

Full Length Research Paper

Workplace trust and micromanaging behavior in Rivers State restaurant industry

Oloko, Lawrence

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
Email address: lawritzdailys@yahoo.com

Accepted 26 August, 2019

This study examined the relationship between workplace trust and micromanaging behavior in Rivers State restaurant industry. Cross sectional research design was adopted in studying one hundred and sixty (160) members of staff from a total of two hundred and sixty-six (266) staff in the 36 restaurants. Our respondents were non-managerial employees constituting the population of the study. From the field survey, we retrieved and analyzed one hundred and fifty two (152) copies of questionnaire from the participants; Spearman's rank correlation coefficient statistical tool was used to determine the relationship existing between the variables while the p-value obtained were used to test hypotheses developed for the study. Findings revealed the existence of significant relationship between the dimensions of workplace trust namely; affective based trust and cognitive based trust and micromanaging behavior. It was then concluded that firms should have that confidence in their employees to the point of delegating some tasks which will help the employees to become innovative and also broaden their horizon. This gave rise to our recommendations; that restaurant supervisors should develop trust in their subordinates that arises from their emotion and reduces their workload by assigning tasks to their subordinates; also they should develop corporate cultures that educate the supervisors on the need for employee participation in decisions concerning their welfare.

Keywords: Affective based trust, Cognitive based trust and Micromanaging behaviour.

INTRODUCTION

For any service organization, quality of service remains a key success factor. Studies have shown that quality of service positively impact on customer satisfaction, their trust, loyalty and perceived value; as such, managers/supervisors are advised to closely and periodically monitor the activities of their staff in order to improve the quality of services the company provides (Bakti and Sumaedi, 2013; Clemes, Gan, Kao and Choong, 2008; Ibrahim and Othman, 2014; Kaur, 2013; Lai and Chen, 2011; Moliner, 2009; Yusoff, Ismail and Ali, 2010). This management style of observing every move or activity performed by staffs has been widely referred to as micromanagement (DeCaro, Thomas, Albert and Beilock, 2011). Scholars have opined that the effects of micromanaging behaviour are not limited to the micromanager and the subordinates (Badger, Sullivan, Wiezel and Bopp, 2009), but also extend to the whole organization (Hansson, Backlund and Lycke, 2003; Sahay, Saxena and Kumar, 2000); making it an important organizational phenomenon to be given attention to.

The term micromanagement is relatively subjective. There is a significant gray area between what one person sees as interference and another sees as support and interaction. Participation, guidance, and collaboration, to some, are seen as meddling, manipulation, and excessive control by others. There is a large gap between the perception of the micromanager and the micromanager (Chambers, 2009). This subjectivity serves as the bases for the divergent views of the nature of the construct.

While some scholars have argued that it is totally negative and should be discouraged, others argue for its situational necessity and inevitability. For instance, Spanberger and Jackson (2008) were of the opinion that there are times and circumstances where micromanagement is not only appropriate but required; and it does not have to be negative as it may be beneficial for organizations where the interference of supervisors may be necessary to improve service delivery (Rajkumar and Gayathri, 2016). This line of

reasoning is based on the fact that sometimes micromanagement is not always a choice, but industrial standard, e.g. during audits, investigations, trouble shooting, editing a document and policy audit. Riordan (2010) had also revealed that peculiar situations of new strategy, disappointing results, lingering projects, serious customer complaints; if the task is new, complicated, value laden, requires great care and quality control, and there is time constraints in meeting customer orders or statutory requirement; a supervisor may be left with micromanagement as a way out.

Concept of Workplace Trust

Trust entails believing or having confidence in someone or something (Oxford Dictionaries n.d.a). To entrust an individual with something is to assign a responsibility to or put something into someone's care. Mayer et al. (1995) described trust as the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trust or, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party. Also, trust can be viewed as an attitude held by one individual, the truster, toward another individual, the trustee. Trust in individuals is an expectation or belief that actions from another party will be motivated by good intentions. Moreover, it has been argued that individuals take a risk in this belief because the other party may not act out of benevolence (Whitener et al., 1998; in Jones, 2004). Panahi (2008) revealed that trust is an essential ingredient in every organization which can avert a lot of things from collapsing and absence of it in an organization could be catastrophic. Colquitt, Scott and Lepine (2007) highlighted this importance by asserting that employees trust for the organization could increase output and general performance of the organization but its absence for the organization they work in could prompt employees to put up deviant behaviour such as stealing from co-workers and the company and this, could lead to organizational inefficiency.

After reviewing a variety of definitions of workplace trust, Shockley-Zalabak et al. (2000) concluded that workplace trust refers to the positive expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviors of multiple organizational members based on organizational roles, relationships, experiences and interdependencies. In Rusu and Babos (2015) workplace trust is defined as the ability of individuals to internalize the viewpoint of the system, in order to protect every member of the organization and also recognize their contribution to achieving organization's goals.

Affective Based Trust and Micromanaging Behavior

The affective dimension of trust captures how people "feel" about a subject. Affect is a state of mind that arises

from one's own emotion and a sense of others' feeling and motives (Chua et al., 2008). It is an emotional bond between parties which does not necessarily result from reasoning and understanding but from feeling and sense (Morrow et al. 2004). Affective trust is subjective in nature because it is based on the moods, feelings, or emotions that one has concerning the perceived trustworthiness of an individual, group, or organization (Hansen et al., 2002). It is grounded in reciprocal interpersonal care and concern or emotional bonds.

This form of trust has been described as the social view of trust and has a more emotional connotation. It encompasses care, concern, benevolence, altruism, a sense of personal obligation, commitment, mutual respect, openness, a capacity for listening and understanding, and a belief that sentiments are reciprocated (Scott, 2000). Affective trust is the confidence that an individual places in a partner on the basis of feelings generated by the level of concern and care that the partner displays (Johnson and Grayson, 2005). This type of trust is emotionally based and is characterized by the perceived strength of the relationship and the sense of security felt in the relationship.

The existence of affective trust indicates that the parties in the relationship have developed an emotional bond that has evolved from the initial business relationship and results in the concern for the other party rather than self-interest. The partner acts with benevolence to elicit an emotional bond of trust (Hansen et al., 2002). Unlike cognition, however, affect is divided into two types, namely, positive affectivity such as happiness and pride (Fredrickson, 2001), and negative affectivity such as worry and anger.

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between affective based trust and micromanaging behavior in Rivers State restaurant industry.

Cognitive Based Trust and Micromanaging Behavior

The cognitive dimension of the human mind captures how people judge and assess an object based on facts and evidence (Chua et al. 2008). This dimension connotes the straightforward and conscious process of being aware of an event. Cognition is a knowledge-based, immediate understanding of exogenous stimuli, such as a partner's capability and potential (McAllister 1995). It can also subsequently form beliefs or expectations based on reason and rationale, such that it works as a base for an individual's further behaviour. The cognitive aspect of an individual emphasizes the perception based on reason and evidence. Chua et al. (2008) calls it as "referring to [the] head."

Several scholars have described cognitive based trust from different perspective. For instance, Ladebo (2006) describe cognitive trust as an objective, rational, and

methodical evaluation by a trust or concerning a target as being trustworthy. Ng and Chua (2006) referred to it as being hinged on an appraisal of the other's track record – the competence and reliability this person has demonstrated in the past. In their view, Ergeneli et al. (2007) asserted that cognition-based component treats trust or distrust in the other party as a rational decision, based on experience and premises such as responsibility and competence. To Chua et al. (2008) it involves a calculative and instrumental assessment. In relation to trust in the supervisor, Hon and Lu (2010) described cognitive trust as subordinates' beliefs about supervisor reliability, dependability and competency. This is in line with Wang et al.'s (2010) believe that cognition-based trust occurs due to perceptions of competence, reliability, and dependability.

Basically, cognitive trust is the degree of confidence or willingness that exists in order to depend on the other party's reliability and competence (Johnson and Grayson, 2005; McAllister, 1995). This form of trust is performance-based in nature with rationality used as a basis for trusting the other party (e.g., Erdem and Ozen, 2003). It arises from an accumulated knowledge that allows one to make predictions, with some level of confidence, regarding the likelihood that a focal partner will live up to his/her obligations (Johnson and Grayson, 2005). The implication here is that one party in the relationship is familiar with the other to some extent and, therefore, has accumulated a certain level of knowledge which warrants trusting that party (Dunn 2000). As cognitive trust is objective in nature, it is based on a rational process which determines whether the other party in the relationship can be trusted (Hansen et al., 2002).

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between cognitive based trust and micromanaging behavior in Rivers State restaurant industry.

Relationship between Workplace Trust and Micromanaging Behaviour

To trust an employee is to think enough of the person to treat him or her as a thinking person who can have good ideas if given a goal and some broad operating parameters. In an environment of trust, employees have the freedom to explore, innovate, create, stretch, and yes, sometimes make mistakes (Whipple, 2016). A positive relationship between supervisors and subordinates, resulting from mutual trust and benefits, provides a solid ground for further cooperation. Bacon (2006) states that a successful organization is supported by good managers who establish sound management controls, while trusting their subordinates and providing them with appropriate latitude to act on independently.

On the contrary, not trusting your staff is the easiest way to becoming a micromanager. Managers who are afraid to trust their subordinates' performance impose

excessive control and under-delegate (Bacon, 2006; White, 2010) and then hover over them to ensure that the schedule is followed (Pixton et al., 2014). According to Badger et al. (2009) and Porterfield (2003), the unwillingness to trust in subordinates' capability to perform well on their own is another reason for the micromanaging behaviour. This criterion of constant supervision are said to be demeaning to the subordinates and an obstacle to their successful performance and creates a feeling of untrustworthiness towards them (Porterfield, 2003).

To micromanage someone implies a lack of trust. The manager is not confident the employee can or will do a job correctly, so the employee is besieged with "helpful" instructions from the manager on exactly how to perform tasks. At first, the intrusion is simply irritating to the employee, who has her own ideas on how to do the job. After a while, it degenerates into an opportunity to check out mentally and join the legion of disenchanting workers doing what they are told and collecting a pay-check. This leaves the employee's power on the door step of the organization every day (Whipple, 2016).

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a cross sectional survey research design in studying one hundred and sixty (160) member of staff from a total of two hundred and sixty-six (266) staff in the 36 restaurants studied, which constitutes our accessible population, however our study units include the non-managerial employees of the firms having that our unit of analysis is at individual level of the organization. The human resource department provided us the data on functional departments within the organization. Out of one hundred and sixty (160) employees; one hundred and fifty two copies were retrieved and analyzed; the instrument with which we elicited data from the respondents is the questionnaire and was analyzed using Spearman's Rank order coefficient of correlation statistical tool.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents Spearman's rank order correlation run to ascertain the relationship between affective based trust and micromanaging behavior as reported by one hundred and fifty two (152) respondents. A strong positive correlation coefficient value was reported between variables which were statistically significant ($\rho = .751^{**}$, $p = .000 < 0.05$ (alpha value) this suggests that there is significant relationship between affective based trust and the criterion variable; also cognitive based trust and micromanaging behavior reported significant values of correlation ($\rho = .646^{**}$, $p = .000 < 0.05$).

Decision: The null hypotheses stated are rejected and

Table 1. Spearman' rank order correlation coefficient: A test of association between the variables Correlations

		Affective.based.trust	Cognitive.based.trust	Micromanaging.Beh	
Spearman' rho	Affective.based.trust	Correlation	1.000	.635**	.751**
		Coefficient			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	152	152	152
	Cognitive.based.trust	Correlation	.635**	1.000	.646**
		Coefficient			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	152	152	152
	Micromanaging.Beh	Correlation	.751**	.646**	1.000
Coefficient					
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.	
	N	152	152	152	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
SPSS output, Version 20 – Field Survey, 2018

we state that there is significant relationship between the dimensions of workplace trust and micromanaging behavior in Rivers State restaurant industry.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study examined the relationship between workplace trust and micromanaging behavior in Rivers State restaurant industry; two hypotheses were formulated as tentative answers to research questions raised and were tested to find support for the propositions, thus;

The result of the tested H_01-2 reported the existence of a significant relationship between the dimensions of workplace trust (affective based trust and cognitive based trust) and micromanaging behavior; ($\rho = .751^{**}$, $p = .000 < 0.05$; $\rho = .646^{**}$, $p = .000 < 0.05$); from these empirical outcomes, it is suggestive therefore that if lack of delegation decreases, affective based trust increases; and if lack of delegation increases, affective based trust decreases. Hence we find that affective based trust is associated with lack of delegation. This finding is in line with that of (Fredrickson, 2001) who infers that affective based trust can also create negative affectivity. Accordingly, employees should be seen by the supervisor to be able, competent, organizationally important, and satisfies a legitimate need (Ghumro, Mangi and Soomro, 2011).

CONCLUSION

Trust entails believing or having confidence in someone or something (Oxford Dictionaries). To entrust an individual with something is to assign a responsibility to or put something into someone's care. Therefore, this study concludes that firms should have that confidence in their employees to the point of delegating some tasks which will help the employees to become innovative and

also broaden their horizon, and this will boost the employees trust in turn by making them feel the organization needs their full support, thereby lessening the workload of the organizational leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. Restaurant supervisors should develop trust in their subordinates that arises from their emotion and reduce their work load by assigning tasks to their subordinates.
- ii. Restaurants should develop corporate cultures that educate the supervisors on the need for employee participation in decisions concerning their welfare.
- iii. The organization should have a climate able to influence the moods, feelings and emotions of the managers toward trusting their employees and not to keep monitoring them at all times.
- iv..An organization should have a rational and methodological evaluation of an employee as been noteworthy and involve them in joint decision making.
- v. The supervisors should be able to build the capability and potential in their employees and invest in them the power to also make some decisions regarding methods of task accomplishments in line with organization standard.

REFERENCES

- Aronberg, R. (1985). Motivating and managing engineers. *J. Professional Issues in Engineering*, 11(1), 33-38.
- Bacon, T. R. (2006). The balanced leader. *Leadership Excellence*, 23(4), 17-18.
- Badger, W., Sullivan, K., Wiesel, A., and Bopp, P. (2009). Profiling the leadership of project managers. *International Journal of Construction Education and Research*, 5(2), 121-146.
- Bakti, I.G.M.Y., and Sumaedi, S. (2013). An analysis of library customer loyalty: The role of service quality and customer satisfaction, a case study in Indonesia. *Library Management*, 34(6/7), 397-414
- Bhatti, K.K., and Qureshi, T. M. (2007). Impact of employee participation

- on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(2), 54-68.
- Chambers, H.E. (2009). *My way or the highway: The micromanagement survival guide*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Clemes, M. D., Gan, C., Kao, T. H., and Choong M. (2008). An empirical analysis of customer satisfaction in international air travel. *Innovative Marketing*, 4, 50-62.
- Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A., and Lepine, J.A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness and trust propensity: A meta analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 909-927. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909>.
- DeCaro, M. S., Thomas, R. D., Albert, N. B., and Beilock, S. L. (2011). Choking under pressure: Multiple routes to skill failure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 140(3), 390-406.
- Dysvik, A., and Kuvaas, B. (2012). Perceived supervisor support climate, perceived investment in employee development climate, and business-unit performance. *Human Resource Management*, 51, 651-664. Doi:10.1002=hrm.21494
- Formichelli, (1997). Letting go of the details: Drawbacks of micromanagement. *Nation's Business*, 85, 50.
- Ghumro, I. A., Mangi, R. A., and Soomro, H. J. (2011). The Manager's Job: Delegating the job. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 669-678.
- Hansson, J., Backlund, F., and Lycke, L. (2003). Managing commitment: Increasing the odds for successful implementation of TQM, TPM or RCM. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 20(9), 993-1008.
- Harmon, J., Scotti, D. J., Behson, S., Farias, G., Petzel, R., Neuman, J. H., and Keashly, L. (2003). Effects of high-involvement work systems on employee satisfaction and service costs in veterans' healthcare. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 48(6), 393-405.
- Ibrahim, S., and Othman, M. (2014). Developing and validating Halal service quality instrument for Malaysian food service establishments: A conceptual paper. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 130, 400-408.
- Kaur, M. (2013). Service quality in international fast food chains in Chandigarh: Perception of customers. *International Journal of Applied Research and Studies*, 2(7), 1-13.
- Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organisations. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 13(1), 1-9.
- Lai, W., and Chen, C. (2011). Behavioural intention of public transit passenger: The role of service quality, perceived value, satisfaction and involvement. *Transport Policy*, 18, 318- 325.
- Leana, C.R. (1987). Power relinquishment versus power sharing: Theoretical clarification and empirical comparison of delegation and participation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(2), 228-233.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59.
- Meier, P. (2009). *You may be a narcissist if: How to identify narcissism in ourselves and others*. Retrieved from www.energeticsinstitute.com.au/page/narcissism.html
- Merriam-webster online dictionary.(n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/micromanagement> (2005, November 2 27). Retrieved from <http://www.businessweek.com/stories/2005-11-27/the-man-who-invented-management>
- Modrak, V., Radu, S. M., and Modrak, J. (2014). Metrics in organizational centralization and decentralization. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 10.
- Mok, K. H. (Ed.). (2013). *Centralization and decentralization: Educational reforms and changing governance in Chinese societies* (13). Springer Science and Business Media. 24.
- Moliner, M.A. (2009). Loyalty, perceived value and relationship quality in healthcare services. *Journal of Service Management*, 20(1), 76-97.
- Nienaber, A., Romeike, P.D., Searle, R., and Schewe, G. (2015). A qualitative meta-analysis of trust in supervisor-subordinate relationships. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(5), 507 – 534.
- Øgaard, T., Marnburg, E., and Larsen, S. (2008). Perceptions of organizational structure in the hospitality industry: Consequences for commitment, job satisfaction and perceived performance. *Tourism management*, 29(4), 661-671.
- Omoankhanlen, J. A, and Sunday, P.I. (2017). Organizational trust and workplace deviant behaviour in higher institutions in Rivers State. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 5(10), 48-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2349_0349_0510005
- Spanberger, P.G., and Jackson, S.M. (2008). Intelligent micromanagement. *Leadership Perspectives*, 2(4), 1-4.
- Spanberger, P.G., and Jackson, S.M. (2008). Intelligent micromanagement. *Leadership Perspectives*, 2, (4).
- Spector, M.D., and JONES, G.E. (2004). Trust in the workplace: Factors affecting trust formation between team members. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(3), 311-321.
- Tracey, J. B., and Nathan, A. E. (2002). *The strategic and operational roles of human resources: An emerging model*.
- Uma, M.H. (2015). Employee participation: A tool of motivation and high productivity. *Pacific Business Review International*, 8(3).
- Whipple, B. (2016). *Delegation and micromanagement*. Leadergrow Inc.
- White, R.D. (2010). The micromanagement disease: Symptoms, diagnosis, and cure. *Public Personnel Management*, 39(1), 71-6.
- White, R.D. (2010). The micromanagement disease: Symptoms, diagnosis, and cure. *Public Personnel Management*, 39(1), 71-76.
- Yen, C. H., and Teng, H. Y. (2013). The effect of centralization on organizational citizenship behaviour and deviant workplace behaviour in the hospitality industry. *Tourism Management*, 36, 401-410.
- Yusoff, W.Z.W., Ismail, M., and Ali, A.S. (2010). Understanding the services provider perspective towards better service quality in local authorities. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 8(3), 226-230.
- Zainuddin, S., and Isa, R.C. (2011). The role of organizational fairness and motivation in the relationship between budget participation and managerial performance: A conceptual paper. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(12), 641-648.