and education sectors from the administration of a municipality in the state of Minas Gerais. The sample comprised a total of 81 respondents. This number is statistically significant to calculate the sample size, considering sample error and level of confidence of 5% and 95%, respectively.

The program *Statistical Package for Social Sciences* – SPSS version 22 was used to treat

1 Mean value inversely treating the variable.

2 For the criteria of items exclusion, see Gomes (2011), p. 113-116.

the data collected. It enables their statistical analysis.

Data were analyzed considering the total sample involving all respondents from Health and Education Sectors, and, later, each subsample was analyzed separately in order to present the comparative analysis considering dimensions of trust and expression of OCBs.

4 RESULTS AND ANALYSES

4.1- Data analysis of the total sample

Data from the sociodemographic survey, considering the sample in education and health sectors, profiled respondents under the following aspects: predominantly female (85,2%), aged between 22 and 60 years old (93,8%), married (51,9%), with a bachelor degree (40,7%) or technical course (24,7%), earning between R\$ 724,01 and R\$ 1.448,00 monthly (76,5%), having worked in the sector from 1 up to over 10 years (97,5%), most of them being in permanent positions (59,3%). As for the positions, the sample predominantly showed 35,8% teachers, 13,6% administrative agents, 12,3% nursing assistants, 9,9% health agents, and 8,6% administrative assistants, amounting to 80,2%.

Cronbach's Alpha was calculated in order to analyze the internal consistency of trust in the superior, trust in the coworker, trust in the work team, trust in the organization, measured by *Behavioral Trust Inventory* (BTI) and by PR-RMS. According to George and Mallery (2003), values starting at 0,7 are acceptable. Values between 0,8 and 0,9 are good, and the ones above 0,9 are excellent.

For the dimensions of trust, the highest *Cronbach's Alpha* value (0,929) corresponds to trust in the organization, followed by trust in the work team (0,906), trust in the superior (0,888), and the lowest value for trust in the coworker (0,862), according to Table 1:

Table. 1- Dimensions of trust measured by *Cronbach's Alpha* – Total Sample

Dimensions	Alpha	N. of items
Trust in organization	0,929	10
Trust in work team	0,906	10
Trust in superior	0,888	10
Trust in coworker	0,862	10

Source: elaborated by the authors

In a study by Simões (2010), *Cronbach's Alpha* equaling 0,90 was found for the construct trust in organization, a value similar to the one found in this study.

In the following, results found for the relation between the dimensions of trust are presented and discussed. The dimensions were measured by BTI and PR-RMS and OC was measured by EICCOrg. The *Spearman* Correlation was used. Later, the analysis of multiple linear regression will be presented, revealing the impact of dimensions of trust over OC.

In a first instance, EICCOrg was considered as a unidimensional scale, that is, measuring the relation of dimensions of trust and OC (Table 2).

Table 2: Correlations between dimensions of trust and OC –Total Sample

Correlations					
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Trust in superior	1,000				
2. Trust in coworker	,498**	1,000			
3. Trust in work team	,624**	,616**	1,000		

4. Trust in organization	,515**	,455**	,565**	1,000	
5. Organizational Citizenship	,382**	,642**	,622**	,720**	1,000

** . Correlation is significant in level 0,01 (2-tailed).

Source: elaborated by the authors.

With the unidimensional analysis of coefficients, it is possible to verify that all coefficients found are statistically significant. A positive relation between dimensions of trust and CO may be observed. Amongst the four trust variables, trust in organization presents a higher correlation coefficient comparing to OC (0,720), while trust in superior presented the lowest correlation coefficient comparing to OC (0,382).

Afterwards, EICOOrg was assumed as a multidimensional scale, assessing the relations between dimensions of trust and dimensions of OCBs (Table 3). This way, it was possible to obtain a more profound study, verifying which dimensions of trust (trust in superior, in coworker, in work team and in organization) present significant correlations with the dimensions of OC (individual initiative, additional commitment, help, and organizational defense).

Table 3: Correlations between dimensions of trust and CO dimensions – Total sample

	Descriptive Est.			Correlations							
	Mean	Md	D. P.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Trust in superior	5,357	5,600	1,178	1,000							
2. Trust in coworker	5,578	5,800	1,033	,498**	1,000						
3. Trust in work team	5,157	5,100	1,119	,624**	,616**	1,000					
4. Trust in organization	3,778	3,800	0,756	,515**	,455**	,565**	1,000				
5. Individual initiative	5,849	5,889	5,849	,218	,401**	,471**	,740**	1,000			
6. Additional commitment	5,761	5,750	5,761	,258*	,459**	,441**	,703**	,754**	1,000		
7. Help	5,951	6,083	5,951	,423**	,804**	,624**	,521**	,623**	,599**	1,000	
8. Organizational defense	6,068	6,000	6,068	,356**	,491**	,789**	,389**	,397**	,407**	,559**	1,000

** . Correlation is significant in level 0,01 (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant in level 0,05 (2-tailed).

Source: elaborated by the authors.

Considering the multidimensional analysis, it is possible to verify that all coefficients are statistically significant, because there is a positive relation between dimensions of trust and OC dimensions, except for the correlation between trust in superior and individual initiative (0,218). Among the four OC variables, correlation between help and trust in coworker is the one presenting the highest coefficient regarding the dimensions of trust (0,804). And among the statistically significant coefficients, correlation between additional commitment and trust in superior is the one presenting the lowest coefficient (0,258).

In order to understand relations between dimensions of trust and OC dimensions, multiple linear regressions tests were carried out. It aimed to understand which dimensions of trust (dependent variables) have a greater impact on OC dimensions (independent variables). To secure reliability, the *Variance Inflation Factor* (VIF) was calculated and, as it can be seen in Table 4, it ruled out the possibility of collinearity and showed that interferences based on the models are reliable.

The maximum value commonly recommended for VIF found in literature is 5 (MONTGOMERY; PECK; VINING, 2012; Rogerson, 2001). As it can be verified, the highest value found for VIF in

the total sample study corresponds to 2,234 (Table 4), confirming that the explanatory variables are orthogonal, non-correlated, and showing that the interferences based on the models are reliable.

Table 4: Results of multiple linear regression tests and VIF for correlations of dimensions of trust regarding OC – Total Sample

Dimension (Model 1)	Individual Initiative	Additional commitment	Help	Org. Defense	Org. Citizenship	Collinearity Est.	
						Toler.	VIF
Trust in superior	-0,275(***)	-0,176(**)	-0,009	-0,202(**)	-0,145(**)	,470	2,128
Trust in coworker	0,088	0,100	0,363(***)	-0,016	0,180(***)	,630	1,587
Trust in work team	0,129(*)	0,095	0,037	0,735(***)	0,120(**)	,448	2,234
Trust in organization	0,731(***)	0,581(***)	0,151(*)	0,001	0,439(***)	,512	1,953
F	28,3(***)	22,9(***)	42,1(***)	36,8(***)	44,9(***)		
R ²	59,8%	54,6%	68,9%	65,9%	70,2%		
R ² adjusted	57,7%	52,2%	67,3%	64,2%	68,7%		

(*) p < 0,05, (**) p < 0,01, (***) p < 0,001.

Source: elaborated by the authors.

In this study, values of correlation for trust in superior, even if they are low, are statistically significant, only except for the correlation with the dimension of individual initiative (0,218). The highest value was found for the correlation with behaviors of help (0,423). However, in regression equations, trust in superior did not seem to play an explanatory power over other dimensions, as it can be seen in Table 4.

Going towards the analysis of other dimensions of trust, as Table 3 shows, trust in superior was the variable presenting the lowest correlation coefficient regarding OC variables. Statistically significant correlations ranged from 0,258 to 0,423.

According to Table 3, trust in coworker presented correlation coefficients ranging from 0,401 to 0,804. Correlation between trust in coworker and behaviors of help was the highest in the correlation matrix (0,804). In the regression testing (Table 4), trust in the coworker was the most significant predictor for the dimension of help (0,363) and for OC (0,180). This shows that trust in coworker has strong ties with behaviors of help in the organization. It also suggests that the bonds connecting pairs in the work environment are not merely transactional, that is, exchanges do not occur for mere economic convenience. People not only execute their in-role activities but they also trust their colleagues and express behaviors of help (REGO, 2002).

Trust in work team presented correlation coefficients ranging from 0,441 to 0,789, according to Table 3. The most significant correlations involving trust in work team occurred with the OC dimensions: organizational defense (0,789) and help (0,624). Regression analysis (Table 4) evidenced that trust in work team was the most important predictor for organizational defense (0,735), not being an important predictor for behaviors of help (0,037).

This demonstrates that trust in work team impacts on behaviors of organizational defense. When there is trust in the work team, there is a greater number of manifestations of behaviors to protect and support coworkers. Besides, people will be more prone to voluntarily promote the organization outside the work environment, to contribute for the organization's good credibility, to defend the organization against external threats; in sum, all behaviors to defend the organization and all those involved in it (GOMES, 2011; MOORMAN; BLAKELY, 1995).

In accordance with Table 3, trust in organization presented correlation coefficients ranging from 0,389 to 0,740. Most significant correlations involving trust in the organization occurred within the OC dimensions: individual initiative (0,740), additional commitment (0,703) and, moderately,

with help (0,521). Regression test (Table 4) reveals trust in the organization as the main predictor for behaviors of individual initiative (0,731), additional commitment (0,581) and for OC (0,439).

Values found in this study point that when trust in the organization is high, people are more prone to motivate others to express their ideas and opinions, to adopt voluntary acts of creativity and innovation, to search for self-development; in sum, there is more propension to all actions of voluntary initiative that provide benefits to the organization as a whole (REGO, 2002; PODSAKOFF *et al.*, 2000; MOORMAN; BLAKELY, 1995).

In the following, analyses of subsamples data are presented, considering health and education sectors separately. Distributed by sectors, 46 respondents work in Health (56,8%) and 35 in Education Sector (43,2%).

4.2 Data Analysis for the Health Sector

Amongst the 46 respondents for health sector, the profile is mainly female (80,4%). Most of them (76,1%) holds a degree or a diploma for technical course and is concentrated between 5 or more than 10 years working in the organization (50%); also, most of them (87,5%) earns between R\$ 724,01 and R\$ 1.448,00 monthly.

In the reliability analysis for the dimensions comprising Trust (Table 5), the highest value for *Cronbach's Alpha* corresponds to trust in organization (0,924), followed by trust in superior (0,890), trust in work team (0,888), and the lowest value is for trust in coworker (0,837). The value for *Cronbach's Alpha* in EICOOrg answers equals 0,836, a good value according to George and Mallery (2003).

Table 5: Dimensions of trust measured by *Cronbach's Alpha* – Health Sector

Dimensions	Alpha	N. of items
Trust in organization	0,924	10
Trust in superior	0,890	10
Trust in work team	0,888	10
Trust in coworker	0,837	10

Source: elaborated by the authors.

In the following, results found for the relation between the dimensions of trust are presented and discussed. The dimensions were measured by BTI and PR-RMS and OC was measured by EICOOrg. The *Spearman* Correlation was used. Later, the analysis of multiple linear regression will be presented, revealing the impact of dimensions of trust over OC.

Table 6 shows the results for the correlations between dimensions of trust and OC for respondents from the health sector, considering EICOOrg as a unidimensional scale.

Table 6: Correlations between dimensions of trust and OC – Health Sector

	Correlations				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Trust in superior	1,000				
2. Trust in coworker	,496**	1,000			
3. Trust in work team	,704**	,624**	1,000		
4. Trust in organization	,418**	,514**	,487**	1,000	
5. Organizational citizenship	,391**	,753**	,459**	,714**	1,000

** . Correlation is significant in level 0,01 (2-tailed).

Source: elaborated by the authors.

With the analysis of coefficients, it is possible to verify that all coefficients found are statistically significant. A positive relation between dimensions of trust and OC may be observed. Amongst the four trust variables, trust in coworker presents a higher correlation comparing to OC (0,753). Trust in superior presented the lowest correlation coefficient comparing to OC (0,391).

Table 7 presents correlations between dimensions of trust (measured by BTI and PR-RMS) and expressions of OCBs, measured separately by EICOrg, considered as a multidimensional scale.

Table 7: Correlations between dimensions of trust and OC dimensions – Health Sector

	Descriptive Est.			Correlations							
	Mean	Md	D. P.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Trust in superior	4,991	5,000	1,298	1,000							
2. Trust in coworker	5,550	6,000	1,077	,496**	1,000						
3. Trust in work team	5,043	5,000	1,113	,704**	,624**	1,000					
4. Trust in organization	3,637	3,700	0,752	,418**	,514**	,487**	1,000				
5. Individual initiative	5,882	5,889	0,602	0,186	,490**	0,275	,714**	1,000			
6. Additional commitment	5,772	5,792	0,558	0,182	,508**	0,215	,669**	,680**	1,000		
7. Help	5,938	6,125	0,588	,462**	,853**	,583**	,493**	,594**	,539**	1,000	
8. Organizational Defense	6,076	6,250	0,823	,387**	,466**	,742**	0,266	0,137	0,209	,471**	1,000

** . Correlation is significant in level 0,01 (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant in level 0,05 (2-tailed).

Source: elaborated by the authors.

In the analysis involving OC dimensions it is possible to verify that most of the coefficients are statistically significant. A positive relation between dimensions of trust and dimensions of OC is observed. Amongst the four OC variables, correlation between help and trust in coworker is the one presenting the highest coefficient comparing to dimensions of trust (0,853). Amongst the statistically significant coefficients, correlation between organizational defense and trust in superior presents the lowest coefficient (0,387).

Table 8 presents regression tests to explain the relation between dimensions of trust and OC dimensions in order to reach a more precise result for the analyses.

Table 8 – Results of multiple linear regression tests and VIF for correlations of dimensions of trust regarding OC dimensions – Health Sector

Dimension (Model 1)	Individual initiative	Additional commitment	Help	Org. Defense	Org. Citizenship	Collinearity Est.	
						Toler.	VIF
Trust in superior	-,153(*)	-0,058	0,058	-0,154	-0,048	,423	2,363
Trust in coworker	,244(***)	,213(**)	,451(***)	-0,044	,288(***)	,633	1,579
Trust in work team	-0,104	-0,132	-0,053	,706(***)	-0,05	,420	2,382
Trust in organization	,686(***)	,557(***)	0,118	-0,103	,402(***)	,548	1,825
F	19,8(***)	13,4(***)	37,3(***)	13,5(***)	35,7(***)		
R ²	65,90%	56,70%	78,50%	56,80%	77,70%		
R ² adjusted	62,60%	52,50%	76,40%	52,60%	75,50%		

(*) p < 0,05, (**) p < 0,01, (***) p < 0,001.

Source: elaborated by the authors.

As for the dimensions of trust, trust in superior was the variable presenting the lowest correlation coefficient comparing to other OC dimensions (Table 7). The dimensions organizational defense (0,387) and help (0,462) were the statistically significant correlations.

The analysis reveals that correlation values for trust in superior are statistically significant – except for correlations with dimensions individual initiative (0,816) and additional commitment (0,182). The highest value was found for the correlation with behaviors of help (0,462), slightly higher than the value found for the total sample (0,423) (Table 3). In regression equations, trust in superior did not appear to play an explanatory power over other dimensions.

According to Table 7, trust in coworker in Health Sector presented correlation coefficients ranging from 0,466 to 0,853 – higher values than those found for the total sample (Table 3). Correlation between trust in coworker and behaviors of help was the highest in the correlation matrix (0,853). In regression testing, trust in coworker was the main predictor for the dimension of help (0,451).

As Table 7 reveals, trust in work team for the Health Sector presented significant correlation coefficient, equaling 0,583 for the dimension of help and 0,742 for organizational defense – inferior values than those found in the global study. Regression analysis revealed that trust in work team was the only predictor for organizational defense (0,706), being presented, therefore, as an unimportant predictor for behaviors of help (-0,053).

The dimension of trust in organization presented significant correlation coefficients between 0,493 and 0,714 (Table 7). The most significant correlations involving trust in the organization occurred with the following OC dimensions: individual initiative (0,714) and additional commitment (0,669). As Table 8 shows, regression testing reveals trust in organization as the main predictor for behaviors of individual initiative (0,686), extra commitment (0,557) and for unidimensional OC (0,402).

4.3 Data Analysis for the Education Sector

Amongst the 35 respondents for the Health Sector, the sample was profiled as mainly female (91,4%) with a background from the educational area. Most of them (82,8%) holds a degree and/or is concentrated above 10 years of work in the organization (54,3%), earning, for the most part (74,3%), between R\$ 724,01 and R\$ 1.448,00.

In the reliability analysis (Table 9) the highest value for *Cronbach's Alpha* corresponds to trust in organization (0,937), followed by trust in work team (0,927), trust in coworker (0,908) and the lowest value is for trust in superior (0,835). The value found for *Cronbach's Alpha* in EICCOrg equals 0,893, a good value according to George and Mallery (2003).

Table 9: Dimensions of trust measured by *Cronbach's Alpha* – Education Sector

Dimensions	Alpha	N. de items
Trust in organization	0,937	10
Trust in work team	0,927	10
Trust in coworker	0,908	10
Trust in superior	0,835	10

Source: elaborated by the authors.

Table 10 presents the results obtained from EICCOrg as a unidimensional scale correlating dimensions of trust and OC.

Table 10 – Correlations between dimensions of trust and OC – Education Sector

Correlations					
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Trust in superior	1,000				
2. Trust in coworker	,628**	1,000			
3. Trust in work team	,599**	,624**	1,000		
4. Trust in organization	,632**	,440**	,600**	1,000	
5. Org. Citizenship	,480**	,484**	,789**	,762**	1,000

** . Correlation is significant in level 0,01 (2-tailed).

Source: elaborated by the authors.

The coefficient analysis allows to verify that all coefficients found are statistically significant. A positive relation between dimensions of trust and OC may be observed. Among the four trust variables, trust in work team presents the highest correlation coefficient regarding OC (0,789). Trust in superior presented the lowest correlation coefficient regarding Organizational Citizenship (0,480).

Table 11 presents results of the relation for dimensions of trust and dimensions of OC.

Table 11 – Correlations between dimensions of trust and OC dimensions – Education Sector

	Descriptive Est.			Correlations								
	Mean	Md	D. P.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1. Trust in superior	5,837	6,000	0,785	1,000								
2. Trust in coworker	5,614	5,700	0,988	,628**	1,000							
3. Trust in work team	5,306	5,400	1,125	,599**	,624**	1,000						
4. Trust in organization	3,963	3,800	0,732	,632**	,440**	,600**	1,000					
5. Individual initiative	5,806	5,778	0,739	,398*	0,305	,700**	,790**	1,000				
6. Additional commitment	5,748	5,750	0,642	,433**	,362*	,672**	,742**	,831**	1,000			
7. Help	5,967	5,917	0,497	,459**	,721**	,714**	,588**	,671**	,648**	1,000		
8. Organizational defense	6,057	6,000	0,906	,448**	,556**	,871**	,519**	,688**	,607**	,714**	1,000	

** . Correlation is significant in level 0,01 (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant in level 0,05 (2-tailed).

Source: elaborated by the authors.

Data analysis in Table 11 allows to verify that all coefficients are statistically significant, except for the correlation between trust in coworker and individual initiative (0,305). A positive relation between dimensions of trust and of OC may be observed. Among the four OC variables, correlation between organizational defense and trust in work team is the one with the highest coefficient regarding dimensions of trust (0,871). Among the statistically significant coefficients, correlation between additional commitment and trust in coworker presents the lowest coefficient (0,362).

Table 12 show the regression calculus to explain the relation between dimensions of trust and dimensions of OC for a more precise analysis result.

Table 12 – Results of multiple linear regression tests and VIF for correlations of dimensions of trust regarding OC dimensions – Education Sector

Dimension (Model 1)	Individual initiative	Additional commitment	Help	Org. Defense	Org. Citizenship	Collinearity Est.	
						Toler.	VIF
Trust in superior	-0,247	-0,19	-0,093	-0,211	-0,173	,440	2,271
Trust in coworker	-0,159	-0,061	,244(**)	0,035	0,024	,545	1,835
Trust in work team	,374(***)	,341(***)	0,125	,726(***)	,297(***)	,457	2,188
Trust in organization	,670(***)	,491(***)	0,189	0,12	,412(***)	,460	2,174
F	19,9(***)	19,2(***)	12,0(***)	27,3 (***)	27,6(***)		
R ²	72,70%	71,90%	61,60%	78,50%	78,60%		
R ² adjusted	69,00%	68,10%	56,50%	75,60%	75,80%		

(*) p < 0,05, (**) p < 0,01, (***) p < 0,001.

Source: elaborated by the authors.

It may be observed that correlation values for trust in superior in Education Sector are statistically significant (Table 11). The highest value was found for correlation with behaviors of help (0,459), a little higher than the value found for the dimension of help in the total sample (0,423) (Table 3). In regression equations, trust in superior did not appear to play an explanatory power over other dimensions.

As Table 11 reveals, trust in coworker presented significant correlation coefficients ranging from 0,362 to 0,721. Most significant correlation involving trust in coworker occurred with the OC dimension of help (0,721). In regression testing, trust in coworker was the most significant predictor for the dimension of help.

The dimension trust in work team presented significant correlation coefficients, ranging from 0,672 to 0,871 (Table 11), higher than the ones found in the total sample. Significant correlations involving trust in work team occurred with OC dimensions organizational defense (0,871), help (0,714), individual initiative (0,700), additional commitment (0,341), unidimensional OC (0,297), and the only one among the other dimensions of trust, organizational defense (0,726).

Trust in the organization presented correlation coefficients between 0,519 and 0,790 (Table 11). Most significant correlations involving trust in organization occurred with OC dimensions individual initiative (0,790) and additional commitment (0,742). Regression testing (Table 12) reveals trust in organization as the main predictor for behaviors of individual initiative (0,670), additional commitment (0,491) and unidimensional OC (0,412).

4.4 Comparative Study between sample and subsamples

In face of the data analyzed and considering the dimensions of trust and its relations with OCBs in the sample and subsamples of Education and Health sectors, the three groupings show a statistically significant index for the influence of dimensions of trust and expressions of OCBs, with each one presenting its own specificities to justify the difference in the indexes revealed in previous seen data.

In the total sample, trust in organization reached the higher index (0,929), sustained by the subsamples in Health sector (0,924) and Education sector (0,937), therefore, pointing to the respondents' credibility in the public sector.

Regarding correlations of dimensions of trust and the OC construct, data in the total sample reaffirmed a positive correlation between trust in the organization and expression of OCB (0,720). The dimension trust in coworker (0,753) stood out in the health subsample, followed by trust in work team (0,789) in the education subsample. This fact allows us to affirm that, for each of the groups, we have

a different dimension of trust stimulating respondents in the expression of OCBs.

Taking OC construct in its two dimensions, the correlation presenting higher index is trust in coworker and (0,804 and 0,853, respectively), both for the total sample and Health Sub-sample. In Education, though, trust in work team and organizational defense (0,871) present a more significant relation.

In Health Sector, a higher correlation between trust in coworker and behaviors of help occurred (0,853) and regression results (Table 8) confirmed that trust in coworker was the only predictor for help (0,451). This reveals a straight connection between trust in coworkers and the manifestations of behaviors to help one another to reach the sector's goals.

In the Education Sector, the highest correlation was seen between trust in work team and behaviors of organizational defense (0,871), and, according to regression results (Table 12), trust in work team was the only predictor for organizational defense (0,762). This shows a straight connection between trust in team and actions to defend and support the group.

Trust in superior presented weak to moderate correlations both in the total sample and subsamples, showing that, besides not being an important dimension, the other ones play a more significant role in relations with OC because they presented at least one strong correlation with OC dimensions.

A result regarding the explanatory power of dimensions of trust over expressions of OC in each sector may be observed. In the total sample, trust in organization presented a positive relation with dimensions: individual initiative, additional commitment and help. In the Health Sector, trust in coworker explains the behaviors of help, individual initiative, additional support and OC. These examples confirm the existence, for each subsample, of other possible distinct variables that may condition OCBs.

In Education Sector it is possible to verify that trust in work team explains behaviors of organizational defense, individual initiative, additional commitment and OC (measured by EICCOrg as a unidimensional scale), while, in Health Sector, trust in work team explains only behaviors of organizational defense. Regarding what occurs with trust in coworker variable, we see that, in the Education Sector, this dimension exerts an explanatory power only over behaviors of help.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The results of this study confirmed the positive and significant correlation between dimensions of trust and expressions of OCBs in samples found by Dolan, Tzafrir and Baruch (2005), Henriques (2003), Korsgaard; Brodt and Whitener (2002), Menguc (2000) and Robinson e Morrison (1995). Multiple regression tests showed that trust plays an important role over OCBs. It was possible to identify, through the results obtained, the main predecessors for OCBs as much for the sample as for the subsamples.

Studying the subsamples, the existence of specificities conditioning correlations and the explanatory power of trust variables in each sector was observed. Results revealed that OCBs are a kind of response to an environment based on trust.

When considering variables for each dimension of trust, human resources managers may work in a way that identifies the causes leading particular variables to influence negatively on trust in the organization and intervene to increase levels of trust that may be low.

With the results of this study, it is expected to offer organizations a reflection on how to make the work environment more cooperative and with more manifestations of OCBs. This way, workers will be more committed to their tasks and more willing to help one another, willing

to support and defend coworkers and the organization, to motivate others, to search for their self-development, to preserve the organization's resources, to offer attitudes when faced with problems and difficulties (or even to encourage the team). Finally, a series of benefits for all involved is possible.

This study may become an important tool to help the manager develop strategies to maximize performance in administrative processes and to enhance human relations in the organization. Understanding OC will promote the development of an organizational environment in the company that results in cooperative and proactive attitudes.

For public companies that aim at offering necessary services and satisfying their users' needs, results obtained in this study may be used in personnel management, especially improving an organizational culture based on social responsibility, on the definition of organizational values, on the effective management of resources and the fulfilment of public servants. This way, servants will be willing to secure a good customer service and to promote the ongoing search for results that can satisfy the needs by the public organization's users.

It is suggested that future inquiries provide a more profound analysis of statistical data investigating other variables that may influence trust and OC. It is also suggested that a qualitative research is undertaken, elucidating questions that are between the lines in numerical data, in order to deepen the questions raised after statistical data is collected.

REFERENCES

- BARNARD, C. I. **The functions of the executive**. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- BATEMAN, T. S.; ORGAN, D. W. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". **Academy of Management Journal**, v. 26, n. 4, 1983, p. 587-595. Available at: <<http://amj.aom.org/content/26/4/587.short>>. Access in 04 Feb. 2014.
- DEJOURS, C; ABDOUCHELI, E.; JAYET, C. **Psicodinâmica do Trabalho**: contribuições da Escola Dejouriana à análise da relação prazer, sofrimento e trabalho. São Paulo: Atlas, 1994.
- DEJOURS, J. C. **A banalização da injustiça social**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2000.
- DIEHL, A. A. **Pesquisa em ciências sociais aplicadas**: métodos e técnicas. São Paulo: Prentice Hall, 2004.
- DOLAN, S. L.; TZAFRIR, S.S.; BARUCH, Y. Testing the causal relationships between procedural justice, trust and organizational citizenship behavior. **Revue de Gestion des Ressources Humaines**, v. 14, n. 10, Dez. 2005, p. 79-89. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Simon_Dolan/publication/228352863_Testing_the_causal_relationships_between_procedural_justice_trust_and_organizational_citizenship_behavior/links/00b7d5283bb104df3b000000.pdf>. Access in : 10 Feb. 2014.
- DRUMMOND, V. S. **Confiança e liderança nas organizações**. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2007.
- FARIAS FILHO, M. C.; ARRUDA FILHO, E. **Planejamento da Pesquisa Científica**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2013.
- FEHR, E. On the Economics and Biology of Trust. **Journal of the European Economic Association**, 2009, v. 7, n.2-3, p.235-266.
- GAMBETTA, D. **Trust**: Making and breaking cooperative relations. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

_____. Can We Trust Trust? In: Gambetta, Diego (ed.) **Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations**. Electronic edition, Department of Sociology, University of Oxford, chapter 13, 2000, p. 213-237.

GEORGE, D.; MALLERY, P. **SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference**. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2003.

GIL, A.C. **Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa**. 4. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002

GILLESPIE, N. **Measuring trust in working relationships: the behavioral trust inventory**. **Proceedings of the Academy of Management Conference**, Seattle, WA, USA, 2003.

GOMES, A. C. P. **Construção, Desenvolvimento e Validação da Escala de Intenções Comportamentais de Cidadania Organizacional (EICCOrg)**. 2011. Dissertation. (Masters in Psychology) - Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Programa de Pós Graduação em Psicologia, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2011. Available in: <<https://pospsi.ufba.br/sites/pospsi.ufba.br/files/ana_cristina_gomes.pdf>. Access in: 10 Aug. 2013.

GRUNIG, J.E.; HON, L. C. **Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations**. **Institute for Public Relations**, 1999. Available in: <<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2bf6/b0b64c6efeae3512ba2a13222f751a144a73.pdf>>. Access in: 04 Oct. 2013.

HENRIQUES, Alexandre José de Jesus Carlos. **Comportamentos de cidadania organizacional: O papel da confiança na chefia**. 2003. Dissertation. (Masters in Organizational Behavior) - Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada, Lisboa, 2003.

KATZ, D.; KAHN, R. **Psicologia social das organizações**. São Paulo: Atlas, 1973.

KERR, S.; JERMIER, J. M. Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, v. 22, n. 3, 1978, p. 375-403. Available at: <<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0030507378900235>>. Access in: 29 Mar. 2014.

KONOVSKY, M. A.; PUGH, S. D. Citizenship Behavior and Social Exchange. **Academy of Management Journal**, v. 37, n.3, p. 656–669, 1994.

KORSGAARD, M. A.; BRODT, E. S.; WHITENER, M. E. Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, v. 87, n. 2, 2002, p. 312 – 319.

MENEGON, L. F. **Comportamento Organizacional**. São Paulo: Person Education do Brasil, 2012.

MENGUC, B. An Empirical Investigation of a Social Exchange Model of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Across Two Sales Situations: A Turkish Case. **The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, ABI/INFORM global**. v. 20, n. 4, 2000, p.205.

MEHBOOB, F.; BHUTTO, N. A. Job satisfaction as a Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. A Study of Faculty Members at Business Institutes. Dubai: **International Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Behavioral Sciences (ICBEMBS'2012)**, Jan. 7/8, 2012.

MOORMAN, R. H.; BLAKELY, G. L. Individualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, v. 16, 1995, p. 127–142.

MONTGOMERY, D. C.; PECK, E. A.; VINING, G. G. **Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis**. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. Inc., 2012.

ORGAN, D. W. **Organizational Citizenship behavior**: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1988.

PODSAKOFF, P. M.; MACKENZIE, S.B.; BOMMER, W.M. Transformational Leader Behaviors and Substitutes for Leadership as Determinants of Employee Satisfaction, Commitment, Trust, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. **Journal of Management**, v. 22, n. 2, 1996, p. 259-298.

PODSAKOFF, P. M. *et al.* Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. **Journal of Management**, v.26, n.3, 2000, p.513-563. Available at: <<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/014920630002600307>>. Access in: 10 Oct. 2013

REGO, Arménio. Climas éticos e comportamentos de cidadania organizacional. **Rev. adm. empres.**, São Paulo, v. 42, n. 1, Mar. 2002, p. 50-63.

ROBINSON, S. L.; MORRISON, E. W. Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behavior. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, v. 16, n. 3, 1995, p. 289 – 298.

Rogerson, P. A. **Statistical methods for geography**. London: Sage, 2001.

SIMÕES, V.D. P. **Gerindo um Bem Escasso**: O papel da comunicação interna na construção de confiança na organização. 2010. Dissertation. (Master in Strategic Management of Public Relations) Escola Superior de Comunicação Social, Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa, Lisboa, 2010.

SIQUEIRA, M.M.M. *et al.* **Medidas do comportamento organizacional**: Ferramentas de diagnóstico e de gestão. Porto Alegre: ARTMED, 2008.

TURNIPSEED, D. L.; RASSUALI, A., Performance perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors at work: a bi-level study among managers and employees. **British Journal of Management**, 2005, 16, 231-244. Available at: <<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00456.x/full>>. Access in: 09 Sept. 2013

VERGARA, S. C.; BRANCO, Paulo D. Empresa Humanizada: a organização necessária e possível. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**. São Paulo: RAE, v. 41, nº 2, Abr./Jun. 2001, p. 20-30.

VERGARA, S. C. **Projetos e relatórios de pesquisa em administração**. 8. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2007.

YAN, V. V. **Projecto de Investigação sobre a Relação dos Comportamentos de Cidadania Organizacional com a Avaliação de Desempenho, a Intenção de Turnover e o Turnover Voluntário**. 2008. Dissertation. (Integrated Masters in Psychology) - Universidade de Lisboa, Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação, Lisboa, 2008.

ZANINI, M. T. **Confiança**: o principal ativo intangível de uma empresa: pessoas, motivação e construção de valor. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2007.

ZANINI, M.T.; LUSK, E.J.; WOLLP, B. Confiança dentro das organizações da nova economia: uma análise empírica sobre as consequências da incerteza institucional. **RAC. Revista de Administração Contemporânea**, v. 13, n. 1, 2009, p. 67-89. Available at: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rac/v13n1/a06v13n1>>. Access in: 14 Oct. 2013.