

Research Article

OFFERING A CAUSAL MODEL PREDICTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL LOYALTY: THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSPARENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST STUDY: EMPLOYEES ZAHEDAN UNIVERSITY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

*Nadiya Nadim Nezhad¹, Mojtaba Pahlavani² and Fariba Nadim Nezhad³

¹Department of Management, University of Shiraz, Iran

²Department of Management, Islamic Azad University, Nikshahr, Iran

³Department of Educational Research, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Iran

*Author for Correspondence

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the mediating role for organizational trust on transparency and organization a loyalty. The research methods were descriptive-correlation. The studied population comprised 630 employees of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. For this purpose, using a random sample of 187 personal were selected and responded to self report questionnaire of Organizational loyalty (the attitude Allen & Mayer (1990), the behavioral Zaytaml (1996)), Organizational trust and transparency Rawlins (2008), results showed that the relationship between organizational transparency and organizational loyalty, is affected by organizational trust. The Dimensions (accountability, information sharing and participative) organizational transparency on attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty is positive indirect effect and (secretive) organizational transparency on behavioral and Attitudes aspects of organizational loyalties negative indirect effect. This means that the dimensions of organizational transparency (accountability, information sharing and participative, secretive) on attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty have not a direct effect. While indirect effect on the four dimensions of organizational transparency on attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty is significant. This indicates that the mediating role of organizational trust through transparency and organizational loyalty. Also, the amount of variance explained the fitted model study for dimension Attitudes equal is 0/23 and for dimension behavioral loyalty equal is 0/21.

Keywords: *Organizational Transparency, Organizational, Trust Organizational Loyalty*

INTRODUCTION

Today, human resources and its unique role as a strategic source, designer and administrator of systems and organizational processes has become more important and gained a high position compared to the past, so that human is considered a significant source in advanced organizational thinking; in other words, it is regarded as the most important production source in every organization (Tabarsa, 1387).

Given the importance and role of human resources in organizational success, evidence shows that the quality and quantity of products or services will have a direct relationship with employees' commitment and loyalty to organizational values and objectives (Gudarzi, 1390). It seems that organizational transparency can have a significant role in improvement and development of organizational loyalty; in other words, it can help organizations to achieve sustainable competitive advantages and maintain their position (Teimurnejad, 1382). In this research organizational trust is used as a variable to explain the conceptual model. On one hand, organizational trust affects organizational transparency and on the other hand influences organizational loyalty. Therefore, this variable is investigated here. Trust is defined as the decision to rely on others and expect their performance based on this shared agreement. At each level of trust, there is a standard amount of risk that the other one will not act based on agreements (Clark, 2004).

Theoretical Foundations

Organizational Loyalty

Poor staff can cause business failure and ordinary staff will keep business and help it to reach breakeven point. However, good staff can help the organizations to reach their highest performance (Deal, 2003). As

Research Article

a result, organizations should not only attract the best people but also create loyalty to maintain them (Barnet, 2003). Loyalty has been defined in three different ways: First: Outcomes resulted from interactions between employee and organization.

Second: As tendency toward organization in which tendency contains three factors: Identification of organizational values and objectives; High involvement in work activities; High tendency to be a member of the organization. Third: some researchers have defined loyalty based on behavior and tried to combine the first and second definitions. Therefore, it can be said that loyalty is a form of attachment with both affective and behavioral components (Bronte, 2003). Organizational loyalty can be defined as: "labor which is committed to organizational success and believes that his organization is the best place to work for." These employees want to stay in the organization and never look for alternative options or pay attention to other job offers (www.loyaltysearch.com). Attitudinal loyalty: It's a kind of attachment, mutuality, and trust (Allen and Mayer, 1990). Porter (1974) identifies attitudinal loyalty as the relative power of individual identification and his membership in a special organization. Guest (1995) defines it as powerful understanding and belief in acceptance of organizational values and objectives as well as high inclination to work for the organization or even perform beyond one's abilities toward organizational interests. Attitudinal loyalty includes three components based on affective commitment, continued commitment, and normative commitment. Behavioral loyalty: Loyalty is shown in different ways. Since emotions cannot be seen, behavioral dimensions help us to evaluate loyalty. In organizations, loyalty-based behaviors are usually implicit. Behavioral loyalty is established as a result of previous performance of people who are eventually connected to each other. This framework includes the following main dimensions: 1. Considering positive features of organization; 2. Tendency to remain in the organization; 3. Ignoring the benefits of other organizations; 4. Complaining

Organizational Transparency

In recent years, organizational transparency has been investigated by several researchers, because lack of transparency has been identified as a fundamental factor in 2008-2009 crises.

Transparency is so important that some researchers have introduced it more beneficial than strict rules (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008).

Strathern (2000) believes that transparency is a social issue which is created through expectations of organizational main actors such as top management, consultants, experts, and other beneficiaries. Transparency in commercial organizations includes division of information which is not normally exchanged between two business parties (Lamming & Coldwell, 2005).

Some researchers believe that transparency depends on beneficiaries' perception. According to these researchers, transparency is every individual's mental perception of awareness about the other party's characteristics and activities (Haltman and Axelsson, 2004).

Given studies done in the field of transparency, two main attitudes can be presented:

1. Transparency is a static phenomenon and is referred to conditions that disclosed information is standard and reported through formal documents. This kind of information disclosure is a one-sided reporting (from organization to beneficiaries or legislators). This form of information sharing is based on formal and standard processes, so that beneficiaries who want more information should convince managers and other organizational officials.

2. Transparency is a dynamic phenomenon. This kind of transparency is mostly created by development of information and communication technology, because these technologies enable continuous interaction between organization and its beneficiaries. In dynamic transparency, IT can establish a virtual environment for organizational information exchange and increase beneficiaries' participation (Vakar and Vemdsen, 2008).

Hess believes that organizational transparency means the right to know. From this point of view, the most important objectives of social accountability include: increasing beneficiaries' participation and organizational transparency. Eventually, it can be said that without exact and on time information it's not possible for beneficiaries to expect effective responses from decision-makers (Barjer and Owns, 2009). Transparency is the best tool for dealing with corruption. It should be mentioned that corruption is not

Research Article

only an ethical issue, but also a big barrier for organizational growth and development (Lindstedts and Naurin, 2006). In his complementary studies, Laurens identified four main factors which affect organizational transparency: substantial information, participation, accountability, and secretiveness (opposite to honesty and transparency).

Substantial Information

Transparent organizations should provide beneficiaries (external and internal) required information, so that they can make informed decisions. It means that transparent organizations should disclose all organizational information which can be represented legally.

Participation

Beneficiaries are supposed to cooperate and participate in identifying the required information. It can be said that transparency doesn't merely mean making information available, rather it means beneficiaries' active participation in obtaining and distributing information which eventually brings about knowledge.

Accountability

As it is known, transparency requires accountability. Transparent organizations are accountable toward their activities, decisions, as well as beneficiaries. It seems that accountability to one's behavior and speech makes people more aware of their decisions and performance, because they are expected to justify what they have done.

Secretiveness

It means sharing a special part of information or disclosing information when it is needed. When there is a high rate of secretiveness in the organization, its transparency will decrease.

Eventually, Rawlins has introduced four elements in measurement of organizational transparency. To this end, he mentioned some essential elements in measurement of each dimension including:

Information dimension: Essential elements include relatedness, being correct, comprehensiveness, reliability, and confirmation of information.

Participation dimension: Investigated elements are feedback, providing detailed information, and facilitating access to information.

Accountability dimension: The amount of shared information is an essential element (does disclosed information cover all organizational issues and dimensions?).

Secretiveness dimension: the essential elements include the amount of organizational efforts to hide information and the amount of organizational honesty.

Analysis of these issues will enable beneficiaries to determine organizational transparency in an effective way.

Organizational Trust

Trust is considered as a basic factor in effective relationships and a fundamental principle in organizational closeness. Becker and Billings (1993) refer to trust as a major factor for organizational success, continuous change and transformation in technology, roles, job design, and responsibilities. Looking at the two extremes from trust to lack of trust, Shaw (1997) explains about the importance of trust as follows: "success at work (business) depends on two factors: 1) winning competitive strategy and 2) super organizational execution. Lack of trust is an enemy to both of them." This explanation emphasizes in the critical role of organizational trust.

Trust will create interpersonal and intrapersonal impacts and affects organizational external and internal relations. Since trust is an underlying (basic) mental state, it affects individuals' perceptions, tendencies, and behaviors (Costigan *et al.*, 1998; Marshall, 2000). Employees' trust in each other and organization as a whole has a direct effect on their perception of their roles in organization (Jones *et al.*, 1998).

Mino (2002) believes that trust can provide a basis for motivation, creativity, and maintaining employees. Moreover, experimental and field experiences have shown that reliable behavior in the frame of relations and attentions to the management has a positive and causal relationship with employees' trust in management (Karsgado *et al.*, 2002).

Lohman separated personal trust from systemic (organizational) trust; however, he showed that trust appears in a mutual performance framework which affects people and social systems (Nihan *et al.*, 1997).

Research Article

Perio and colleagues (2007) stated that Lohman has divided trust into interpersonal trust (which is measured by trust in supervisors) and systemic trust (which is measured by total trust in organization). Systemic trust is defined as latent trust and a phenomenon which is beyond daily experiences and affects personal trust (Perio *et al.*, 2007). Lohman (1979) believes that the real value of trust is that it enables organizational members to decrease complexities of organizational life.

Researchers have considered different dimensions for organizational trust. Simon introduces honesty as a critical and key criterion for developing organizational trust. Maier and colleagues refer to ability, benevolence, transparency, and tendency of one to another as effective variables on organizational trust. Different researchers have considered various factors in measurement of trust. Among these factors, there are three main ones including ability, benevolence, and honesty.

Ability is defined as a set of skills, qualification, and features by which a department can affect other departments in a specified range. Since the one in whom others trust may have high qualifications which increase reliability, a specified range is provided.

Benevolence is a range where the trusted person believes he wants to do something good. Here, there is no motivation for profit. Benevolence shows that the trusted party has special achievements for those who trust. An example of this case can be the relationship between two sides.

The relationship between honesty and trust depends on the perception of those who trust about the trusted party's honesty and how he follows a set of principles. Mac Fall has studied the importance of following these principles and states that following some principles represent honesty. Any way, if these principles are not accepted, the trusted person will lack required honesty for specific goals and intentions.

Research Model

Given the experimental background, organizational loyalty has a direct effect on employees' performance and leads to less turnover, more efficient use of resources, and higher organizational productivity. On the other hand, organizational transparency usually increases effectiveness of organizations. Establishment of trust is one of important ways through which loyalty is created. Since there are few studies on the direct relationship between transparency and loyalty, the present study aims to investigate the effects of organizational transparency on loyalty with regard to trust as a mediating variable. Therefore, the conceptual model and research hypotheses are presented here.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Method

This research was practical regarding objectives and descriptive, correlational regarding data collection methods. Statistical population included all staff of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences including 630 people based on Informatics center statistics. 187 employees were selected using Cochran formula and through simple random sampling. Questionnaires of loyalty self-reporting, transparency, and organizational trust were used for data collection. Rawlins (2008) questionnaire was used to measure transparency variable. This questionnaire contains 27 statements which measure four components (participation, information sharing, accountability, and secretiveness). In order to measure organizational trust, Rawlins (2008) standard questionnaire was used. This questionnaire contains 13 statements and measures three components (competence, integration, and goodwill). Questionnaire of organizational loyalty includes 16 statements and two attitudinal and behavioral dimensions each of which has some components. In this research Allen and Meyer (1990) questionnaire was used to measure "attitudinal dimensions in organizational loyalty". This questionnaire contains 18 statements and some components such as continuous, affective, and normative commitment. Zeetamil questionnaire (1996) was used for measurement of "behavioral dimensions". The questionnaire includes 8 statements and some components such as considering positive characteristics of organization, tendency to remain, ignoring the benefits of other organizations and complaining.

In order to identify questionnaire reliability, Chronbach's alpha and SPSS software were used. Accordingly, the obtained coefficient was 0.79 for organizational transparency, 0.85 for organizational trust and 0.91 for organizational loyalty. Data was analyzed using indicators of descriptive statistics

Research Article

(mean, SD, tilts and strain) and indicators of inferential statistics (Pearson correlation coefficient, path analysis, and confirmatory factor analysis) through LISREL and SPSS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

In this research the direct and indirect effects of organizational transparency (accountability, basic information, participation, and secretiveness) and organizational trust dimensions (competence, integration, basic information) on attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of loyalty were investigated. To measure the assumed model of the research, first parameters were estimated using maximum likelihood method. Estimated parameters include direct effect coefficient, indirect effect coefficient, and total effect coefficients for each of which a separate table has been provided containing standardized estimated coefficients, estimation standard error, and t-value associated with parameter significance. According to these coefficients, research hypotheses are approved or rejected. Eventually, model fitness feature and fitted model of organizational loyalty are presented.

Since correlation path analysis between variables is the basic part of the study, correlation matrix of research variables is presented.

Table 1: Correlation matrix of research variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Accountability	1								
Information sharing	0.22**	1							
Participation	0.25**	0.24**	1						
Secretiveness	-0.18**	-0.25**	-0.29**	1					
Competence	0.27**	0.30**	0.33**	-0.24**	1				
Integration	0.18**	0.22**	0.15**	-0.11*	0.12*	1			
Goodwill	0.24**	0.30**	0.28**	-0.40**	0.14**	0.13*	1		
Attitudinal dimension	0.17**	0.14*	0.20**	-0.18**	0.31**	0.22**	0.37**	1	
Behavioral dimension	0.17**	0.15**	0.11*	-0.16**	0.32**	0.27**	0.28**	-0.11*	1

According to table1, from exogenous variables (dimensions of organizational transparency) accountability (0.17), secretiveness (-0.16), information sharing (0.15), and participation (0.11) have the highest to lowest correlation coefficient with behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty and all of coefficients are statistically significant. From endogenous variables (dimensions of organizational trust) competence (0.32), goodwill (0.28), and integration (0.27) showed the highest to lowest correlation with behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty.

Moreover, according to this table among exogenous variables (dimensions of organizational transparency) participation (0.20), secretiveness (-0.18), accountability (0.17), and information sharing (0.14) had the highest to lowest correlation with attitudinal dimensions of organizational loyalty and all coefficients are statistically significant. From endogenous variables (dimensions of organizational trust) goodwill (0.37), competence (0.31), and integration (0.22) had the highest to lowest correlation with attitudinal dimensions of organizational loyalty.

Given the information in the following table, hypotheses associated with direct effects of variables will be approved or rejected.

According to table2, direct effects of organizational transparency dimensions (accountability, basic information, participation, and secretiveness) on dimensions of organizational trust (competence, integration, and goodwill) and also direct effects of organizational trust dimensions (competence, integration, and goodwill) on dimensions of organizational loyalty (attitudinal and behavioral dimensions) show that only the effect of participation on integration equals 0.07 and the direct effect of secretiveness on integration equals -0.03 which is not statistically significant considering t (t=0.49). Other variables have statistically significant relationship.

Research Article

Given the information in table3, hypotheses associated with indirect effects of variables will be approved or rejected.

Table 2: Estimations of direct effect coefficients

Variables	Standardized parameters	Estimation standard error	T
Direct effect of accountability on:			
Competence	0.15**	0.03	2.93
Integration	0.12*	0.03	2.19
goodwill	0.12*	0.04	2.24
Direct effect of information sharing on:			
Competence			
Integration	0.19**	0.02	3.66
Goodwill	0.17**	0.04	3.01
	0.17**	0.03	3.33
Direct effect of participation on:			
Competence	0.21**	0.04	3.91
Integration	0.07	0.03	1.12
Goodwill	0.12*	0.04	2.18
Direct effect of secretiveness on:			
Competence	-0.11*	0.02	2.01
Integration	-0.03	0.02	0.49
Goodwill	-0.30**	0.03	5.83
Direct effect of competence on:			
Attitudinal dimension	0.25**	0.04	4.89
Behavioral dimension	0.27**	0.04	5.24
Direct effect of integration on:			
Attitudinal dimension	0.15**	0.04	2.94
Behavioral dimension	0.21	0.05	4.22
Direct effect of goodwill on:			
Attitudinal dimension	0.31**	0.03	6.25
Behavioral dimension	0.21**	0.04	4.13

Table 3: Estimation of indirect effect coefficients

Variables	Standardized parameters	Estimation standard error	t
Indirect effect of accountability on:			
Attitudinal dimension	0.09**	0.02	3.78
Behavioral dimension	0.09**	0.03	3.87
Indirect effect of information sharing on:			
Attitudinal dimension	0.13**	0.03	4.83
Behavioral dimension	0.12**	0.03	4.81
Indirect effect of participation on:			
Attitudinal dimension	0.10**	0.03	3.84
Behavioral dimension	0.09**	0.04	3.82
Indirect effect of secretiveness on:			
Attitudinal dimension	-0.13**	0.02	4.63
Behavioral dimension	-0.10**	0.03	3.71

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Research Article

In investigating indirect effects of organizational transparency dimensions (accountability, basic information, participation, and secretiveness) on dimensions of organizational loyalty (attitudinal and behavioral dimensions) it was observed that indirect effects of transparency dimensions on organizational loyalty are statistically significant. It should be mentioned that these effects are through mediating role of organizational trust dimensions (competence, integration, and goodwill).

Total Effects

Another estimated parameter is related to measurement of total effects which can be obtained from the combination of direct and indirect effects. In some cases variables have direct or just indirect effects in each other where the total effect will equal the direct or indirect effect.

Another characteristic of path analysis is possible comparison of total, direct, and indirect effects and also measurement of endogenous variables variance by the model. Accordingly, tables 4&5 show direct, indirect, and total effects of variables on attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty along with explained variance.

Table 4: Standardized coefficients of direct, indirect, and total effects of variables on attitudinal dimensions along with variance

Variables	Direct effects	Indirect effects	Total effects	Variance
Estimations				
On attitudinal dimension of loyalty from:				
Accountability	-	0.09**	0.09**	
Basic information	-	0.13**	0.13**	
Participation	-	0.10**	0.10**	0.21
Secretiveness	-	-0.013**	-0.13**	
Competence	0.25**	-	0.25**	
Integration	0.15**	-	0.15**	
goodwill	0.31**	-	0.31**	

Table 5: Standardized coefficients of direct, indirect, and total effects of variables on behavioral dimensions along with variance

Variables	Direct effects	Indirect effects	Total effects	Variance
Estimations				
On behavioral dimension of loyalty from:				
Accountability	-	0.09**	0.09**	
Basic information	-	0.12**	0.12**	
Participation	-	0.09**	0.09**	0.23
Secretiveness	-	-0.10**	-0.10**	
Competence	0.27**	-	0.27**	
Integration	0.21**	-	0.21**	
goodwill	0.21**	-	0.21**	

According to the results of tables 4&5, none of transparency dimensions as research exogenous variables (accountability, information sharing, participation, and secretiveness) has a direct effect on attitudinal or behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty. This finding emphasizes on the mediating role of organizational trust between transparency and behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty. According to these results, variance obtained was 0.21 for attitudinal dimensions and 0.23 for behavioral dimensions of fitted model.

Research Article

Characteristics of Model Fitness and the Fitted Model

In order to investigate model fitness, fitness indicators were used. In total, among various fitness indicators, AGFI, GFI, RMSEA, and χ^2/df were used in the research. The following table presents model fitness characteristics.

Table 6: Model fitness characteristics in prediction of organizational loyalty

Characteristic	Estimation
The ration of chi-square to degree of freedom (χ^2/df)	1.90
P value	0.38
Adaptive fitness indicator (GFI)	1.00
Good fitness indicator (GFI)	0.99
Adjusted good fitness indicator (AGFI)	0.97
Square root of variance estimation in error approximation (RMSEA)	0.03

Considering good fitness reported in table6, model fitness for prediction of organizational loyalty is at a favorable level.

Diagram of fitted model is also presented along with estimated parameters (standard values)

Conclusion

The results showed that none of organizational transparency dimensions as research exogenous variables (accountability, information sharing, participation, and secretiveness) has direct effects on attitudinal dimensions of organizational loyalty. This is while indirect effect of each exogenous dimension including accountability (0.09), information sharing (0.13), participation (0.10), and secretiveness (0.13) on attitudinal dimensions of organizational loyalty is statistically significant. This finding emphasizes on the mediating role of organizational trust between transparency and attitudinal dimensions. Moreover, the results of total effects showed that none of organizational transparency dimensions as research endogenous variables (accountability, information sharing, participation, and secretiveness) has direct effects on behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty. This is while indirect effect of each exogenous dimension including accountability (0.09), information sharing (0.12), participation (0.09), and secretiveness (0.10) on behavioral dimensions of organizational loyalty is statistically significant. This finding emphasizes on the mediating role of organizational trust between transparency and behavioral dimensions.

According to findings, dimensions of accountability, information sharing, and participation have direct and positive effect on organizational trust while secretiveness has a direct and negative effect. In this regard, it is recommended to administrators of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences to follow these guidelines in order to increase employees' trust:

- Involve employees actively in fundamental and basic decision-making. This will help them to understand their organizational role better, concentrate on their responsibilities, and show higher integration and goodwill in organizational activities.
- Be accountable to employees to establish creativity and performance improvement in them.
- Provide basic information for informed decision-making.
- Managers shouldn't seek secretiveness and they should inform employees about basic and fundamental organizational information.

Moreover, findings showed that organizational trust dimensions had a direct and positive effect on dimensions of organizational loyalty in total. In this regard, it is recommended to administrators of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences to follow these guidelines in order to increase employees' loyalty:

- Increase democracy in work environment and create social integration and cohesion in organization.
- Increase employees' knowledge and awareness through holding seminars and workshops in order to increase their loyalty.

Research Article

- Increase employees' commitment to organizational ideals and objectives through delegating employees in selection of ideals and better objectives.

- Decrease control on employees' performance which will in turn increase their trust in organization and eventually their loyalty.

Moreover, findings showed that dimensions of organizational transparency (accountability, participation, and secretiveness) had a positive and indirect effect on attitudinal and behavioral dimensions through mediating role of organizational trust dimensions (competence, integration, and goodwill) while secretiveness has a negative indirect effect. In this regard, it is recommended to administrators of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences to follow these guidelines in order to increase employees' loyalty:

- Provide useful and appropriate information for employees so that they can make informed and proper decisions.

- Active participation of beneficiaries in obtaining and distribution of information leads to knowledge and is a requirement for organizational transparency. It will eventually lead to higher organizational loyalty.

- Increasing trust in organization through employees' participation in setting goals, decision-making, and daily activities is another important factor.

- Today, those organizations are successful and pioneering that have committed and loyal employees. Therefore, establishment of an efficient and dynamic management system seems necessary in order to increase employees' organizational loyalty.

REFERENCES

Allen and Meyer (1990). The measurement & antecedents of affective, continuance & normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* **63** 1-18.

Becker TE and Billings RS (1993). Profits commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **14** 177-90.

Burger R and Owens T (2010). Promoting Transparency in the NGO Sector: Examining the Availability and Reliability of Self- Reported Data. *World Development* **38**(9) 1263-1277.

Clark Williams C (2004). Trust Diffusion: The Effect of Interpersonal Trust on Structure, Function & Organizational Transparency, Boston University, Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Costigan R, Iiter S and Berman J Jr (1998). A multi-dimensional study of trust in Organizations. *Journal of Management Issues* **10**(3) 303-317.

Gist M (1987). Self-efficacy: Implication for organization behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review* **12** 472-485.

Hultman J and Axelsson (2007). Towards a Typology of Transparency for Marketing Management Research. *Industrial Marketing Management* **36** 627- 635.

Jones G and George J (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review* **23**(3) 531-546

Korsgaard MA, Brodt SE and Whitener EM (2002). Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy Behavior and organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **87**(2) 312-319.

Lamming RC, Philips W and Caldwell ND (2002). Turning the Transparency Concept into Practice: A Conceptual Model and Results from Case Studies. *Proceedings: The 11th IPSERA Conference, University of Twente, Netherlands.*

Lindstedt Catharina and Naurin Daniel (2007). Transparency against Corruption. A Cross-Country Analysis, manuscript, *Goteborg University.*

Luhmann N (1979). *Trust and Power: Two Works*, edited by Niklas Luhmann (New York: John Wiley).

Marshall EM (2000). *Building Trust at the Speed of Change: The Power of the Relationship-Based Corporation* (New York: AMACON).

Mayer RC, Davis JH and Schoolman FD (1995). An Integrative Model of organizational Trust. *Academy of Management Review* **20** 709-734.

Research Article

Mino CE (2002). Organizational trust, organizational cynicism and organizational commitment during a change initiative (*Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, August 2002*). *Dissertation abstracts International*.

Nyhan RC and Marlowe HA (1997). Development and psychometric properties of the Organizational trust inventory. *Evaluation Review* **21**(5) 614.

Perry RW and Mankin LD (2007). Organizational Trust, Trust in the Chief Executive and Work Satisfaction. *Journal of Public Personnel Management* **36**(2) 165-179.

Porter LW, Stons RM, Mowday RT and Boulian PV (1974). Organizational commitment, job Satisfaction & Turnover among psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **5**(5) 603-609.

Rawlins Brad L (2008). Measuring the Relationship Between Organizational Transparency and Employee Trust. *Public Relations Journal* **2**(2) 1-17.

Shaw RB (1997). *Trust in the Balance: Building Successful Organizations on Results Integrity and Concern* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

Strathern M (2000). The tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal* **26**(3) 309-321.

Tabarsa Mohammad (2006). The importance of human resource management. Available: www.gl.mefa.ir.

Teymornezhad Kave (2003). Accountability in the municipality of Tehran, research on how to provide municipal services and satisfaction, PhD thesis, *Allameh Tabataba'i University School of Management Accounting*.

Vaccaro A (2010). Corporate Transparency and Green Management. *Journal of Business Ethics* **95** 487-506.