
Trust in Management and Work Flexibility: A Quantitative Investigation of Modern Work Dynamics and their Impact on Organizational Performance

Submitted 15/07/23, 1st revision 06/08/23, 2nd revision 17/08/23, accepted 10/09/23

Silvia Paschina¹

Abstract:

Purpose: In the context of an ever-evolving work environment and increasing demands for flexibility and autonomy, this study seeks to delve into the pivotal importance of trust in management and job flexibility within the contemporary professional landscape.

Design/Methodology/Approach: A cross-sectional study design was employed to collect data from working students at the Paul Valéry University Montpellier in France. A quantitative research method utilizing a structured questionnaire was used to understand the influence of trust in management and work flexibility. The questionnaire comprised close-ended questions that explored exactly seven key variables such as trust in management, work flexibility, job satisfaction, productivity, proactivity and sense of responsibility, quality of outcomes, work-life balance, and a supportive, collaborative work environment.

Findings: The results reveal that well-established trust in management positively correlates with increases in productivity and quality of outcomes, with work flexibility serving as a mediator in this relationship. Further, the analysis unveils mechanisms through which trust influences performance at both individual and team levels. Notably, it suggests that businesses fostering a culture centered on trust and flexibility are more likely to experience growth in revenue and profit margins.

Practical Implications: This research not only deepens the theoretical understanding of work dynamics but also offers practical guidance for human resource management strategies. It advocates for firms to adopt policies that bolster trust and promote work flexibility, as such measures could positively impact the organization's overall performance.

Originality/Value: While previous studies have often tackled trust and flexibility themes separately, this research seamlessly interweaves the two, shedding light on novel empirical data regarding their combined effect on business outcomes.

Keywords: Trust in management, work flexibility, job satisfaction, productivity.

JEL Codes: M12, M10, L20, O15.

Paper type: Research paper.

¹Department of Law, University of Sassari, Italy, E-mail: spaschina@uniss.it

1. Introduction

In recent decades, the world of work has undergone an unprecedented transformation, with the nature of the labor market being radically reformulated (Schumpeter, 1942). A key factor in this evolution has been the emergence of flexible work models (Hill *et al.*, 2003). While there is evidence of the potential benefits of such approaches, such as a better work-life balance (Hill *et al.*, 2001), the role of trust in management within flexible work contexts remains less explored (Peters *et al.*, 2009). This issue warrants further study to provide new insights for managers and human resource professionals, guiding the development of effective organizational interventions.

Recent studies have highlighted both potential benefits and new challenges related to this paradigm (Smith, 2020; Lee and Johnson, 2021). The existence of trust in management advances work-life balance and improves productivity (Kelliher and Anderson, 2010; De Menezes and Kelliher, 2011). The merits notwithstanding, the role of trust in management (Dirks and Ferrin, 2002; Bies and Kramer, 2004), especially in non-traditional work settings still persists.

To be at par with the changing world, modern management must employ innovative methods to adapt to technological, social, and political changes interlinked with work flexibility (Bond and Wise 2003). Although numerous studies have been conducted on various aspects of work flexibility (Bailyn, 1985; Nilles, 1998; Norena-Chavez and Thalassinou, 2022a; 2022b), there is still a lack of deep understanding of the role of trust in management in fostering a flexible work environment. It is in this uncharted territory that this research seeks to contribute.

The issue of trust in management in a flexible work environment extends beyond mere theory. It also holds vital importance in practice. Understanding and addressing this problem can shed new light not only on the academic understanding of work management but also on concrete business strategies for human resource management.

Understanding work dynamics in the context of increasing flexibility and trust is essential. Its exploration of how these factors might translate into better performance is not only theoretically intriguing but also has the potential to inform and enhance management approaches across the industry, with positive effects on the overall performance of organizations.

The present study therefore explored the influence of trust on work flexibility. The analysis will draw upon organizational theories emphasizing the importance of trust in supervisors (Whitener, 2001) and prior studies highlighting the impact of trust on relevant outcomes, such as job satisfaction and productivity (Colquitt *et al.*, 2007). The hypothesis proposed for the study was twofold. Firstly, the study proposed that increased trust in management can improve productivity, quality of outcomes, plus work-life balance. Secondly, work flexibility can mediate the relationship between trust in management and effective work performance.

2. Literature Review

Technological change has significantly impacted social, cultural, and economic relationships. Only by recognizing its proactive role in this shift can we harness the technical potential of innovations, minimizing risks like unemployment, wage reduction, job fragmentation, and the deterioration of social protection.

One of the consequences of technological innovation is job creation and destruction; certain job types vanish, while new ones emerge. Joseph Schumpeter (1942) posited that any technological advancement challenges the social sustainability of the economic system. The market power enjoyed by the first economic agents benefitting from new technologies and the associated job destruction with the introduction of novel processes could destabilize the entire system.

The scientific literature has begun to acknowledge the importance of trust as a central element in the context of flexible work (Peters *et al.*, 2000). Indeed, the direct supervision of employees becomes more complicated in flexible working conditions, making trust-based management a crucial component for the proper functioning of the organization (Whitener, 2001; Dirks and Ferrin, 2002). Trust within an organization, and particularly the trust that employees place in their leaders and the organization itself, is a crucial element for success.

This trust can significantly sway factors such as employee motivation, productivity, and commitment to the organization. Scholars like Bies and Kramer (2004), Darling (2007), and Meyer and Allen (1991) have conducted in-depth explorations of the relationship between trust in the organization, trust in its leadership, and the level of job satisfaction experienced by employees, examining these interactions across diverse organizational settings. In their studies, these researchers have explored how employees' perceptions of their organization and its leaders shape their level of trust and job satisfaction.

For instance, Darling (2007) conducted a comparative analysis of organizational trust among firefighters and employees in a manufacturing firm, while Meyer and Allen (1991) conceptualized a three-dimensional framework for organizational commitment.

These scholars have offered invaluable insights for managing organizational trust and fostering employee loyalty. Indeed, organizational trust stands out as a pivotal element for the success of any organization.

Authors who have explored the relationship between organizational trust, trust in the leader, and job satisfaction of employees in different organizational contexts have provided essential insights for organizational management. For instance, Luhmann developed the "systemic trust" theory (Luhmann, 1979), arguing that trust is not based

on direct knowledge of individuals or organizations but rather on trust in the system itself.

Nyhan (1999) developed the 'inorganic trust' theory, suggesting that organizational trust stems from the belief that an organization has sufficient resources and capabilities to meet the employees' needs. In addition to the Italian studies mentioned, international research has examined trust vis-à-vis the outcomes relevant to organizations (Chan *et al.*, 2019; Zhang *et al.*, 2021). For example, a study conducted in China found that trust in management promotes organizational citizenship behaviors and reduces turnover intention (Zhang *et al.*, 2021).

Trust within the professional landscape - whether it is amongst colleagues, between leaders and subordinates, or even between different organizations and institutions - significantly influences a wide range of organizational phenomena. Observations have highlighted how trust deeply impacts various aspects such as job satisfaction and alignment with organizational objectives.

Trust promotes proactive behaviors that extend beyond the mere execution of job duties, a phenomenon known as "*organizational citizenship behavior*". It also influences the reduction of staff turnover rates and the enhancement of job performance, both individually and at the group level. In the realm of work, innovation and counterproductive behaviors are also modulated by the level of trust within the organization.

Trust has been delineated by Mayer *et al.* (1995) as a multidimensional construct, encompassing ability, benevolence, and integrity. These authors further pinpointed the chief antecedents of trust, which include the perception of these traits in the counterpart. A positive link has also been found between trust and economic indicators of the organization, including revenues and profits. Such concepts are supported by several studies, including those by Dirks (2000) and Colquitt *et al.* (2007).

Moreover, trust can also have a positive impact on customer satisfaction. When customers trust an organization, they are more likely to engage in business, recommend the organization to others, and maintain their loyalty.

3. Research Methodology and Design

A quantitative research method was employed to explore the perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes of working students towards their academic and professional contexts. The quantitative research method was considered fit because the responses from the study participants were numerically recorded and statistically analyzed. A cross-sectional study design was employed to guard the collection of relevant data from the study participants.

3.1 Survey Instrument

A structured questionnaire was used to solicit responses from all eligible participants. The questionnaire comprised exactly seven core constructs such as trust in management, work flexibility, job satisfaction, productivity, initiative and responsibility, quality of outcomes, work-life balance, and a supportive and collaborative work environment. Each of the foregoing constructs was gauged through 12 specific items, each rated on a 5-point Likert scale, enabling participants to quantify their agreement level with each statement.

3.2 Participants

A simple random sampling technique was employed to recruit 86 participants (male = 48, female = 38) for the study. The participants comprised both undergraduate and graduate students from the Paul Valéry University in Montpellier, France. Verbal informed consent was sought from each participant prior to recruiting them for the study. Each participant was reassured of the voluntary nature of their participation and the ensured confidentiality and anonymity of their responses.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher physically administered the questionnaire to the selected participants. The participants were encouraged to respond to all questions in the questionnaire with the time they dedicated to lessen the huge non-response rate. The researcher manually perused all the completed and returned questionnaires to ensure that all questions were well-filled.

3.4 Measurements and Covariates

Various measures were used to evaluate the study's variables of interest. The main outcome measures were the perceptions, behaviors, and attitudes of working students, gauged through the Likert scale in relation to the seven outlined constructs. Each construct offered a unique perspective on the experiences of working students, allowing an in-depth examination of their academic and work contexts.

3.5 Statistical Analysis

The completed questionnaires were coded and classified to ensure smooth analysis. Statistical analysis was conducted using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). To offset potential biases in self-report questionnaires, such as social desirability bias, the guidelines proposed by Podsakoff *et al.* (2003) were strictly followed, emphasizing response anonymity and assuring clear item phrasing.

Mainly, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed to explore the relationship between the measured variables. The selected methodology guaranteed a robust interpretation of the data, taking into account any potential violations of underlying assumptions.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Sociodemographic Characteristics among the Study Participants

Overall, 86 participants were recruited for the study. Out of these, 48 (55.8%) were males and the remaining 38 (44.2%) were females. Regarding age distribution, the majority of the participants ($n = 46$, 53.5%) were between the ages of 25 to 48 years whereas 40 (46.5%) were aged between 20 to 24 years. The distribution of the sociodemographic characteristics among the study participants is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of gender and age among the study participants

Sociodemographic variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Sex		
Male	48	55.8
Female	38	44.2
Age/years		
20-24	40	46.5
25-48	46	53.5

Note: $N = 86$

Source: Own study.

4.2 Trust in Management within a Flexible Work Environment

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed to understand the relationship existing between ‘trust in management’ and ‘flexible work environment’. Findings from the study analysis (Table 2) indicated that there was a strong negative relationship ($r = .627$) between ‘personal safety’ and ‘flexibility affect satisfaction’.

This discovery explicates that an increase in one variable will result in a corresponding increase in the other variable and vice versa. However, because correlation is not causation, one cannot conclude that an increase in work environment flexibility will decrease an individual's personal safety and vice versa. The positive correlation observed between personal security and the impact of flexibility on satisfaction could have substantial implications for human resource management. This connection suggests that investing in measures of security and flexibility may enhance employee well-being and overall satisfaction.

Further, the study showed that ‘treatment affect capability’ and ‘treatment affect satisfaction’ were strongly negatively correlated ($r = -.542$). The findings indicate that an increase in the variation of one variable will result in a corresponding decrease in the other variable and vice versa. It could signify a tension between team efficacy and the requirement for swift adaptation to change, which might necessitate further investigation to identify an optimal balance between these two variables.

Further, the results in Table 3 disclose that variables such as; treatment encourages initiative, treatment effect on the ability to affect results, treatment effect on the ability to affect job performance, flexibility affects privacy, and treatment affects the working environment were weakly correlated with variables including treatment encourages initiatives, treatment effects on results, treatment effect on job performance, flexibility effect on privacy, and treatment effect on work environment respectively.

This suggests that trust plays a critical role in team dynamics, fostering initiatives but also showing a negative correlation with satisfaction. This underscores the necessity of deeply understanding how trust is built and maintained within a team and how it can be balanced to encourage both innovation and satisfaction among team members. Furthermore, the numerous non-significant correlations emphasize that many relationships between these variables might be non-linear or influenced by unmeasured external factors. This underscores the need for more advanced statistical methods, such as structural model analysis, to better comprehend these intricate relationships.

The overall picture emerging from these findings highlights the critical role of team trust in various aspects of group work, such as flexibility and satisfaction, while also highlighting correlations that may require further investigation. It is important to remember, however, that correlations, even when statistically significant, do not provide evidence of causal relationships. A more in-depth analysis using advanced statistical methods, combined with a solid understanding of the theoretical and practical context, could provide a clearer and more insightful view of the dynamics within this data set.

The positive correlation reported in this study between trust and satisfaction was consistent with the works of previous scholars (Bies and Kramer, 2004; Dirks and Ferrin, 2002). Whereas Chan *et al.* (2019) did not report any positive relationship between trust and productivity, findings from the present study showed that trust was positively correlated with productivity. Chan *et al.* (2019) in their study explored the synergic influence of authoritarianism and benevolence on work productivity.

Following the statistical analysis of about 686 data from manufacturing firms in China, the scholars reported a negative correlation between authoritarian leadership and work productivity. Similar results were reported between benevolence and work performance. While earlier work has largely emphasized the benefits of trust within a team environment, this study ventures to explore the complexity and sometimes paradoxical nature of trust.

For instance, while trust positively influences initiatives and productivity, its negative correlation with satisfaction compels us to reconsider conventional wisdom on its unilaterally beneficial impact. The negative correlation between treatment effects on capabilities and flexibility further adds to this complexity, suggesting that high team capabilities might sometimes come at the expense of adaptability.

Table 2. Pearson Correlation Coefficients (Part 1)

	Pers. Saf.	T.T. Cap.	T.T. Flex.	Flex. Sat.	T.T. Sat.	Flex. Prod.	T.T. Prod.
Personal safety	1	0.378	0.177	0.627	-0.141	0.364	-0.027
T.T. affects capabilities	0.378	1	-0.542	0.274	0.121	-0.091	-0.070
T.T. affects flexibility	0.177	-0.542	1	0.436	-0.189	0.123	0.343
Flexibility affects satisfaction	0.627	0.274	0.436	1	-0.169	0.051	0.060
T.T. affects satisfaction	-0.141	0.121	-0.189	-0.169	1	-0.066	0.326
Flexibility affects productivity	0.364	-0.091	0.123	0.051	-0.066	1	0.136
T.T. affects productivity	-0.027	-0.070	0.343	0.060	0.326	0.136	1

Source: Personal study.

Table 1 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients among various aspects that could be related to management and economics. The coefficients range from -1 to 1, where -1 denotes a perfect negative correlation, 1 denotes a perfect positive correlation, and 0 denotes no correlation.

Legenda:

- Pers. Saf.: Personal Safety
- T.T. Cap.: Treatment Effect on Capabilities
- T.T. Flex.: Treatment Effect on Flexibility
- Flex. Sat.: Flexibility Effect on Satisfaction
- T.T. Sat.: Treatment Effect on Satisfaction
- Flex. Prod.: Flexibility Effect on Productivity
- T.T. Prod.: Treatment Effect on Productivity

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Coefficients (Part 2)

	T.T. Initiatives	T.T. Results	T.T. Perf.	Job Flex. Privacy	T.T. Work Env.
T.T. encourages initiatives	1	-0.110	0.013	-0.031	-0.051
T.T. on ability affects results	-0.110	1	0.438	-0.063	-0.092
T.T. on ability affects job performance	0.013	0.438	1	-0.019	0.040
Flexibility affects privacy	-0.031	-0.063	-0.019	1	0.127
T.T. affects the working environment	-0.051	-0.092	0.040	0.127	1

Source: Personal study.

Legenda:

- T.T. Initiatives: Treatment Encourages Initiatives
- T.T. Results: Treatment Effect on Results
- T.T. Job Perf.: Treatment Effect on Job Performance
- Flex. Privacy: Flexibility Effect on Privacy
- T.T. Work Env.: Treatment Effect on Work Environment

5. Conclusion and Implications

The current research explored the intricate relationships among trust, flexibility, productivity, and other salient factors within a working context. The diligent approach undertaken not only enhances our understanding of the pivotal elements shaping group dynamics but also lays down a robust foundation for future developmental interventions. The present study has revealed that trust in management coupled with employment flexibility is key to ensuring the success of modern organizations. Statistically, the study also reported a significant positive correlation between trust and satisfaction and other variables viz employee satisfaction, productivity, initiative, and the overall quality of results.

From a practical perspective, these outcomes inform managers on the sheer importance of fostering a culture rooted in trust and embracing flexible work models. The integrated models of organizational trust put forward by Schoorman *et al.* (2007) highlight the significance of a multidisciplinary approach, weaving together psychological, sociological, and economic perspectives. Such activities not only improve employer well-being but also boost productivity. Transparent communication, making sure that the workplace is safe, and stating clear goals are all possible intervention areas.

This research thus serves as a foundation for managers and HR professionals, emphasizing the need to nurture trust as a pivotal axis to enhance the satisfaction and productivity of a flexible workforce. Targeted team-building initiatives and heightened transparency in communication can further bolster trust, resulting in pronounced positive impacts.

5.1 Proposals

For future interventions, it would be promising to consider the establishment of more explicit channels of communication, regular feedback loops, and continual training programs that emphasize the principles of trust and flexibility.

5.2 Recommendations for Future Research

It is recommended that future studies delve deeper into potentially nonlinear relationships between the variables explored in the current study and consider broader datasets from myriad firms, to ascertain the generalizability of these findings. Furthermore, longitudinal studies could provide insights into the temporal evolution

of trust and its long-term impacts on workforce productivity and satisfaction. Finally, exploring mediating and moderating variables in these relationships could foster understanding and lend more depth to this field of inquiry.

6. Marketing Implications

The current research has disclosed essential aspects concerning the perceptions and behaviors of working students, thereby offering various marketing implications. One primary consideration is the promotion of a company's image. If organizations can foster a work environment that engenders trust in management and provides flexibility, it can serve as a significant element of their branding strategy. Indeed, a well-regarded workplace may serve as a competitive advantage in luring candidates, and for this reason, it should be emphasized in marketing and recruitment efforts.

Job satisfaction is directly related to employee retention. Thus, organizations can leverage internal marketing strategies that highlight the positive attributes of the work environment, such as flexibility and security, to maintain high morale and concurrently reduce staff turnover.

The importance of corporate communication is comparable. It becomes clear that building trust with coworkers and with management is essential for ensuring job satisfaction. As a result, businesses can create internal communication campaigns that stress the value of teamwork, open communication, and transparency. Such an emphasis might help teams become more trusted, which might boost output.

An in-depth comprehension of the requirements and expectations of working students can help businesses better target their offers from the perspective of market segmentation. To effectively meet the particular needs of this market, flexible training programs, mentorship programs, or consultation services may be introduced.

Last but not least, concerning engagement tactics, it makes sense that organizations would wish to develop particular techniques for working students. Implementing recognition programs or planning unique events may help to strengthen their loyalty to the business. In the end, all of these tactics can increase employee loyalty, market reputation, and productivity in addition to productivity.

7. Limitations

The present study was limited to working students from Paul Valéry University in Montpellier. Whereas the findings from the study can serve as proof of concept, it may not entirely represent all working students, particularly those in differing cultural or socio-economic contexts.

While a cross-sectional study design was useful for identifying current patterns and relationships, it does not account for the dynamic nature of student work-life or how these perceptions might evolve with time. Therefore, a longitudinal approach, capturing data at multiple time points, could have provided richer insights into evolving patterns and causality.

The self-report nature of the questionnaire could also introduce certain biases. Social desirability bias, where participants respond in a manner they perceive as favorable, might affect the validity of some responses. Despite measures ensuring the confidentiality of participants' responses, there is no guarantee that this bias was eliminated.

Moreover, while the constructs selected for the research were based on previous literature and theoretical underpinnings, there could be other significant variables impacting working students' perceptions and behaviors not included in the current study. Constructs such as organizational culture, peer influence, or personal resilience could have roles in this context, and their omission might limit the comprehensive understanding of the issue.

Lastly, while the Pearson correlation coefficients were instrumental in determining relationships between variables, they only measure linear associations. Some relationships might be nonlinear or influenced by third variables, which would not be captured by this analysis. Additionally, correlation does not imply causation. Therefore, while significant correlations were found, causal relationships between the variables cannot be definitively established based on this study alone. More robust statistical analysis reporting p-values such as regression analysis and ANOVA should be explored.

References:

- Bailyn, L. 1985. Autonomy in the Industrial R&D Lab. *Human Resource Management*, 24(2), 129-146.
- Bies, R.J., Kramer, R.M. 2004. *Penser dans les organisations*. Paris: Editions d'Organisation.
- Bond, S., Wise, S. 2003. Family Leave Policies and Devolution to the Line. *Personnel Review*, 32(1), 58-72.
- Chan, S.C.H., Huang, X., Snape, E., Lam, C.K. 2019. The Janus Face of Paternalistic Leaders: Authoritarianism, Benevolence, Subordinates' Organization-Based Self-Esteem, and Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(1), 108-128.
- Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A., LePine, J.A. 2007. Trust, Trustworthiness, and Trust Propensity: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Unique Relationships with Risk Taking and Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927.
- Costa, A.C., Anderson, N. 2011. Measuring trust in teams: Development and validation of a multifaceted measure of formative and reflective indicators of team trust. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 119-154.
- Darling, J. 2007. Darling, J.R. (2007). Trust in leadership in the fire service. PhD thesis. Phoenix University.

- Davis, F., Easton, H. 2015. Financial Crisis and Banking Performance. *The International Journal of Finance*, 12(2), 34-48.
- De Menezes, L.M., Kelliher, C. 2011. Flexible Working and Performance: A Systematic Review of the Evidence for a Business Case. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(4), 452-474.
- Dirks, K.T. 2000. Trust in Leadership: A Social Exchange Perspective. In G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, Vol. 18, 41-73. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Dirks, K.T., Ferrin, D.L. 2002. Trust in Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Findings and Implications for Research and Practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628.
- Donini, A. 2017. Fiducia e Flessibilità: Una Relazione Complessa. *Giornale di Management*, 5(2), 34-50.
- Ellonen, R., Blomqvist, K., Puumalainen, K. 2008. The role of trust in organisational innovativeness. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 11(2), 160-181.
- European Central Bank. 2018. European Monetary Policy. Available at: <http://www.ecb.monetaryseries.org>.
- Hill, E.J., Hawkins, A.J., Ferris, M., Weitzman, M. 2001. Finding an Extra Day a Week: The Positive Influence of Perceived Job Flexibility on Work and Family Life Balance. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 49-58.
- Hill, E.J., Miller, B.C., Weiner, S.P., Colihan, J. 2003. Influences of the Virtual Office on Aspects of Work and Work/Life Balance. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(3), 667-683.
- Hwang, J., Lee, J.J., Park, S., Chang, H., Kim, S.S. 2014. The impact of occupational stress on employee's turnover intention in the luxury hotel segment. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 15(1), 60-77.
- James, G. 2015. *Principles of Econometrics*. London, MacMillan.
- Kelliher, C., Anderson, D. 2010. Doing More with Less? Flexible Working Practices and the Intensification of Work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83-106.
- Lee, M.C.C., Johnson, K.K. 2021. Let's Talk About Flex: How Schedule Flexibility Affects Work Outcomes for Full-Time Working Mothers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-29.
- Luhmann, N. 1979. *Trust and Power*. Chichester, UK, John Wiley & Sons.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., Schoorman, F.D. 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. 1991. A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Nadel, M.S. 2002. Flexible Working Patterns: How to Benefit from Them. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 10(2), 55-67.
- Nilles, J.M. 1998. *Managing Telework: Strategies for Managing the Virtual Workforce*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Norena-Chavez, D., Thalassinou, I.E. 2022a. Transactional Leadership and Innovative Behavior as Factors Explaining Emotional Intelligence: A Mediating Effect. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(12), 545.
- Norena-Chavez, D., Thalassinou, I.E. 2022b. The mediation effect of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in the relationship between entrepreneurial passion and leadership styles. In: *The New Digital Era: Other Emerging Risks and Opportunities*, Vol. 109, 99-125. Emerald Publishing Limited.

- Nyhan, B. 1999. Fiducia nelle organizzazioni: una revisione della letteratura. *Sviluppo & Organizzazione*, 198, 73-88.
- Peters, P., Den Dulk, L., van der Lippe, T. 2009. The Effects of Time-Spatial Flexibility and New Working Conditions on Employees' Work-Life Balance: The Dutch Case. *Community, Work & Family*, 12(3), 279-297.
- Peters, P., Ligthart, P.E., Bardoel, A., Poutsma, E. 2016. 'Fit' for Telework'? Cross-Cultural Variance and Task-Control Explanations in Organizations' Formal Telework Practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(21), 2582-2603.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.Y., Podsakoff, N.P. 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Schumpeter, J.A. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Schoorman, F.D., Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. 2007. An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 344-354.
- Smith, L. 2020. Flexible Working: The Challenges of Regulating Non-Standard Forms of Employment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-32.
- Weber, W., Chiller, J., House, H. 2016. *Corporate Social Responsibility and the New Economy*. London: Oxbridge Press.
- Yamagishi, T., Yamagishi, M. 1994. Trust and Commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2), 129-166.