PREDICTORS AND CORRELATES OF CHARLATAN BEHAVIOUR IN A NON-WESTERN CONTEXT

Gbolahan Gbadamosi

ABSTRACT

This survey examines some of the key predictors of charlatan behaviour in Botswana. Usable data was collected from 1367 respondents using questionnaires administered in 7 cities. Results showed significant but inverse correlation between only continuance commitment and core self-evaluation, with all other variables being positively correlated with each other. Charlatan behaviour was significantly correlated with continuance commitment and self-rated job performance while these variables were not significantly correlated with each other. The significant predictors of charlatan behaviour were continuance and affective commitments and job performance. Managerial implications, study's limitations and directions for future research were well articulated.

INTRODUCTION

For several decades now, organisations worldwide have been concerned with maintaining and improving performance by sustaining and enhancing employee commitment. A sense of justice and fairness suggests that a committed employee is likely to perceive some trust in the management of the organisation. It is however clear that not all employees perform at their expected level because a number get by irrespective of how they perform and how committed they are. These are the charlatans who have mastered the art of survival in the organisation. Employee commitment does not just come from a favourable attitude towards an organisation; it is a comprehensive attitude that involves the belief that what the organisation and each employee accomplish makes a difference. Now more than ever, managers must learn to identify those "organisational charlatans" – individuals who seek to improve their perceived performance at the expense of their actual performance (Parnell and Singer, 2001; Gbadamosi *et al*, 2004; Gbadamosi, 2005; Gbadamosi and Osuagwu, 2005).

What kind of work attitudes do false performers have towards their work, their organisation and the workplace management and does this affect work performance? Could the absence of trust in management among employees increase the incidence of charlatan behaviour among them? To what extent would trust in management, commitment of employees, their core self-evaluation, job performance and other job characteristics be predictive of charlatan behaviour? The likely strong association between the commitment of employees and perceived trust in management is palpable and logical (the higher the trust the higher the likely commitment), except perhaps if there is some measure of pretence. It is such pretence that is demonstrable in

Dr. Gbolahan Gbadamosi is with the Worcester Business School, University of Worcester, Worcester, UK. He specialises in Organisational Behaviour and HRM with particular interest in the development of HRM in contemporary Africa. He has been on the faculty of Universities in Africa (Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, and Botswana) and the United Kingdom including visiting stint in New Zealand and the U.S.A. He has published extensively in scholarly journals including Management Decision, Journal of Management Development, Journal of African Business among others. His research interests include: Charlatan and Ethical Behaviour, Commitment, Work Stress, Cultural issues, Organisational Change, International HRM and Management in developing countries.

the display of charlatan behaviour. The ensuing link among these variables is the key interest of this study. The study explores the relationship among employee commitment, trust in management, core self-evaluation, job performance, and other job characteristics and the manifestation of charlatan behaviour or false performance with a view to identifying the strength of the relationship and also identifying the extent to which these variables are predictive of charlatan behaviour or false performance.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The emerging role of trust is a perfect focus for those interested in the dynamics of organisations because trust sits at the boundary of psychology and sociology (Tyler, 2003). Trust in management refers to the psychological contract established between individuals and organisations based on the messages an employee receives regarding organisational expectations and employee perceptions of desired managerial actions (Rosseau and Wade-Benzoni, 1994; Brockner *et al*., 1997). There would be mutuality in organisations when there is a general perception that the interests of management and that of employees coincide. When an employee perceives such mutuality she or he is likely to trust management and invariably demonstrate a high level of commitment to the organisation. This notion of mutuality is closely associated with the concept of commitment (Armstrong, 1999). Management and employees are interdependent and both parties obviously benefit from this interdependence. Mutuality means that management is concerned with the well being of employees as well as the success of the organisation, and employees are just as concerned with the success of the organisation as their own well being (Armstrong, 1999). Trust is a key because it enables cooperation and again there is the strong desire to understand how to create effective cooperation within organisations (Tyler, 2003).

For nearly three decades now, researchers have refined the meaning of organisational commitment. It has now evolved into a complex concept that is serving HRM and behavioural researches as a kind of summary index of work related experiences but more significantly it has become predictive of work behaviours and other behavioural intentions. Gbadamosi (2003) discusses the two contending viewpoints for conceptualising organisational commitment. Ferres *et al* (2004) quoting several sources indicated that there is significant theoretical and empirical support for the existence of a linkage between organisational commitment and trust. de Gilder (2003) reported significant positive correlations between trust and both affective and continuance commitments while Dirks and Ferrin (2002) identified several consequences of trust including organisational commitment, decision commitment, job satisfaction and intention to stay. Ferres *et al* (2004) also details several studies that have focused on the consequences of trust listed to include turnover intention, affective and continuance commitment, attitude towards change and citizenship behaviour. Bijlsma and van de Bunt (2003) again reported studies lending theoretical support for the idea that trust lubricates a wide array of organisational processes. Perceived organisational support (POS), intention to leave and affective commitment have all been identified as important outcomes of trust both within and across peer levels (Connell *et al*, 2003b). Acknowledging that much effort has been directed at trust in management, Ferres *et al* (2004) redirected attention to trust at the co-workers' level and reported the construct to be a significant predictor of perceived organisational support, lowered turnover intention, and greater affective commitment.

Core self-evaluation is a broad personality trait often measured indirectly until the attempt by Judge *et al* (2003) to measure it directly by the development of a measure they termed Core Self-evaluations Scale (CSES). According to Judge *et al* (1997), core self-evaluations is a broad latent, higher-order trait indicated by four well established traits in the personality literature: (a) self-esteem, the overall value one places on oneself as a person (Harter, 1990); (b) generalised self-efficacy, an evaluation of how well one can perform across a variety of situations (Locke, McClear, Knight, 1996); (c) Neuroticism, the tendency to have a negativistic cognitive/explanatory style and focus on negative aspect of the self (Watson, 2000); and (d) locus of control, beliefs about the causes of events in one's life – locus is internal when individuals see events as being contingent on their own behaviour (Rotter, 1966). We did not find any studies that had attempted to link charlatan behaviour with core self-evaluations or indeed most of the other behavioural variables being investigated in this study. Judge *et al* (2003) argued strongly of the need for future research to examine the

antecedents of core self-evaluation as well as an ongoing validation of the concept in various setting and this is one of the challenges the present study undertakes.

Research Need and Hypotheses Development

Charlatan behaviour as an increasing organisational phenomenon is ripe for research attention by both academics and practitioners. In today's highly competitive work environment, some employees would probably do all they can, even if it is at the expense of others, to get what they want – retain their jobs. Much of the behavioural research literature have emanated from Western based studies and recently a lot more seem to be coming out of Asia with an infinitesimal amount from Africa. While earlier studies have demonstrated some linkages between organisational commitment and trust in management, we did not find studies that explored charlatan behaviour as a possible consequence of any of the variables being explored in the present study. However, trust in management being a positive behaviour and charlatan behaviour being a negative behaviour we anticipate an inverse relationship between the two. Moreover, we expect that employees who demonstrate more constructive behaviour (e.g. commitment and job performance) will show more trust in management and more positive perception of supervisory support. Similarly, we anticipate that such employees would demonstrate less pretentious behaviour (charlatan behaviour). Given the foregoing, we therefore propose a number of specific research hypotheses for testing: -

H1:   Charlatan behaviour will be inversely correlated with trust in management

H2:   Charlatan behaviour will be inversely correlated with affective commitment

H3:   Charlatan behaviour will be inversely correlated with the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

H4:   Charlatan behaviour will be significantly correlated with continuance commitment

H5:   Charlatan behaviour will be significantly albeit inversely correlated with core self-evaluation (CSES)

H6:   Core self-evaluation (CSES) will be directly correlated with organisational commitment, OCQ, trust in management, job performance, and job characteristics (employee participation, goal clarity, readiness for change, autonomy, and feedback)

H7:   There is no relationship between charlatan behaviour and (a) supervisory support, (b) job performance and (c) job characteristics (employee participation, goal clarity, readiness for change, autonomy, and feedback)

H8:   Organisational commitment (affective and continuance) and the OCQ would be positively and significantly correlated with trust in management

H9:   Organisational commitment, trust in management, core self-evaluation, supervisory support, job performance and job characteristics (employee participation, goal clarity, readiness for change, autonomy, and feedback) will significantly predict charlatan behaviour

The study's findings should enhance our understanding of human resource policies and practices towards improving work attitudes and being able to sift false performers from truly committed employees. Much as the commitment literature is overwhelming, the literature linking commitment with charlatan behaviour or indeed exploring the concept of 'organisational charlatanism' is meagre. Gbadamosi *et al* (2004); Gbadamosi (2005); and Gbadamosi and Osuagwu (2005) had reported some preliminary studies in Africa but this has not resulted in any cumulative body of knowledge. Similarly, little has been done worldwide, since the pioneering efforts by Parnell and Singer (2001) developing the 9-item Organisational Charlatan Scale (OCS) to

measure the concept. The present study will add to the body of knowledge by attempting to further fill this gap and providing a bigger empirical data from Africa. The result should thus add to the enrichment of our understanding of HR policies and practices especially in enhancing employee commitment and morale.

METHOD

Data Collection: Data was collected using questionnaires administered by research assistants. Only organisations that agreed to participate in the study were used for data collection. Prior research experience by randomly selecting organisations had proved complete failures in Botswana, hence resorting to this procedure of self-selection. In each participating organisation, the instrument was administered on randomly selected employees with the assistance of the Human Resource department or the Head Teacher/Principal (in the case of schools). In most cases questionnaires were dropped and research assistants followed up to pick up the instrument over a designated period of time which ranged from 1-4 weeks. The organisations were promised a copy of the published final work as an inducement to encourage participations.

Sample: Survey data was collected from public and private sector employees in 7 locations (cities and towns) in Botswana. The respondents were employed at government departments, public sector parastatals including the public teaching service and others were in the private sector. A total of 1420 questionnaires were returned of which 1367 were usable out of the 2500 questionnaires administered, representing an effective response rate of 54.68 percent. Botswana is a relatively small country with a population of 1.785 million; total adult literacy of 77% and GNP per capita $3430.00 (UNICEF 2003 – Statistics). The sample used for the study shows more females at 54% and more unmarried people at 65%. A large proportion of the sample is under 40 years (about 77%) with over 60% having at least 5 years work experience. The sample is also significantly educated (about 85% with high school education or above) and a vast majority belonging to the public service (only about 28% in the private sector).

Measures: The measures for the study's variables, their source(s), the reported coefficient alpha of each scale from their various original sources along with the alpha of the current sample are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Questionnaire Measures (Sources and Coefficient alpha)

S/N	Study Variables	No. of Items	Source of Scale	Reported Alpha	Study's Alpha
1	Charlatan Behaviour	9	Parnell and Singer (2001)	0.846 & 0.811	0.62
2	Affective Commitment	6	Meyer *et al*. (1993)	0.70 to 0.93	0.73
3	Continuance Commitment	7	Meyer *et al*. (1993)	0.70 to 0.93	0.74
4	Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)	6	Benkhoff (1997)	-	0.66
5	Core Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES)	12	Judge *et al*. (2003)	0.84	0.63
6	Trust in Management	4	LaRocco *et al*. (1975) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.86	0.83
7	Supervisory Support	4	LaRocco *et al*. (1975) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.85	0.78
8	Readiness for Change	4	LaRocco *et al*. (1975) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.84	0.82
9	Employee Participation	4	White and Ruh (1973) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.88	0.80
10	Goal Clarity	4	Gordon and Cummins (1979) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.90	0.85
11	Autonomy	3	Sims *et al*. (1979) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.89	0.75
12	Feedback	2	Sims *et al*. (1979) cited in Weber and Weber (2001)	0.93	0.51
13	Job Performance	3	Yousef (2000)	0.80	0.82
	Total Number of Items	68			

Charlatan behaviour; affective, continuance and normative commitments; and turnover intention were all measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree; Job performance was measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 *very low* to 5 *very high;* while trust in management, supervisory support, readiness for change, employee participation, goal clarity, autonomy, and feedback were all measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "never" to "always". Higher scores reflect higher reported levels of the variable. For autonomy and feedback, Weber and Weber (2001) had used 6 and 5 items respectively. The present study identified 3 of these items to measure autonomy and 2 items to measure feedback as these were considered relevant and adequate to capture the variables. The demographic variables included in the study were gender, marital status, age, work experience, education and type of organisation.

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The means, standard deviations and Pearson's intercorrelation coefficients for all the study variables presenting the general results of the study are shown in Tables 2.

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation and Intercorrelation of Study Variables

	Study Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Charlatan Behaviour	25.97	5.30	-.04	.20**	-.03	-.04	-.05	.02	.01	-.04	-.03	.01	-.03	.11**
2	Affective Commitment	19.83	4.67		.25**	.61**	.29**	.37**	.34**	.28**	.35**	.36**	.17**	.23**	.09**
3	Continuance Commitment	22.09	5.22			.14**	-.06*	.09**	.09**	.05*	.08**	.09**	-.02	.04	.05
4	OCQ	20.48	4.01				.39**	.41**	.37**	.35**	.36**	.40**	.21**	.19**	.07**
5	Core Self-Evaluation	39.31	5.67					.32**	.27**	.27**	.31**	.29**	.30**	.24**	.22**
6	Trust	11.81	4.35						.70**	.64**	.61**	.57**	.32**	.41**	.10**
7	Supervisory Support	11.99	4.22							.67**	.59**	.57**	.29**	.41**	.13**
8	Readiness for Change	11.71	4.18								.53**	.61**	.28**	.39**	.13**
9	Employee Participation	12.42	4.21									.58**	.41**	.42**	.14**
10	Goal Clarity	13.21	4.36										.30**	.42**	.19**
11	Autonomy	11.07	3.10											.47**	.28**
12	Feedback	6.74	2.12												.28**
13	Job Performance	12.54	2.21												-

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; n = 1367

The intercorrelation matrix for the study variables was rather interesting and is explained as follows. First, much as there was an excitingly significant cross-correlation among the variables; the main construct of our interest – charlatan behaviour was significantly correlated only with continuance commitment and self-rated job performance whereas these two variables were not significantly correlated with each other. Second, continuance commitment was significantly correlated with all the study variables except autonomy, feedback and job performance. Thirdly, the only significant but inverse correlation was between continuance commitment and core self-evaluation. Fourth, all other variables of the study were significantly and positively correlated with each other.

Hypotheses testing: Hypothesis 1: was accepted because charlatan behaviour was inversely albeit not significantly correlated with trust in management. Hypothesis 2: was accepted because charlatan behaviour was inversely albeit not significantly correlated with affective commitment. Hypothesis 3: was accepted because charlatan behaviour was inversely albeit not significantly correlated with the OCQ. Hypothesis 4: was accepted because charlatan behaviour was directly significantly correlated with continuance commitment. Hypothesis 5: was also accepted as there was an inverse relationship between charlatan behaviour and core self-evaluation. Hypothesis 6: was accepted because core self-evaluation was significantly correlated with all the predicted variables of the study. Hypothesis 7: this was largely accepted because there was no significant correlation between charlatan behaviour and the predicted variables (supervisory support, job characteristics) except job performance where the correlation was positive and significant. Hypothesis 8: was accepted as all the commitment measures were significantly and directly correlated with trust in management

Table 3: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression for Charlatan Behaviour

S/N	Predictor Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
	Constant	21.173	1.160		18.257	.000
1	Continuance Commitment	.194	.031	.194	6.339	.000
2	Affective Commitment	-.119	.034	-.107	-3.483	.001
3	Job Performance	.237	.071	.100	3.362	.001
	R^2	.048				
	Adjusted R^2	.046				
	n; (df)	1089; (3, 1086)				
	F	18.347				0.000

To test the predictive powers of the variables on the dependent variable multiple regression analysis was performed. This test was carried out to verify hypothesis 9, untangle the bivariate effects of the independent variables and determine their relative importance. With charlatan behaviour as our dependent variable, using the stepwise regression method, all the other study variables were entered into the regression equation. The Stepwise methods are best avoided except for exploratory model building which the present study meets (Field, 2005, p. 161.) Significant models emerged with only continuance commitment, affective commitment and job performance as predictor variables ($F_{3, 1086} = 18.347$; $p < 0.000$; Adjusted R square = 0.046) as shown in Table 3. The standardised regression coefficient show that continuance commitment (t = 6.339) is the strongest predictor followed by job performance at t = 3.362, while affective commitment turned out the weakest predictor of the three at t = -3.483. Together they explain just about 4 percent of the variance in charlatan behaviour, partly confirming our final hypothesis 9.

DISCUSSIONS AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the major variables that are correlated with and that predict and explain charlatan behaviour in organisations so as to enhance managerial understanding of the construct. Charlatan behaviour or what Parnell and Singer (2001) termed 'organisational charlatanism' being a relatively new concept do not have a strong theoretical or empirical support in the literature. As a result of this several variables were investigated as possible predictors in this exploratory effort. We seek to answer the question, when exactly are employees likely to manifest more charlatan behavioural tendencies? To what extent is core self-evaluation (how individuals view themselves – self esteem and self values) also an indicator of charlatan behavioural tendencies?

The result of the intercorrelation between charlatan behaviour and each of the study variable showed that albeit much of the relationship were in the predicted direction – negative or positive – only two were actually statistically significant. Charlatan behaviour was significantly correlated with continuance commitment (r = 0.20, p < 0.01) and with job performance (r = 0.11, p < 0.01). While the direct significant relationship between charlatan behaviour and continuance commitment can be explained by virtue of both being negative behavioural concepts, one would have expected an indirect or perhaps insignificant relationship with job performance. However, since our measure of job performance is subjective rather than objective the

direct relationship can be understood in the light of this limitation. Individuals evaluating their job performance are likely to be more positive and rate their performance rather more high than low. It is also interesting that affective commitment, the short version of OCQ, Core Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES), trust, employee participation, goal clarity and feedback were all inversely correlated with charlatan behaviour as predicted in our hypotheses. These findings may require further corroboration especially since these relationships were not found to have been investigated before.

The findings further disclosed that of all the variables examined in this study as possible predictors of charlatan behaviour using stepwise multiple regressions, only continuance commitment, affective commitment and job performance emerged as significant predictors of charlatan behaviour; while continuance commitment and job performance were positive, affective commitment was negative. Individuals who show high continuance commitment are those who remain in their organisation seemingly because there is no where else to go (they are stuck); it makes sense therefore that such individuals are likely charlatans. Clearly both charlatan behaviour and continuance commitment are negative behavioural concepts. On the other hand, affective commitment (although found to be inversely correlated with it) also emerged a significant predictor of charlatan behaviour. Individuals who are affectively committed because they strongly identify with the goals and objectives of the organisation do not show charlatan tendencies which is confirmed by the low, inverse but insignificant association between the affective commitment and charlatan behaviour which we found. In effect, individuals who manifest high charlatan tendencies will likely show low affective commitment. While the emergence of job performance as a predictor of charlatan behaviour might have thrown a strong challenge to the HR practitioner (since questions would have been asked about the adequacy and appropriateness of the job performance measures used), the subjectivity of the measures used in this study makes such finding to be highly curious and requiring further empirical investigation. It would be contradictory in terms to be charlatan in behaviour and yet be a high performing individual; the question would be why the pretence and charlatan?

Core self-evaluation was another variable whose relationship with any of the other study variable we did not find in the literature also turned up interesting findings. The variable was positively and significantly correlated with all the variables investigated in this study except charlatan behaviour. The positive association with many of these variables including the three measures of organisational commitment, trust in management, job characteristics (supervisory support, readiness for change, employee participation, goal clarity, autonomy, feedback) and job performance is perhaps an affirmation that the variables explored in the study are indeed behavioural and associated in ways that should predict our dependent variable – charlatan behaviour. On the trust in management relationship with other study variables; including organisational commitment, core self-evaluations, job characteristics and job performance which have witnessed more prior empirical investigations, our results revealed yet a significant positive association with all study variables except charlatan behaviour. Our finding on organisational commitment and trust is largely consistent with reported literature. While, Matthai (1989) found a strong positive relationship between trust and affective commitment, others have suggested that trust influences affective and continuance commitment (de Gilder, 2003; Tan and Tan, 2000). We also found a significant relationship between trust and continuance commitment which Connell *et al* (2003a) did not find.

Managerial Implications: There are a number of managerial implications of the findings. First, for the sustenance of high levels of employee performance and indeed while striving to enhance organisational effectiveness managers would benefit from ensuring that the strongly linked and likely predictors of charlatan behaviour are well considered and deliberately planned for in managerial activities. Secondly, we can argue that it is critical for HR practitioners/managers to put in place parameters for the identification of employees who manifest calculative deception – who are charlatan. We argue that it is a critical managerial responsibility to search for and be able to identify charlatan behaviour (individuals) in order to be able to deal with the potential problem it poses for the organisation. There is no doubt that such negative behaviour, if ignored and/or undetected, may catch on many employees becoming fashionable and thus creating a high level of mediocrity and decline in performance. It may also lead to decline in morale where employees perceive organisational charlatans as just getting by without detection. Finally, the strong association between and amongst all the psychological variables employed in this study calls for both research and managerial attention. Performance successes could be enhanced if organisations pay increased attention to building a bridge to ensure a two-way flow between and amongst many of these variables. Building trust in employees, for instance, through a well considered policy, which encourages treating employees with respect as well as

ensuring a management commitment that relates to them promptly and always will among others make the realisation of enhanced employee commitment (a laudable objective) achievable, just as it might possibly enhance self-evaluation and self confidence.

Study Limitations: Like all studies this effort is not without any blemish. A few limitations could be identified. First, the use of Research Assistants to collect data removes absolute control for authenticity of data collected from the researcher. In this study efforts were however made to minimise the negative impact that could arise from this limitation. We used follow-up telephone calls to confirm visits of Research Assistants and the number of instruments (questionnaires) that was collected from each organisation from the contact person in each organisation. Secondly, there are a number of possible additional relevant predictor variables that could be used in a research of this nature especially given that very little has been done linking charlatan behaviour with a number of known behaviour variables in the literature. Finally, given the relatively small population size of Botswana the study's sample size is fair and acceptable; however the sample is heavily skewed towards the public sector which is a limitation for a balanced data set. This weakness is however a general and well known problem in Botswana– like many other African countries – where the private sector is still largely undeveloped and most people who are engaged in paid employment actually work for government or a largely government owned outfit/parastatal. Hence the skewness may actually be a true reflection of the sizes of both sectors.

Future Research Direction: Future research would benefit from taking into cognisance the above mentioned weak points in the development of future research efforts, by adding a number of other possible predictors of charlatan behaviour given conceptual knowledge and experiences. Second, perhaps a cross-cultural as well as multi-cultural investigation of the construct across a number of countries would prove useful in furthering our understanding of the construct and perhaps a developing versus developed world comparison may also be beneficial. Third, another important area is that given that the present study explored trust in management and not co-workers trust (a concept explored recently by Natalie *et al* (2004)), it might be more useful in the context of charlatan behaviour to examine co-workers trust to further illuminate our understanding of the various variables that are associated with and are likely predictors of charlatan behaviour. This is critical because an organisational charlatan seems more easily identifiable by co-workers. Fourth, future research will benefit from a departure from the traditional survey method to obtain information about how, why and when individuals manifest charlatan behaviour tendencies. The use of a interviews and focus-group may also be very useful in this respect. It would be valuable to compare such qualitative studies to the little we know from quantitative efforts. Finally, demographic profiles of respondents were statistically unexplored in this study as they relate to the charlatan construct and would be an area useful for future study.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study has verified the relationship among charlatan behaviour and a number of behavioural concepts using a large sample from Botswana. In summary, this paper directed attention towards a relatively new concept in HRM and organisational behaviour – that of understanding charlatan behaviour – organisational charlatanism. Our results have identified some predictors of charlatan behaviour namely: continuance commitment, affective commitment and job performance. It also found that the concept – charlatan behaviour – is inversely associated with affective commitment, the OCQ, core self-evaluation, trust in management, employee participation, goal clarity and feedback. The present findings have again confirmed some measure of construct validity and support for the Organisational Charlatan Scale (OCS) even though additional future research would be useful for further authentication. Parnell and Singer (2001) had earlier reported limited construct validity for the scale. Since charlatans do not appear to fool their co-workers easily (Parnell and Singer, 2001); increased attention may need to be directed at using the co-worker to identify the charlatan colleague in a more objective manner. Much as future researches may be useful in further clarifying some of the present findings, managerial implications are clear as organisations may profit from a policy that builds trust, identify and tackle the charlatanism syndrome as well as sustain the enhancement of employee commitment in organisations. This research has contributed to the relative poor state of empirical investigations on charlatan or false behaviour and sensitised researchers and practitioners alike to the crying

need and urgency of human resource practice and research to see the problem as a growing challenge which perhaps may be a critical hindering factor in effective employee performance and their morale.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M. 1999. *A handbook of human resource management*, 7th Ed, London, Kogan Page.

Benkhoff, B. 1997. Disentangling organizational commitment: the dangers of the OCQ for research and policy. *Personnel Review*, 26(1 and 2), 114-31.

Bijlsma, K.M. and van de Bunt, G.G. 2003. Antecedents of trust in managers: a "bottom up" approach. *Personnel Review*, 32(5), 638-664.

Brockner, J., Siegel, P.A., Daly, J.P., Martin, C. and Tyler, T. 1997. When trust matters: the moderating effect of outcome favourability. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), 558-584.

Connell, J., Ferres, N. and Travaglione, A. 2003a. Engendering trust in manager-subordinate relationships: predictors and outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 32(5), 569-587.

Connell, J., Ferres, N. and Travaglione, A. 2003b. Trust in the workplace: the importance of interpersonal and organisational support. *Journal of Management Research*, 3(2), 113-118.

Dirks, K.T. and Ferrin, D.L. 2002. Trust in leadership: meta-analytical findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611-628.

Ferres, N., Connell, J. and Travaglione, A. 2004. Co-worker trust as a social catalyst for constructive employee attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 608-622

Field, A. 2005. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*, Sage, London

Gbadamosi, G. 2003. HRM and the commitment rhetoric: challenges for Africa. *Management Decision,* 41(3), 274-280.

Gbadamosi, G.; Oni, F.O. and Ndaba, J. 2004. Employee Commitment and Trust in Management as Correlates of Charlatan Behaviour and Performance in Swaziland. In Delener, N. and Chao, C. (Eds.) *Navigating Crisis and Opportunities in Global Markets: Leadership, Strategy and Governance*, 2004 Conference Proceedings GBATA, South Africa, 293-299.

Gbadamosi, G. 2005. What if I don't trust Management, Can I Pretend? In Kaynak, E. and Harcar, T.D. (Eds.) *Global Business: The Challenges and Responsibilities in a World of Shifting Alliances*, International Management Development Research Yearbook, Vol. XIV, Proceedings of the 14th World Business Congress*, IMDA, 17-23.

Gbadamosi, G. and Osuagwu, L. 2005. Charlatan Behaviour, Commitment and Perception of Business Ethics: A Correlational Study. In Delener, N. and Chao, C. (Eds.) *Global Markets in Dynamic Environments: Making Positive Connections through Strategy, Technology and Knowledge"*, 2005 Conference Proceedings of GBATA, Portugal, 445-451.

de Gilder, D. 2003. Commitment, trust and work behaviour: the case of contingent workers. *Personnel Review*, 32(5), 588-604.

Harter, S. 1990. Causes, correlates, and the functional role of global self-worth: A life span perspective. In Sternberg, R.J., Kolligan, J.Jr. (Eds.), *Competence Considered.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 67-97.

Judge, T.A.., Erez, A., Bono, J.E. and Thoresen, C.J. 2003. The core self-evaluations scale: development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 303-331.

Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., and Durham, C.C. 1997. The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core-evaluation approach. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 19, 151-188.

Locke, E.A., McClear, K. and Knight, D. 1996. Self-esteem and work. *International review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, 11, 1-32.

McDonald, D.J. and Makin, P.J. 2000. The psychological contract, organisational commitment and job satisfaction of temporary staff. *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal,* 21(2), 84-91

Matthai, J.M. 1989. Employee perception of trust, satisfaction, and commitment as predictors of turnover intentions in a mental health setting. *Dissertation Abstract International*.

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. and Smith, C.A. 1993. Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualisation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.

Natalie, F, Connell, J and Travaglione, A. 2004. Co-worker trust as a social catalyst for constructive employee attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 608-622

Parnell, J.A. and Singer, M.G. 2001. The organisational charlatan scale: developing an instrument to measure false performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(5), 441-455.

Rosseau, D.M. and Wede-Benzoni, K.A. 1994. Linkage strategy and human resource practices: how employee and customer contracts are created, *Human Resource Management*, 33(3), 463-489.

Rotter, J.B. 1966. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1) No. 609.

Tan, H. and Tan, C.S. 2000. Towards the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organisation. *Generic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs,* 126(2), 241-260.

Tyler, T.R. 2003. Trust within organisations. *Personnel Review*, 32(5), 556-568.

Watson, D. 2000. *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guildford.

Weber, P.S and Weber, J.E. 2001. Changes in employee perceptions during organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(6) 291-300

Yousef, D.A. 2000. Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behaviour with job satisfaction and performance in a non-Western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-24