The Impact of Employees' Behaviour in the Workplace

The Impact of Employees' Behaviour in the Workplace

Edited by

Emrah Atar

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

The Impact of Employees' Behaviour in the Workplace

Edited by Emrah Atar

This book first published 2022

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF LOCALLY
BASED WORKFORCE DIVERSITY,
MOTIVATION, CORPORATE VALUE,
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CITIZENSHIP

EMRAH ATAR[1]

1. The Concepts of Motivation

Scholars have been studying motivation continuously, and their methods of defining motivation are diverse and different. For example, Harris and Cameron (2005) pointed out that motivation is a state within a person, through which people could achieve their goals by being motivated, inspired and guided to take corresponding actions. Moreover, personal motivation can prompt individuals to take action to obtain self-satisfaction. Robbins and Luthans (2003) believed that motivation is a person's desire to do something, but only if the result of this behavior can satisfy a person's specific needs. This kind of need refers to the attractiveness that can make up for certain physical or psychological deficiencies. In addition, motivation is considered to be a course of behavior that can be regarded as "individuals make efforts to satisfy their own needs or to achieve a certain goal" (Lang, 2010). It could be explained as when an individual has an idea to do something, the reason is that there is a certain motivation to promote and support him/her to complete the task.

How to motivate employees has long been a topical issue in the field of economics and management. With the continuous deepening of research, the definition of work motivation has also been continuously improved. In general, an important function of motivation in an enterprise is to induce

---

[1] Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Administration at Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Turkey

and drive employees to complete their desired work results. Herbert (1976) identified work motivation as a process that makes employees work hard on their own initiative. It also refers to a set of variables that can influence individuals' perceptions of their work tasks, as well as the constraints of the working environment on their own behaviors. In addition, it and can also explain the direction and persistence of their individual behaviors. Sun (1986) claimed that work motivation is a process of mental activity, in which people are motivated inherently to move toward their desired goal.

Steer and Porter (1991) also indicated that work motivation is a process. This process occurs in an organisational context, and individuals' behaviors are stimulated, guided and maintained. Pinder (1998) stated that work motivation is an internal, hypothetical, and intangible structure; that is to say, various internal and external forces simultaneously stimulate employees' work behaviors through determining these behaviors' direction, method, intensity, and duration. Stephen Robbins (1998) pointed out that satisfying certain needs of individuals who wish to achieve organisational goals through high-level efforts is the basis of work motivation. Zhao (2000) defined work motivation as a kind of internal work drive, which prompts employees to achieve organisational goals in order to meet certain self-demand. Robins and Luthans (2003) stated that work motivation is a process, which originates from a certain physical or psychological deficiency of the individual, and inspires corresponding behaviors, or in other words, urges the person to strive towards a specific goal.

Although researchers' definitions of work motivation are different, they have particular points in common. Firstly, a specific need of the individual, which is a desire for something, leads to the emergency of work motivation. To be specific, desire motivates them to have this or that kind of motivation. Secondly, work motivation is generated for a certain corporate goal. To work towards the desired goal, individuals hope to put in their unremitting efforts, and this behaviour is driven by work motivation. Thirdly, individual behaviors' direction, method and duration within an organisation is determined by work motivation. In addition, work motivation guides the behaviors of individuals internally, that is to say, work motivation is the internal driving force of individual behaviors. To conclude, these definitions highlight the relationship of motivation and needs, goals, as well as behaviors. Therefore, this study supposes that work motivation is to meet employees' certain needs and encourage them to move toward specific organisational goals. Additionally, it is an internal

drive that can determine the direction, manner, and duration of an individual's behavior

a) Theories of Motivation

The stage when the concept of motivation is fully developed is the 20th century. Three famous theories were formed during this period: the hierarchy of needs theory, the theory X and theory Y, and the two-factor theory. In this section, the important theories mentioned above will be discussed in details.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory is considered one of the most famous motivation theories, which proposes that people's minds are preserved in the five levels of needs (Soni and Soni, 2016). They are physiological needs (including solving natural physical needs such as hunger, shelter and sex), safety needs (including personal, mental, psychological and physical safety requirements from harm), social needs (including love, belonging, acceptance and friendship), respect needs (including internal factors such as self-dignity, self-achievement and self-dominance, as well as external respect factors such as social status, social recognition and social attention), and self-realisation needs (including self-growth, development of self-potential and self-realisation). Maslow (1954) believed that these five internal needs are rising step by step. In other words, when one need is basically met, the next level of demand will become the dominant need of the person. From the driving perspective, this theory holds that even when a need is not fully satisfied, as long as the demand is generally met, it will no longer have an incentive effect. In the workplace context, if managers want to motivate someone, according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, they need to understand which level of needs the person is currently in and then focus on meeting this need or satisfying higher-level needs. In fact, many scholars and experts have recognised Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory due to the simplicity and ease of understanding, especially by those managers who are engaged in actual work in enterprises. Nevertheless, it is a pity that this theory still lacks research evidence to be tested (Harrigan et al., 2015).

From the perspective of human nature, McGregor and Cutcher-Gershenfeld (1960) proposed two hypotheses. One hypothesis supposes that human nature is negative, which is called Theory X. Conversely, the other hypothesis assumes that human nature is positive, which is called Theory Y. There are four assumptions regarding Theory X. First of all, employees do not love their work by nature, and as long as they have the right

opportunity, they will avoid work. Secondly, it is necessary to adopt coercive measures or to use punishment to make them achieve their goals because they do not love their jobs. Thirdly, employees will evade their responsibilities as long as there are suitable opportunities, and they will only comply with express regulations. Last but not least, most employees suppose that security is higher than other work-related factors and have no ambitions.

In contrast to these negative views on human nature, McGregor also proposed Theory Y, which is also based on the four assumptions about human nature. Firstly, the employees regard work as natural as rest and entertainment without boredom. If an employee makes a promise to accomplish a certain goal, he/she will take the initiative to guide and control himself/herself. Moreover, learning to take responsibility is recognised by workers, and they are even pursuing responsibility. Last but not least, making creative decisions is a universal ability that people have, not just managers. Theory X considers that lower-level needs determine individuals' behavior, but Theory Y considers that higher-level needs determine an individual's behavior (Senarathne, 2020). Actually, McGregor supported Theory Y due to its practicality and validity of it. Therefore, it has been usually believed that employees' work motivation can be mobilised by using some methods, such as making the management process more democratic, allowing employees to participate more in the process of making decisions, and offering more challenging and responsible work to employees, as well as building relax and harmonious group relationships (Noland, 2014).

The two-factor theory was put forward by the psychologist Herzberg. Herzberg (1968) believed that the relationship between an individual and his/her work is the most fundamental relationship, and the success of work tasks is highly related to a person's attitude towards work. A survey conducted by Herzberg found that people who are satisfied and dissatisfied with their jobs have different answers. In their answers, some factors are always related to job satisfaction, while others are always related to job dissatisfaction. The causes of these different factors could be divided into internal causes and external causes (Holmberg et al., 2018). Job satisfaction is often related to internal reasons, such as being recognised by superiors, gaining personal progress, achieving growth, and taking responsibility.

On the other hand, employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs tend to complain about external factors, such as company management system, salary and benefits, internal fairness, working environment, and colleague

relations. Herzberger (1968) concluded that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not two opposite sides. He argued that both the opposite of "satisfied" and "dissatisfied" is "not satisfied". According to Herzberger's point of view, the factors related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are independent and completely different. Therefore, if managers only pay attention to the dissatisfaction factors of employees in the management process and strive to eliminate these dissatisfaction factors, the possible result is only likely to bring peace to the workplace, instead of producing motivational effects (Lundberg et al., 2009). That is to say, these factors can only alleviate the dissatisfaction factors of employees, but employees cannot be really motivated. The factors that really motivate employees are usually related to the work itself, like improving personal abilities, promotion, leaders' affirmations, responsibility and achievement. To conclude, these factors are inherently rewarding and can stimulate the human's inherent potential (Thant and Chang, 2021).

b) Job Motivation in the Public Sector

Every country has both public and private sectors and the main difference between the two is the ownership. Political communities own public organizations, while private companies are owned by shareholders (Rainey et al., 1976). Thus, organizational characteristics are likely to differ between public sector organisations and private sector firms. However, how much difference there is has been constantly disputed by scholars. After analyzing 34 empirical studies, Boyne found that three hypotheses gained majority acceptance: *"public organizations are more bureaucratic, and public managers are less materialistic and have weaker organizational commitment than their private-sector counterparts"* (Boyne, 2002:97). In the public-sector model of work motivation, Wright (2001) suggested that sector employment choice can influence work context and impact work motivation. However, controversy has existed on the topic of inspiration in the public and private sectors. Public agencies generally have a hierarchy, and especially in China, high power distance is typical in those public sector organisations (Hofstede, 2011). The top-down communication, the vagueness of goals and poor employee commitment in the public sector may all hinder job motivation to different degrees. Still, other scholars argue that this is the case in the private rather than the public sector (Buelens and Van Den Broeck, 2007). On the other hand, public organizations often have broader missions and are able to have a more direct and profound impact on society and citizens. Workers in these kinds of organisations are likely to experience a sense of fulfillment through

serving others; job security in the public sector may be relatively higher (Kjeldsen and Hansen, 2018), while some research studies say the opposite (Crewson, 1997).

In China, the core purpose of all Chinese public services is "wei ren min fu wu", which was proposed by the first chairman of the Communist Party of China, Zedong Mao. These five Chinese characters represent the public sector's mission, which is to "serve the people" (Liu et al., 2008). Chinese people call jobs in the public sector "tie fan wan" which means the "iron rice bowl" showing that once an individual gets a job there, he or she will not have any possibility of losing it. This job security is one of the first things Chinese people would think of in the public sector (Zhang, 2017). The relationship between motivation and job satisfaction is more robust in public sector organisations than in private ones. Employees in the public sector are stereotyped as lazy, self-serving and misguided (Wright, 2001). Therefore, it is necessary to have a deeper understanding of employee motivation in the Chinese public sector. Li and Zhang (2017) have suggested some deficiencies in the incentive mechanism of Chinese public services. The first is that many organizations do not pay enough attention to the incentive to work and do not focus on the reward system and performance appraisal. Second, there are defects in the incentive system. Incentive indicators lack overall goal orientation, and there is no differentiation in the hierarchy. Third, the lack of understanding of the needs of different positions and different types of employees makes incentives less targeted.

2. Dimensions and Measurements of Corporate Values

The concept of value can be traced back to 1951, when Kluckhohn (1954) proposed that value is an idea that affects the behavior mode, approach, and purpose of an individual or group. In 1973, Rokeach (1973) defined values as preferences, ends, and enduring beliefs that lead an individual or society to believe in specific conduct or life. The ultimate and instrumental value systems identified by Rockeach in his values questionnaire emphasize the consequences and processes of value connotation, namely the end goal and the means of achieving the end goal, respectively.

The early research of scholars on values mainly focused on psychology and sociology. As corporate culture appeared in the field of scholars' eyes, corporate values were also studied by more and more scholars. Ardichivili (2002) proposed five characteristics of corporate ethical culture, among which mission and values-driven are the core elements. The consensus of

many scholars' research results is that values are the core and cornerstone of corporate culture (Hunt et al., 1989), and the values upheld by a company gradually form institutional norms with corporate characteristics after precipitation and accumulation (Thomsen, 2004). In his study, Campell et al. (2006) pointed out that corporate values are the philosophical thinking of enterprises, expressing the belief and value principles between enterprises and normative social structures (Adams, 2017). To sum up, corporate values are the reflection of corporate mission, vision, and social responsibility. The values of an enterprise represent the attitude and judgment of the enterprise towards things and are the basic beliefs and ultimate goals respected by the enterprise in the process of operation (Cambra-Fierro et al., 2008), which are accepted by the enterprise and employees (Hemingway and Maclagan, 2004). Although there is no definite quantitative standard for corporate values, it plays a leading role in decision-makers and employees (Schmeltz, 2014). Corporate values give employees direction and norms of behavior to better achieve corporate goals (Sadri and Lees, 2001).

Scholars' research on corporate values is based on corporate culture. Corporate values are the core of corporate culture. There are also many dimensional models in the research on the dimension and measurement of corporate values. Schein's value framework divides corporate values into external adaptation and internal integration (Schein et al., 2000). External adaptation includes government, community, partners, customers, and natural environment, while internal integration includes leadership and decision-making style, personal ethics, expectations of employees, group to group, individual to individual, and individual to group (Maltz and Schein, 2012). In 2015, Zhang Qiang integrated a new two-dimensional corporate values framework based on the research of Schein's two-dimensional values framework, and the external adaptive values include the government, community, suppliers, competitors, customers, and natural environment. The factors of internal integration include decision-making style, job requirements for employees, employees' attitude towards work, individual to individual, individual to the group, group to group. In 2003, Li Xiaodong constructed his corporate values framework from six dimensions: culture, labor, status, interests, enterprise, and market. In 2009, Doron proposed a three-dimensional framework of corporate values. He believed that corporate values could be divided into social-ethical, economic-practical, and emotional-development. The social-ethical dimension is morally oriented and regulates people's behaviour in organizations. Economy-utility is performance-oriented and reflects how individuals and

organizations compete and develop. The emotion-development dimension
is oriented to satisfy emotional needs and refers to personal development
opportunities and the realization of personal value.

To conclude, most scholars divide the dimensions of corporate values
from the perspective of morality and performance. However, the
emotional dimension introduced by Doron makes the division of corporate
values more perfect and has richer connotations.

3. Dimensions and Measurements of Organizational Identity

The concept of organizational identity belongs to the field of organizational
behavior. The earliest concept was put forward by Dearborn and Simon
(1958)and other scholars on the basis of social identity theory in 1958. In
the 1980s, Ashforth and Mael (1989) introduced the concept of organizational
identity into the study of organizational behavior, pointing out that
organizational identity is a perception of self-belonging of individuals in
an organization and establishes a psychological connection between
employees and organizations. It can be considered that corporate identity
reflects the specific identity and psychological state of individuals in
connection with the organization and can prompt employees to show some
attitudes and behaviors from the organisation's interests (Eksi et al., 2020).

So far, there is no unified result on the connotation of organizational
identity in the academic circle; there are different perspectives, such as
emotion and cognition, but most of the research on the purpose of
organizational identity is based on social identity theory (Abdollahi et al.,
2021). Albert et al. (2000) defined organizational identity as the cognition
that enables individuals and organizations to maintain consistency in
organizational goals (Hatch and Schultz, 2004). Starting from self-definition
(Whetten, 2006), Hall and other scholars believe that organizational identity
is the consistency between individual self-definition and organizational
values (Witting, 2006). Hsu and Elsbach (2013) pointed out that corporate
identity is the perceptual process of integrating individual emotion and
organizational emotion (Bankins and Waterhouse, 2019). According to
JohnM. T. Lamer, organizational identity is actually the psychology and
behavior beneficial to the organization shown by individuals who contact
the organization (Erat et al., 2020). It can be found from the research of
some scholars that although the definition of organizational identity varies
from different perspectives, a high organizational identity will make

employees show the attitude and behavior of maintaining the organization and create a harmonious working atmosphere.

Although scholars have different descriptions of the connotation of organizational identity, some common points can be observed. Organizational identity comes from the perception of a matching degree between employee self-definition and organizational definition, which is a psychological recognition and psychological contract. With high organizational identity, employees will have a high sense of identity, belonging, dependence and responsibility to the organization, and feel more satisfied with the organization, which is reflected in their attitude and behavior, increasing team cohesion and bringing many benefits to the enterprise.

Scholars have many different research results on the dimension division of organizational identity, and there are also differences in different regions, including one-dimensional, two-dimensional, three-dimensional, and four-dimensional structures. In 1992, Mael and Ashforth (1992) proposed a single-dimension organizational identity structure, including six items in total. This scale has been proved by many scholars to be very reliable and valid and is a one-dimensional scale with wide application. From the perspective of social identity theory, they define organizational identity as employees' psychological identification with the organization, which is a subjective psychological feeling. Karasawa divides organizational identity into two dimensions: self-identity and identity of other members (Heere and Xing, 2012). In 1983, Cheney proposed a three-dimension organizational identity scale with three dimensions of similarity, membership, and loyalty (Cheney and Christensen, 2001). The three-dimensional scale developed by Cheney contains 26 items, and this model has been questioned by later scholars for its overlapping items and low reliability and validity due to its excessive items. In 2004, Dick (2004) proposed a four-dimensional organizational identity scale based on the research of social identity theory. He divided organizational identity into four dimensions: cognition, emotion, evaluation, and behavior.

4. Organisational Culture

Organisational culture is difficult to define, and no widely accepted definition can be found in the literature, with different definitions ranging from psychology, sociology, economics, etc. This distinction is rooted in the fact that some people see culture as a fundamental metaphor, while

others see organisational culture as a variable. These two distinctions also lead to two distinct questions, one being "what does an organisation mean to its members" and the other being "what does organisational culture do" (Schultz, 2012). From the perspective of the first question, organisational culture can be defined as the values, beliefs etc., shared by the members of an organisation (Miron et al., 2004). Watkins (2013) used social media platforms to initiate a discussion on what organisational culture is and received a number of different responses. The common and easily understood answers were that organisational culture is a reflection of how an organisation does things; that it is a description shared by the organisation itself; that it is the sum of values and rituals, and is likened to glue because it enables members of an organisation to integrate better; that it is the immune system of an organisation because it helps the organisation to differentiate between people and find the right people. In that it helps the organisation differentiate between people and find the right people for the organisation; in some responses, organisational culture is also considered a presence that is influenced by the organisation itself and society.

a) Types of organisational culture

There are elaborative and structural approaches to classifying organisational culture, with the interpretive approach represented by Johnson et al. (2008) culture web model and the structural approach best known for Hofstede et al. (1991) five culture dimensions. This research will not trace the first two cultural classifications but rather summarise the research perspectives of other scholars. Deal and Kennedy (2000) proposed four types of organisational culture: the tough-guy culture, which is highly relevant to individualists and is formed in high-risk, fast-feedback companies such as advertising, construction and sports, where employees are expected to be optimistic, strong and always motivated.

The second is a culture of working hard and playing hard. The requirements for employees are to work hard and play hard, to be sociable, to be friendly and to have a strong belief in "finding a need and satisfying it"; the third is the culture of bet-your-company, which is formed in companies with high risks and slow feedback, such as aerospace companies, where the requirements for employees are to weigh and consider everything carefully, to make up one's mind and not to change it easily. The fourth is a process culture, formed in low-risk and slow feedback, such as insurance and public utilities, where employees are expected to be disciplined and careful.

Scholars also propose four types of organizational cultures, but the classification criteria are different from those mentioned above. According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), the first is a rational culture, which emphasizes work orientation and goal attainment, employees are compliant based on contract, the motivation behind which is competence, leaders are efficient and goal-oriented, and their performance criteria are efficiency and productivity; the second is a developmental culture, which emphasizes innovation, intuitive information processing, employee compliance based on ideology, the motivation behind which is growth, and leaders who are creative and risk-taking, whose performance criteria are adaptability and external legitimacy, and whose goal is the pursuit of development and resources; the third is the consensus culture, which emphasises interpersonal relationships and loyalty. Collective information processing (e.g. discussion, involvement, consensus) is the means to an end. Employees conform based on a sense of belonging, the motivation behind which is a sense of attachment, leadership, is caring and supportive, performance is measured based on involvement and support, and the goal is human development; the fourth is a bureaucratic culture, which emphasises the primacy of rules and stability. Formalised information processing (e.g. records, evaluations, etc.) is the means to an end. Employees are compliant based on regulations. The motivation behind this is security, and leaders are conservative and cautious, with the goal of stability and control.

Although types of organisational culture are defined differently in the literature by different scholars, one point that has been made many times in relation to types of corporate culture is that the various kinds of culture do not exist in isolation and that there should be more than one type of organisational culture in an organisation (Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1993; Cameron and Quinn, 2011).

b) Roles of organisational culture

According to Barney (1991), the role of organisational culture, which can help companies achieve sustained competitive advantage, and which can likewise help people understand and manage the people within an organisation, and which can be seen as a key factor when implementing organisational change (Cabrera et al., 2001), is increasingly being appreciated, and although the way in which it is measured varies from one academic to another, the variables studied are always strikingly similar,   according to Aydin and Ceylan (2009), they measured organisational culture in terms of dimensions such as information transfer, communication and collaboration,

and ultimately found that all the dimensions studied were significantly related to organisational effectiveness. Other scholars measured corporate culture in terms of dimensions such as adaptability and consistency and eventually found that it was positively related to organisational effectiveness. In addition to organisational effectiveness, organisational performance is one of the common variables studied. According to Lapiņa et al. (2015), organisational culture is directly related to organisational effectiveness and performance, suggesting that the stronger the organisational culture, the more effective the organisation. Using a sample of nine banks of various types in Ghana, which account for more than half of the market, and interviewing nearly 300 employees at various job levels, The research has shown that, overall, there is a positive relationship between organisational culture and performance in the Ghanaian banking sector (Poku et al., 2013).

In conclusion, organisational culture's role is wide-ranging, and this research only summarises the essential parts or those of personal interest to the author. It is worth noting that organisational culture has also been treated as a mediating factor in some research, which is also part of the role of organisational culture, and it is because of the wide range of roles of organisational culture that the importance of its research is evident.

c) The Interdependence of Organisational Culture and Organisational Identification

Organisational culture and organisational identification are two closely related concepts that are both interrelated and distinct from each other. Hatch and Schultz (2004) studied the interdependence model of organisational culture, organisational identification and image using an overlap approach and distinguished between organisational culture, organisational identification, and their associated organisational image. They argue that organisational culture is the internal symbolic context that forms and sustains organisational identification, refering to the feelings, perceptions and views of organisational members in general, and is considered to be the common understanding of the members of the organisation's specific values; and the organisational image is something that is absorbed within the cultural system and is a manifestation of organisational culture to interpret and express organisational identification, which should include the views of organisational members towards others and towards the organisation itself. This view is also supported by empirical evidence, as Schrodt (2002) found that all six dimensions of

organisational culture were significantly associated with organisational indentification, using the retail industry as an example.

It can be seen that although organisational culture and organisational identification are two different concepts, there is some overlap between them, which makes them show a state of interdependence. Firstly, in terms of their respective meanings, organisational culture refers to a comprehensive system of norms and behaviours that govern the organisation, usually defined by the members' understanding of the organisational system to which they belong, and generally encompassing all aspects of the members' daily life and work practices. Organisational identification, on the other hand, reflects how an organisational entity understands itself in the context of the organisational culture in which it is embedded, and it represents an expression of organisational culture. Focusing on organisational culture implies how members regulate language and behaviour in relation to the larger cultural system. Researchers need to better engage with the cultural system itself, which is a good indication that the study of organisational identification will better help us study the organisational cultural system.

d) The interaction between organisational culture and organisational identification

As far as the role of organisational culture on organisational identification is concerned, organisational culture has an active role in promoting organisational identification. Organisational culture has two internal and external functions; one is the internal integration function, it will promote the members of the organisation to show a sense of collective identification and understand how to work effectively, and the second is the external differentiation function, the organisational culture as a common behavioural norm and value system of the members of the organisation, it makes the organisation unique and clearly distinguishable from other organisations, which not only can distinguish itself from other organisations, but also can confirm and enhance members' sense of identification with the organisation. Organisational culture is the sum of norms, ethics, goals, thinking and values that are commonly recognised and observed by all members in the organisation's behaviour, which can promote the integration of the ideology, values, ethics and behavioural orientation of the members of the organisation with the overall ideology, behaviour and values of the organisation, giving all members a sense of identity and belonging to the organisation.

In terms of the role of organisational identification on organisational culture, cultivating and improving employees' identification with the organisation is conducive to the deepening of organisational culture. In the organisation, identification with the organisational culture is the confirmation of the shared culture of the organisation; members use the same cultural symbols, agree with the shared cultural philosophy and follow the same behavioural norms; these are the basis of organisational cultural identification. Once employees have identified with the organisation, they will willingly take the ethical codes, codes of conduct and values advocated by the organisation as their own, thus further deepening the organisational culture, which is a widely shared belief among members and reflected as a consistency, however, the identification with the organisational culture is also conducive to reaching consensus among members of the organisation. However, organisational culture identification also facilitates consensus among organisational members and leads to concerted action by organisational members, thus positively influencing organisational identification and management of the enterprise.

e) The impact of different types of organisational cultures on organisational identification

Wallach (1983) studied the effects of three different types of organisational cultures (bureaucratic, innovative and supportive) on organisational identification and found that innovative and supportive organisational cultures are more likely to develop if companies focus on empowerment, team orientation and creating change in the process of building their organisational cultures. However, innovative and supportive organisational cultures have a significant positive correlation with employees' evaluative and affective identification. This indicates that both innovative and supportive organisational cultures are able to obtain good evaluations from employees, improve employees' emotional identification with the organisation, and help to improve members' psychological identification with the organisation, whereas some companies neglect empowerment and consensus in the process of building organisational culture and excessively promote personal leadership, which can easily form a bureaucratic organisational culture, and bureaucratic organisational culture has only a slightly positive correlation with employees' emotional identification. Bureaucratic organisational culture has only a slight positive correlation with employees' emotional identification. In contrast, it has a significant negative correlation with evaluative identification, which means that bureaucratic organisational culture can have an impact on employees'

emotional identification, but the impact is very small. However, a bureaucratic organisational culture can also strengthen the attachment of some leaders to the organisation, as some leaders can find self-satisfaction in this culture, depending on the company's specific situation. Of these three types of organisational culture, the supportive organisational culture is considered to have the most significant impact on employees' organisational identification. Vijayakumar and Padma (2014) argue that adhocracy and hierarchical culture show a direct positive influence on positive identification and a direct negative influence on the three modes of identification: ambivalent identification, neutral identification, and disidentification; clan culture had a weaker tendency towards positive identification and had no effect on the three modes of identification: ambivalent identification, neutral identification, and disidentification. Market culture has no influence on positive identification but affects the three modes of identification: ambivalent identification, neutral identification and disidentification.

5. Structures of Organizational Citizenship

The academic research on organizational citizenship behavior can be traced back to Bamard, the founder of the organizational school, who put forward the "willingness to cooperate" in 1938. Then, American professor Dennis Organ (1998) first proposed the concept of organizational citizenship behavior. He pointed out that organizational citizenship behavior is a spontaneous out-of-role behavior of employees beyond individual work, which has no relation with the reward system within the organization but is conducive to the improvement of organizational efficiency. In 1988, Organ officially defined the concept of organizational citizenship behavior, believing that organizational citizenship behavior is an indirect behavior performed by individuals voluntarily and not within the scope of formal compensation, which can improve organizational performance.

The concept of organizational citizenship behavior has attracted extensive attention, and some scholars have raised doubts. First of all, whether it is completely out of role behavior is open to debate. Morrison(1996) pointed out that the boundary between out-of-role behavior and in-role behavior is very fuzzy and difficult to distinguish. In addition, scholars found that OCB impacts performance and promotion, indicating that OCB does not exist completely outside the compensation system. In order to determine task performance, Borman proposed the concept of relationship performance (Bauer et al., 2018). Based on this, Organ redefined OCB in

1997 by combining OCB with relational performance; that is, OCB is beneficial to task performance and is a kind of behavior outside the role of organization members, which can enhance the social-psychological environment of the organization and improve the overall effectiveness of the organization. To sum up, scholars generally agree that organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary, unregulated, unpaid behavior beneficial to the organization.

So far, scholars' research on the dimensions and measurement of organizational citizenship behavior has not formed unified and universally agreed results. At present, there are two, three, four, five, six, seven and ten-dimensional methods for the division of organizational citizenship structure. Moreover, the measurement of organizational citizenship behavior is very different in different environments and cultures. In the West, Organ (1998) early proposed a two-dimensional scale that included altruism and general obedience. By 1988, Organ had added three dimensions to his research, creating a five-dimensional scale of conscientiousness, politeness, citizenship, sportsmanship, and altruism. In addition, Williams (2002) drew lessons from Organ's model and proposed a two-dimensional scale to distinguish organizational citizenship behaviors for individuals and organizations.

Graham (1991) divided organizational citizenship behavior into four dimensions: interpersonal help, personal initiative, personal diligence, and loyalty. Famous scholar Podsakoff (2000) after five-dimensional model of outraged, developed a three-dimensional measurement model, and then on the basis of their research, to measure up to seven-dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, are helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, obey, individual initiative, civic virtue and self-development. Podsakoff's seven-dimensional model is widely used.

6. Small and Medium-sized Entreprises

As the research focuses on SMEs, the first task is to understand " SMEs ". Short (2018) pointed out that when studying "SMEs", it is necessary to pay attention to its complexity. In other words, there is no universal definition of this term in the global scope, and its exact meaning varies depending on the economic development status of each country or economy. Generally, in the business world, companies are classified by the number of employees they have as one of the bases for classifying the size of their organisation. According to Caruso (2015), SMEs in the US typically have no more than 500 employees. Obviously, even if the same

research is about SMEs, an enterprise with 250 employees and an enterprise with 500 employees will have different internal operating systems and management models. Therefore, we cannot simply consider them as homogeneous (Short, 2019).

7. Workforce Diversity

Workforce diversity is inextricably tied to the study of inequality, and the concept of workforce diversity is often connected to the broader sociological and psychological literature on inequality (Henry and Evans, 2007). Diversification of the workforce is a perplexing organisational management issue (DiTomaso et al., 2007). The importance of managing worker diversity to increase organisational performance cannot be overstated, especially in light of the current global developments (DiTomaso et al., 2007). It is claimed that organisations that appreciate diversity are more likely to thrive and prosper in today's dynamic global labour market (Dass and Parker, 1996). Its significance is mainly due to some minorities who felt alienated from the employment market are fighting for their human rights because of globalisation's unrestricted movement of workers.

a) Dimensions of workforce diversity

Diversification of the workforce has developed mainly to advance equitable employment possibilities (Henry and Evans, 2007). Instead of neglecting talent that may help them become more valuable and accurate, this notion of equal opportunity strives to ensure businesses benefit from the differences inherent in a varied workforce (Agocs and Burr, 1996). The expansion of human rights due to advancements in economics and politics and increased migration of individuals from various backgrounds has prompted organisations to promote workplace diversity because of these developments (Atar, 2021).

Understanding how groups interact at various levels of analysis requires defining which distinctions generate unequal structural interactions (i.e., power, status, and quantitative or compositional patterns) (DiTomaso et al., 2007). By illustrating the breadth of problems that should be addressed in workforce diversity research and the parallels and variations across workforce diversity debates, this research aims to expand the conversation around workplace diversity and lead to future study possibilities.

b) Workforce diversity and organization performance

In the context of globalization, workforce diversity is often described as the variation in common attributes exhibited by employees. Workforce diversity can contribute to workplace equity and is strategically valued by many organizations (Barak, 2015). So far, studies have mainly examined the impact of workforce team diversity on organizational performance. Diversity has led to organizational gains in several areas, including role pressure (Findler et al., 2007), organizational commitment (Cho and Mor Barak, 2008), retention and innovation (Cho et al., 2017). At the same time, however, other studies have found that labour diversity as a whole is negatively impacted by organizations (Choi and Rainey, 2010).

Some of the more recent literature has focused on the relationship between diversity and performance in the workplace and the role that was managing diversity plays (Choi & Rainey, 2010). Among these, inclusive organizations play a crucial role in examining employee diversity, and effective organizational initiatives to manage diversity positively impact organizations with a highly diverse workforce. Organizations that do not take steps to manage diversity may experience low team cohesion or high levels of conflict and negatively impact organizational performance.

c) Benefits and limitations of workforce diversity

According to research, worker diversity has risen considerably in recent years (Roberge & van Dick, 2010). Having a varied staff may be critical for promoting creativity and innovation and retaining a competitive edge (Bassett-Jones, 2005). A number of studies, meanwhile, have revealed that variation can have detrimental problems such as a high dispute or diminished social cohesion (Aghazadeh, 2004, Price *et al.*, 2005). To the extent that this occurs, there are several by-products that arise in the workplace, including the exclusion of others, slander, and marginalization.

Strengthening management by increasing innovative thinking is one way to manage diverse employees (Bantel and Jackson, 1989). The viability of this pathway can be explained in that diverse employees are far more capable of having information, competencies, and perspectives relevant to the organisation's overall strategic goals than homogenous groups. Additionally, group variety may promote workplace creativity and innovation. For instance, multidisciplinary staff can help stabilize an enterprise's mental and cerebral life and depth.

References

Abdollahi, A., Riahi, F. & Rezaei Pitenoei, Y. (2021). 'Investigating the moderating role of organizational identity on the relationship between managerial compensation and earnings manipulation', *Valued and Behavioral Accountings Achievements,* 5(10), pp. 230-201.

Adams, C. A. (2017). 'Conceptualising the contemporary corporate value creation process', *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*.

Aghazadeh, S.M., 2004. Managing workforce diversity as an essential resource for improving organizational performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.

Agocs, C. & Burr, C., 1996. Employment equity, affirmative action and managing diversity: assessing the differences. *International journal of manpower*.

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E. & Dutton, J. E. (2000). 'Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges', *Academy of management review,* 25(1), pp. 13-17.

Ardichvili, A. (2002). Knowledge management, human resource development, and internet technology. *Advances in developing human resources*, 4(4), 451-463.

Ashforth, B. E. & Mael, F. (1989). 'Social identity theory and the organization', *Academy of management review,* 14(1), pp. 20-39.

Atar, E. (2021). Uluslararasi Göç ve Mülteci Yönetimi İçin Büyük Veri Kullaniminin Avantaj ve Dezavantajlarinin Sistematik *Analizi. Alternatif Politika*, 13(1), 146-174.

Aydin, B. & Ceylan, A. (2009). 'The role of organizational culture on effectiveness'.

Bankins, S. & Waterhouse, J. (2019). 'Organizational identity, image, and reputation: Examining the influence on perceptions of employer attractiveness in public sector organizations', *International Journal of Public Administration,* 42(3), pp. 218-229.

Bantel, K.A. & Jackson, S.E., 1989. Top management and innovations in banking: Does the composition of the top team make a difference? *Strategic management journal,* 10**,** 107-124.

Barney, J. (1991). 'Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage' *Journal of management* 17 (1), pp. 99-   120.

Bassett-Jones, N., 2005. The paradox of diversity management, creativity and innovation. Diversity, Management, Creativity and Innovation, 14 (2), 169–175.

Bauer, J. A., Wright, N. A., Askew, K. & Spector, P. E. (2018). 'The relationships between organizational citizenship behavior demands and

extra-task behaviors', *The Psychologist-Manager Journal,* 21(3), p. 163.

Boyne, G. A. (2002). 'Public and private management: what's the difference?', *Journal of management studies,* 39(1), pp. 97-122.

Buelens, M. & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). 'An Analysis of Differences in Work Motivation between Public and Private Sector Organizations', *Public administration review,* 67(1), pp. 65-74

Cabrera, Á., Cabrera, E. F. & Barajas, S. (2001). 'The key role of organizational culture in a multi-system view of technology-driven change' *International Journal of Information Management* 21 (3), pp. 245-261

Cambra-Fierro, J., Polo-Redondo, Y. & Wilson, A. (2008). 'The influence of an organisation's corporate values on employees personal buying behaviour', *Journal of Business Ethics,* 81(1), pp. 157-167.

Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework.* John Wiley & Sons

Campell, D., Christenson, T., Thompson, T., Hogeland, J., & Aldapi, S. (2006). Rural Cooperatives Magazine, May/June 2006. *Rural Cooperatives Magazine*, *73*(2163-2018-4529).

Caruso, A. (2015) 'Statistics of US businesses employment and payroll summary: 2012', Economy-WideStatistics Briefs,(G12-SUSB).

Cheney, G. & Christensen, L. T. (2001). 'Organizational identity: Linkages between internal and external communication', *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods*, pp. 231-269.

Cho, S. & Mor Barak, M.E., 2008. Understanding of diversity and inclusion in a perceived homogeneous culture: A study of organizational commitment and job performance among Korean employees. *Administration in Social Work,* 32**,** 100-126.

Cho, S., Kim, A. & Mor Barak, M.E., 2017. Does diversity matter? exploring workforce diversity, diversity management, and organizational performance in social enterprises. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review,* 11**,** 193-204.

Choi, S. & Rainey, H.G., 2010. Managing diversity in US federal agencies: Effects of diversity and diversity management on employee perceptions of organizational performance. *Public Administration Review,* 70**,** 109-121.

Crewson, P. E. (1997). 'Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect', *Journal of public administration research and theory,* 7(4), pp. 499-518.

Dass, P. & Parker, B., 1996. Diversity: A strategic issue. *Managing diversity. Human resource strategies for transforming the workplace*, 365-391.

Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1983). 'organisational cultures: The rites and rituals of organisational life: Addison-wesley, 1982. Isbn: 0-201-10277-3. *Business Horizons* 26 (2), pp. 82-85.

Dearborn, D. C. & Simon, H. A. (1958). 'Selective perception: A note on the departmental identifications of executives', *Sociometry,* 21(2), pp. 140-144.

Ditomaso, N., Post, C. & Parks-Yancy, R., 2007. Workforce Diversity and Inequality: Power, Status, and Numbers. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 33, 473-501.

Eksi, H., Ozgenel, M. & Demirci, M. E. (2020). 'The mediator role of organizational support in the relationship between organizational identity and organizational stress', *International Journal of Educational Methodology,* 6(3), pp. 643-653.

Erat, S., Kitapçı, H. & Akçin, K. (2020). 'Managerial perception and organizational identity: A comparative analysis', *Sustainability,* 12(6), p. 2278.

Findler, L., Wind, L.H. & Barak, M.E.M., 2007. The challenge of workforce management in a global society: Modeling the relationship between diversity, inclusion, organizational culture, and employee well-being, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Administration in Social Work,* 31, 63-94.

Hampden-Turner, C. & Trompenaars, A. (1993). *The seven cultures of capitalism: Value systems for creating wealth in the united states, japan, germany, france, britain, sweden, and the netherlands*. Broadway Business.

Harrigan, W. J., Commons, M. L. and Pelaez, M. (2015). "Replacing Maslow's Needs Hierarchy With an Account Based on Stage and Value". *Behavioral development bulletin*, 20(1). pp. 24–31.

Harris, G. E. & Cameron, J. E. (2005). 'Multiple dimensions of organizational identification and commitment as predictors of turnover intentions and psychological well-being' *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement* 37 (3), p. 159.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Heere, B. & Xing, X. (2012). 'Bocog's road to success: Predictors of commitment to organizational success among beijing olympic employees', *European Sport Management Quarterly,* 12(2), pp. 161-

181.

Henry, O. & Evans, A.J., 2007. Critical review of literature on workforce diversity. *African Journal of Business Management,* 1.

Herbert, T. T. (1976). *Dimensions of organizational behavior*. New York: Collier Macmillan.

Herzberg, F. (1968). 'One more time: How do you motivate employees' *Harvard Business Review* 65

Hofstede, G. (2011). 'Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context', *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture,* 2(1).

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (1991). 'Cultures and organizations: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival' *Software of the Mind London: McGraw-Hill.*

Holmberg, C., Caro, J. and Sobis, I. (2018). 'Job satisfaction among swedish mental health nursing personnel: Revisiting the two-factor theory'. *Int J Ment Health Nurs,* 27(2). pp. 581-592.

Hsu, G. & Elsbach, K. D. (2013). 'Explaining variation in organizational identity categorization', *Organization Science,* 24(4), pp. 996-1013.

Hunt, S. D., Wood, V. R. & Chonko, L. B. (1989). 'Corporate ethical values and organizational commitment in marketing', Journal of marketing, 53(3), pp. 79-90

Johnson, G., Scholes, K. & Whittington, R. (2008). *Exploring organisational strategy: Text and cases*. Pearson education.

Kjeldsen, A. M. & Hansen, J. R. (2018). 'Sector differences in the public service motivation–job satisfaction relationship: exploring the role of organizational characteristics', *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* 38(1), pp. 24-48.

Kluckhohn, C. & Lindzey, G., 1954. Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Lang, P. J. (2010). 'Emotion and motivation: Toward consensus definitions and a common research purpose'. *Emotion Review*, 2(3). pp. 229-233.

Lapiņa, I., Kairiša, I. & Aramina, D. (2015). 'Role of organizational culture in the quality management of university' *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 213, pp. 770-774.

Li, C. & Zhang, Y. (2017). 'Research on the Improvement of Human Resources Incentive Mechanism under the Background of State-owned Enterprise Reform', *Journal of Yanbian Party School,* 33(05), pp. 56-59.

Liu, B., Tang, N. & Zhu, X. (2008). 'Public service motivation and job satisfaction in China', *International Journal of Manpower,* 29(8), pp. 684-699.

Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A. and Andersson, T. D. (2009). 'Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism'. *Tourism Management*, 30(6). pp. 890-899.

Maltz, E. & Schein, S. (2012). 'Cultivating shared value initiatives: A three cs approach', *Journal of Corporate Citizenship,* (47), pp. 55-74.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality* Harper & Row: New York.

McGregor, D. and Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miron, E., Erez, M. & Naveh, E. (2004). 'Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other?' *Journal of organizational behavior* 25 (2), pp. 175-   199.

Mor Barak, M.E., 2015. Inclusion is the key to diversity management, but what is inclusion? *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance,* 39**,** 83-88.

Morrison, E. W. (1996). 'Organizational citizenship behavior as a critical link between hrm practices and service quality', *Human resource management,* 35(4), pp. 493-512.

Noland, C. (2014). 'Teaching theory x and theory y in organizational communication'. *Communication Teacher*, 28(3). pp. 145-149.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Translated by: ed. vols). Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com), p.^pp. Reprint.

Pinder C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behaivor*. Upper Saddle River. NJ: Prentice-Hall

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). 'Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research', *Journal of management,* 26(3), pp. 513-563.

Poku, K., Owusu-Ansah, W., & Zakari, M. (2013). Organizational culture and organisational performance: Empirical evidence from the banking industry in Ghana.

Price, E.G., Gozu, A., Kern, D.E., Powe, N.R., Wand, G.S., Golden, S. & Cooper, L.A., 2005. The role of cultural diversity climate in recruitment, promotion, and retention of faculty in academic medicine. *Journal of general internal medicine,* 20**,** 565-571.

Rainey, H. G., Backoff, R. W. & Levine, C. H. (1976). 'Comparing public and private organizations', *Public administration review,* 36(2), pp. 233-244.

Robbins, S. P. (1998). *Fundamentos de comportamiento organizacional*. Pearson educación.

Robbins, S. P. and Luthans, F. (2003). *organizational Behavior*. 9th edn. Beijing: Renmin University of China Press

Roberge, M.-É. & Van Dick, R., 2010. Recognizing the benefits of diversity: When and how does diversity increase group performance? *Human Resource Management Review,* 20**,** 295-308.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. Free press.

Sadri, G. & Lees, B. (2001). 'Developing corporate culture as a competitive advantage', *Journal of Management Development*.

Schein, O. D., Katz, J., Bass, E. B., Tielsch, J. M., Lubomski, L. H., Feldman, M. A., ... & Steinberg, E. P. (2000). The value of routine preoperative medical testing before cataract surgery. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *342*(3), 168-175.

Schmeltz, L. (2014). 'Identical or just compatible? The utility of corporate identity values in communicating corporate social responsibility', *International Journal of Business Communication,* 51(3), pp. 234-258.

Schrodt, P. (2002). The relationship between organizational identification and organizational culture: Employee perceptions of culture and identification in a retail sales organization. *Communication studies*, *53*(2), 189-202.

Schultz, M. (2012). *On studying organizational cultures*. de Gruyter.

Senarathne, C. W. (2020). 'The optimal capital structure under the conditions of employment: An application of theory x and theory y'. *Zagreb International Review of Economics and Business,* 23(1). pp. 51-69.

Short, H. (2019) 'Learning in SMEs', *Human Resource Development International*, 22(5), 413-419.

Soni, B. and Soni, R. (2016). "Enhancing Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs for Effective Leadership". *Competition forum,* 14(2). p. 259.

Steer, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1991). Motivation and work behavior. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill.

Sun, B. (1986). *organizational behavior*. Beijing: China Material Publishing House.

Thant, Z. M. and Chang, Y. (2021). 'Determinants of Public Employee Job Satisfaction in Myanmar: Focus on Herzberg's Two Factor Theory'. *Public organization review*, 21(1). pp. 157–175.

Thomsen, S. (2004). 'Corporate values and corporate governance', *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*.

Van Dick, R., et al. (2004). 'Should i stay or should i go? Explaining turnover intentions with organizational identification and job